


Exploring the Differences in Work Value Among Generations in the UAE

Mohammed Yasin Ghadi, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, UAE & Mu'tah University, Jordan*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9939-7938>

Ali M. AlGhazo, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, UAE

Ahmed Al-Nakeeb, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, UAE

Tahir Masood Qureshi, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, UAE

Omyma Ismail Shehata, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, UAE

Omar Y. Ghadi, California Miramar University, USA

ABSTRACT

This study aims to measure the work values of Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z and address the generational differences based on their work values. An appropriate sample was used where respondents were employees working, across the United Arab Emirates, in different industries in the private and public sectors. The data were collected from 130 employees based on a 45-item work value inventory (WVI). Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) statistical test was used to answer the research question based on multivariate tests across all three generations. Findings have suggested that Generation X placed more emphasis on work values as compared to Generation Z and Generation Y and were differentiated based on surroundings, altruism, and way of life work values.

KEYWORDS

Birth Effects, Generational Differences, UAE, Work Values

INTRODUCTION

The efforts of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Emiratization initiative (Arabic: Tawteen) have had limited success in increasing the percentage of local Emiratis in the private sector as many companies recruit local citizens to meet mandated quotas and fill non-strategic positions (Forstenlechner et al., 2012; Patro, 2015; Sekhar, 2015). However, on the second trend's bottom-up approach, focused on reforming the educational system, aligning the curriculum with market needs and the entered workforce (Bains, 2009; Davidson, 2009; EIU, 2009).

Work values refer to the set of standards, principles, and importance of work and work-related issues from an employee's perspective (Beckett et al., 2017). The current literature on intergenerational

DOI: 10.4018/IJSSMET.318086

*Corresponding Author

This article published as an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and production in any medium, provided the author of the original work and original publication source are properly credited.

differences in work attitudes has relied on generational stereotypes. In addition, it has provided mixed empirical results regarding work values in positive and negative interactions between generations (Klaffke, 2020).

In 2015, Gimbergsson and Lundberg (2016) indicated that work values were divided into broader categories. For instance, intrinsic work values were characterized by development and motivation factors (Galli, 2020). Extrinsic work values were related to power, work, and status. Altruistic work values focus on a desire to help each other and contribute to society. Status-associated work values relate to a satisfaction of personal superiority. Social work value indicators include leisure time and work-life balance, which are associated with work value changes in each generation (Minh et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2018).

The generations are divided and termed based on year of birth (Jiří, 2016):

- **Rationalists:** 1900–1945
- **Baby Boomers or Boom Generation:** 1946–1960
- **Generation X or Thirteeners:** 1960–1980
- **Generation Y:** 1981–1999
- **Generation Z:** 2000–2012

Generation Y holds a significant difference in values of organizational fit from the previous generations, as they prefer organizations with common goals and vision (Rani & Samuel, 2016). A similar study shows that Generation Y desires extrinsic and social work values. Generation Y seeks short-term and long-term developments to achieve their goals. They also prefer work-life balance (Winter & Jackson, 2015). Generation Z has a different set of values, seeking organizations with long-term objectives and goals.

Work values must be within the confines of work-related standards and values; however, it is influenced by an employee's attitude toward work (Karthikeyan, 2022). Work values in any organization determine how employees approach their work, individual feelings about one's job, and the pride or perception one holds for their organization. An organization's ability to succeed depends on how much emphasis it places on its core principles and how those values are reflected in employee behavior at work.

Leuty (2013) noted that work values can be used as a motivator to achieve work satisfaction. The study highlights the stability of scores over time, regardless of the indecisive conclusion of the study. A quinquennial assessment of work values would serve in the development of human resources practices and strategies in today's rapidly changing world. According to Lim (2012), the UAE workforce demographics show a significant increase in Generation Y but lack evidence about this group.

UAE is the hub of many national and multinational organizations. Employees from all over the world and from all generations are present within the organizations. Marzooqi (2017) concluded that Generation X values creativity (but is not creative compared to previous generations). Generation X workers in the UAE appreciate diverse, changing work responsibilities. The study further concluded that Generation X prefers a positive attitude toward the employer and work environment. Professional growth is also a high priority among the generation.

There has been a tremendous increase in the importance of studying and understanding the millennial generation. Researching this cohort is difficult because, as the youngest group, it is still arriving in the workplace. The oldest generation has gained work experience for a substantial number of years and are, therefore, taking on leadership roles. Millennials can offer a range of opportunities for comparisons within the generations (Merchant & Merchant, 2011).

This study aims to examine the relationship between generation, work values, and age. It compares work values among three generations in a sample of working adults. This study has fulfilled its objective by measuring the work values of employees of the same age from three different generations

(Generations Z, Y, and X). The study's first set of analyses demonstrates whether the three generations can be differentiated in a multigenerational workplace by work values. The second set of analyses identifies the effectiveness of work values across the three generations. The study aims to extract the core differences within the generations based on social, economic, and geographical backgrounds.

BACKGROUND OF THE LITERATURE

The three categories of work values identified in the literature were extrinsic satisfaction, concomitants of work, and intrinsic satisfaction. According to Carruthers (1968), the expanded 15 categories include extrinsic rewards (way of life, security, prestige, and economic return), extrinsic concomitants (surroundings, associates, supervisory relations, and variety), and intrinsic values (altruism, creativity, independence, intellectual stimulation, aesthetics, achievements, and management).

The literature on generations at work spotlights differences between generations in core job characteristics, such as work-related values, expectations, and attitudes. People from various generations have diverse expectations, preferences, and attitudes about work values (Öztürk & İnkiler, 2021).

Values serve as a bonding mechanism between people, setting the tone for the workplace and creating a culture that promotes collaboration toward shared goals. A previous study showed that comparable values among employee can result in congruent interpretations and compatible perceptions of activities and situations (Tursunbayeva et al., 2021).

Employees place greater importance on extrinsic values by following a semi-circle pattern during their college years and increasing this pattern during young adulthood (Lechner et al., 2017). Work values and attitudes differ as both factors have separate definitions, applications, and effects. The primary differential characteristic is that work values change with time, unlike opinions or attitudes (Borg et al., 2019). Work values change based on psychological concepts and beliefs that can change within one's psychological framework (Papavasileiou et al., 2017). Employees from Generation X Generation Z welcome recognition and superiority in the workplace. Both generations prioritize working with organizations that hold fast paced goals. Leadership influences their work values. A transparent leadership style is more appreciated by these generations (Öztürk & İnkiler, 2021). Work nature and type of organization, therefore, impact employee work values.

Jaskyte (2016) showed that public sector employees in Russia prefer a good salary package and Indian employees prefer recognition over salary. In high-context nations, employees prefer a vital role in the organization. Other countries value an extrinsic job nature over a secure job with high salary packages (Jaskyte, 2016). The pro-social behaviors of new generations are more adaptable because they hold a new set of work values compared to older generations. The new generation works on intrinsic values, self-harmony, innovation, creativity, and long-term associations (Wu et al., 2019). The new generation also holds multi-dimensional work values due to internet usage and globalization. Most importantly, equality, recognition, preference within the organization, and long-term development and career growth are common work values for the new generation (Wang & Lin, 2019).

Work values pave the way for employee growth when the organization's culture and objectives parallel the employee's goals and objectives (Vivek & Raveendran, 2017). The study extracted four core values preferred by the new generation: (1) performance and evaluation; (2) growth and creativity; (3) security; and (5) flexibility and risk-taking approaches. A comparison of work values between millennials and Generation Z shows that the older generation prefers work-life balance and commitments, whereas the new generation fulfills commitments and long-term orientation with their organizations based on supervision methods and attitudes. Career commitment was considered the main work value for the engagement of employees.

Papavasileiou and Lyonsb (2015) highlighted the homogenous work values of millennials from different countries. The study highlights results from 22 studies (17 countries), discussing how internal consistency appears throughout the results. However, differences are apparent in millennials

from different countries and within the same country. The study shows that Greek millennials are unique in their work values. Also, the one-size-fits-all approach to HR practices is inappropriate. The relationship between work values, work satisfaction, and turnover was also highlighted in previous studies (Gera et al., 2017; Lu & Lin, 2002). These studies found that personal capability was the most important work value factor for Chinese workers. Wray-Lake et al. (2009) concluded that work values change across time due to economic and social experiences during adolescence and adulthood.

Latkovikj et al. (2016) used a Macedonian millennial sample to illustrate how this group seeks to stay or work in an organization with opportunities for career progression, independence, and high-level work autonomy. According to Kostanek and Khoreva (2018), organizations can offer unique opportunities and challenges when they employ a multigenerational workforce. Firms must customize, adjust, and diversify their approaches to retention practices and talent management to meet attitudes, expectations, behaviors, and values across several generations.

According to Enam and Konduri (2018), baby boomers exhibited an increased level of engagement toward travelling. Millennials were inclined to prolong their student status as compared to other generations. Millennials were also motivated to perform discretionary activities; however, they lack motivation toward participation at work. Sanner-Stiehr and Vandermause (2017) indicated a lack of authority among baby boomers, as they focused on inner-self and work. Therefore, firms should emphasize knowledge-transfer and knowledge-sharing activities in multigenerational workplaces across generations. According to a study by Bejtkovský (2016), employees from the silent generation (1928 – 1945) may have different strengths and weaknesses in the workplace. The study suggests that they may not possess as high of emotional intelligence or loyalty as other generations, but they tend to have a high proficiency with new technologies and internet literacy. This skill set can enable them to work efficiently in today's digital age. However, it is important to note that these findings are generalizations and that individual employees may not fit into these stereotypes.

Simmons et al. (2018) did not find differences in work values across three generations among construction professionals in the United States. This shows that the practices and work values adopted by such companies were based on generational status that, to a certain extent, affect both employees and construction companies. Devi and Sheriff (2017), using an Indian context, argued that baby boomers value rewards, social values, and their job. On the contrary, Generation X wants to work in the technology-based environment or an informal work setup. Likewise, Generation Y is technologically savvy, prefers immediate response, desires a fun work environment, is buoyant, and will multitask. Mulia (2019) displayed statistically significant differences toward risks (i.e., shipping risk, product risk, and financial risk) associated with online transactions among baby boomers and millennials (Hajari et al., 2015).

Another Indian study indicated that baby boomers were more likely to negotiate than Generation Y. The latter seeks to withdraw their contracts rather than use negotiation skills. In addition, the study has indicated resignation (as a conflict resolution style) was preferred by male baby boomers as compared to their counterparts (Gupta et al., 2016). Aziz et al. (2018) found a downward tendency of the younger generation toward affective and normative commitment as compared to previous generations. An upward tendency, however, was observed toward turnover intention and job dissatisfaction among the same cohort.

The results of this study will help companies across many sectors understand today's workforce. This understanding will help organizations improve their HR practices and build robust policies that will enhance employee satisfaction and reduce turnover.

METHODS

Study Design

A cross-sectional design was applied to answer the following research questions:

1. Can the three generations be differentiated by work values within a multigenerational workplace?
2. Which work values discriminate among the three generations?

The study was conducted over a span of two months (January 2020 to March 2020) at organizations in the public and private sectors in the UAE.

Instrument

This study used the work value inventory (WVI) developed by Super (1970). The inventory consists of 45 self-reported items and used a five-point Likert scale (1 = unimportant, 5 = very important). The 15 work values measured in the instrument were:

1. Altruism
2. Aesthetics
3. Creativity
4. Intellectual Stimulation
5. Independence
6. Achievement
7. Prestige
8. Management
9. Economic Returns
10. Security
11. Surroundings
12. Supervisory Relations
13. Associates
14. Variety
15. Way of Life

Instrument Reliability and Validity

A test-retest approach was used to determine the internal reliability of the WVI on 99 10th-grade students. It took place across a two-week interval. Regarding the validity of the instrument, Bolton (1980) argued that the coefficients of WVI were consistent and developed for the supportive use of work value factors. Table 1 shows the reliability analysis based on Cronbach's alpha, which ranges from 0 to 1. The results of Cronbach alpha indicated that an acceptable threshold of reliability is based on alpha coefficient of at least 0.700. The findings show that all the work values (except economic return, security, and surroundings) meet the acceptable threshold of reliability.

Population and Sample

The study's population included the three identified generations within the UAE workforce, Generations X, Y, and Z. The study had a convenient sample. The survey was transformed to an electronic form via Google Forms. It was completed by employees across different sectors in the UAE. Neither company nor industry names were used in the instrument. The survey was sent via mass e-mails, using directories identified through online searches and personal acquaintances at companies within the UAE. A total of 130 respondents were collected.

Data Collection Procedures

Access to the surveyed organizations was granted to measure the work values of the 130 respondents. The director of organizational effectiveness granted the access per a formal letter of request. The researcher sent a copy of the WVI to all 130 respondents after obtaining receipt of written permission

Table 1. Reliability analysis

| Variables | Items | Cronbach Alpha |
|-------------------------|-------|----------------|
| Altruism | 3 | 0.745 |
| Aesthetics | 3 | 0.859 |
| Creativity | 3 | 0.922 |
| Intellectual Simulation | 3 | 0.887 |
| Independence | 3 | 0.741 |
| Achievement | 3 | 0.858 |
| Prestige | 3 | 0.703 |
| Management | 3 | 0.784 |
| Economic Return | 3 | 0.663 |
| Security | 3 | 0.688 |
| Surroundings | 3 | 0.687 |
| Supervisory Relations | 3 | 0.713 |
| Associates | 3 | 0.746 |
| Variety | 3 | 0.814 |
| Way of Life | 3 | 0.742 |

from the director. A cover letter was attached to introduce the survey and data collection purpose. The responses toward WVI remained confidential to the researcher.

Data Analysis

The data collected were manually entered into a Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 based on responses of the WVI. The personal information or demographic profile of respondents was presented through frequencies and percentages. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. Mean and standard deviations (SD) were used to present the WVI items. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and discriminant analysis were used to analyze the composite scores for each item.

RESULTS

A total of 130 employees completed the questionnaire (see Table 2). Out of 130 participants, most were male (50.77%) in the 1981–1999 generation (38.46%). Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for 15 work values and 130 respondents based on mean scores and SD. The mean scores for the 15 work values ranged from 3.028 to 4.2205 for the study sample. The SD for the study sample ranged from 0.7975 to 1.381.

Table 4 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients for the measured 15 work values. The findings show that most of the pairs were positively and significantly correlated and produced Pearson correlation coefficients with an $r > 0.500$ at $p < 0.001$. The research questions proposed in the previous section were answered by testing the question. The multivariate general linear model function was used along with the multivariate tests (Roy's Largest Root, Pillai's Trace, and Hotelling's Trace) to confirm the findings of the Wilks' Lambda statistic. Table 5 shows that the Wilks' Lambda for the proposed 15 work values were 0.020 at $p = 0.05$. The null hypotheses showing the mean vectors of all three generations as determined by 15 work values were rejected based on the significant Wilks' Lambda. Similarly, other tests confirmed rejecting the null hypotheses at $p = 0.05$. Partial eta squared indicated 8.1% variability in the 15 work values as accounted for by variation in the three study generations.

Table 2. Demographic profile

| Variables | | N | % |
|---------------------|----------------------|----|-------|
| Gender | Male | 66 | 50.77 |
| | Female | 64 | 49.23 |
| Generation Category | 1960-1980 | 40 | 30.77 |
| | 2000-2025 | 40 | 30.77 |
| | 1981-1999 | 50 | 38.46 |
| Educational Level | High school or below | 21 | 16.15 |
| | Diploma | 17 | 13.07 |
| | Undergraduate | 60 | 46.15 |
| | Postgraduate | 22 | 16.92 |
| | Doctorates | 10 | 7.71 |

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for WWI

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------|-----|--------|----------------|
| Altruism | 130 | 3.8769 | .91418 |
| Esthetics | 130 | 3.2103 | 1.24731 |
| Creativity | 130 | 3.4564 | 1.38164 |
| Intellectual Simulation | 130 | 3.1410 | 1.30121 |
| Independence | 130 | 3.3846 | 1.12329 |
| Achievement | 130 | 4.0179 | .97365 |
| Prestige | 130 | 3.8026 | .93058 |
| Management | 130 | 3.0282 | 1.04179 |
| Economic Return | 130 | 4.1256 | .80295 |
| Security | 130 | 4.0513 | .79886 |
| Surroundings | 130 | 4.2205 | .82651 |
| Supervisory Relations | 130 | 4.1692 | .79755 |
| Associates | 130 | 3.4718 | 1.07496 |
| Variety | 130 | 3.2051 | 1.25300 |
| Way of Life | 130 | 3.8026 | .84623 |

Testing of the Eigen values of each function indicated that 68.7% of the model dispersion was classified to the first canonical function with an eigenvalue of .122 (see Table 6). The remaining 33.2% of the model variance can be classified to the second canonical function with an eigenvalue of .055. Furthermore, the canonical correlation between the first and second functions was relatively low at .329 and .229, respectively.

Table 7 rejects the null hypotheses that the means of two canonical functions were equal in the three generations based on the significant chi-square of 20.266 for the model. It was observed that the second function was not statistically significant at $p < .05$ after removing the first canonical function from the model. There was no significance in retaining the second canonical function in further tests.

Table 4. Correlation coefficients and significance level

| | Alt | Es | Cr | IS | Ind | Ach | Pres | Man | ER | Sec | Sur | SR | Ass | Var | WOL |
|-------------------------|-----|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Altruism | 1 | .545** | .605** | .535** | .465** | .748** | .524** | .376** | .431** | .338** | .432** | .414** | .292** | .530** | .464** |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .001 | .000 |
| Esthetics | 1 | .803** | .734** | .707** | .455** | .442** | .630** | .184* | .033 | .075 | .053 | .263** | .796** | .304** | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .036 | .708 | .396 | .548 | .003 | .000 | .000 | |
| Creativity | 1 | .801** | .759** | .541** | .483** | .635** | .256** | .150 | .101 | .077 | .169 | .851** | .265** | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .003 | .090 | .255 | .383 | .054 | .000 | .002 | | |
| Intellectual Simulation | 1 | .718** | .410** | .317** | .622** | .002 | -.003 | -.054 | -.046 | .122 | .809** | .108 | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .983 | .974 | .542 | .600 | .167 | .000 | .220 | | | |
| Independence | 1 | .372** | .445** | .641** | .254** | .073 | .106 | .137 | .187* | .712** | .297** | | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .004 | .410 | .232 | .119 | .033 | .000 | .001 | | | | |
| Achievement | 1 | .534** | .242** | .508** | .433** | .546** | .459** | .141 | .399** | .409** | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .006 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .110 | .000 | .000 | | | | | |
| Prestige | 1 | .335** | .543** | .434** | .464** | .342** | .220* | .446** | .443** | | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .012 | .000 | .000 | | | | | | |
| Management | 1 | .059 | .072 | -.064 | -.056 | .486** | .603** | .304** | | | | | | | |
| | | .508 | .417 | .467 | .530 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | | | | | | |
| Economic Return | 1 | .602** | .673** | .677** | .234** | .149 | .526** | | | | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .007 | .091 | .000 | | | | | | | | |
| Security | 1 | .566** | .505** | .360** | .058 | .466** | | | | | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .510 | .000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Surroundings | 1 | .749** | .316** | .056 | .561** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .000 | .528 | .000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supervisory Relations | 1 | .326** | .013 | .581** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | .000 | .881 | .000 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Associates | 1 | .174* | .669** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | .047 | .000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Variety | 1 | .229** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | .009 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Way of Life | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5. Multivariate tests for null hypotheses

| | Effect | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|-------------|--------------------|--------|----------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|
| Intercept | Pillai's Trace | .980 | 377.700 ^b | 15.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .980 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .020 | 377.700 ^b | 15.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .980 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 50.137 | 377.700 ^b | 15.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .980 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 50.137 | 377.700 ^b | 15.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .980 |
| Generations | Pillai's Trace | .161 | .666 | 30.000 | 228.000 | .008 | .081 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .845 | .664 ^b | 30.000 | 226.000 | .010 | .081 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | .177 | .662 | 30.000 | 224.000 | .012 | .081 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | .122 | .925 ^c | 15.000 | 114.000 | .038 | .109 |

a. Design: Intercept + Generations

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 6. Eigenvalues of the Canonical Functions

| Function | Eigenvalue | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Canonical Correlation |
|----------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | .122 ^a | 68.7 | 68.7 | .329 |
| 2 | .055 ^a | 31.3 | 100.0 | .229 |

a. First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Table 7. Wilks' Lambda of the Canonical Functions

| Test of Function(s) | Wilks' Lambda | Chi-square | df | Sig. |
|---------------------|---------------|------------|----|------|
| 1 through 2 | .845 | 20.266 | 30 | .009 |
| 2 | .947 | 6.477 | 14 | .953 |

Table 8 shows the canonical functions in the structure matrix. It reveals that the work values have absolute correlation with the first canonical function.

Table 9 presents multiple pairwise comparison tests across generations for each work value.

Findings in Table 9 reveal a statistically significant difference for Generation X for altruism as compared to Generations Z and Y. In addition, Generation X showed a statistically significant difference on surroundings and way of life as compared to Generations Z and Y. No statistically significant differences were found across all three generations for each work value.

Table 8. Structure matrix discriminant functions

| | Function | |
|-------------------------|----------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 |
| Way of Life | .610* | .115 |
| Associates | .549* | .219 |
| Independence | .319* | .108 |
| Altruism | .294* | .077 |
| Management | .276* | .132 |
| Economic Return | .271* | -.117 |
| Esthetics | .230* | .190 |
| Achievement | .222* | .073 |
| Variety | .213* | .200 |
| Intellectual Simulation | .129* | .058 |
| Security | .100* | -.092 |
| Prestige | .303 | .591* |
| Creativity | .092 | .194* |
| Surroundings | .095 | .189* |
| Supervisory Relations | .042 | .081* |

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions.

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

*. Largest absolute correlation between each variable and any discriminant function

Table 9. Multiple pairwise tests across generations

| Dependent Variable | (I) Generation | (J) Generations | Mean Difference (I-J) | Sig. |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Altruism | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .09167 | .896 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .22500* | .041 |
| Esthetics | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .01667 | .998 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .24167 | .635 |
| Creativity | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | -.07500 | .968 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .10833 | .928 |
| Intellectual Simulation | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .04167 | .989 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .14167 | .867 |
| Independence | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .10833 | .903 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .30000 | .422 |
| Achievement | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .06667 | .950 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .18167 | .657 |
| Prestige | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | -.14167 | .772 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .23667 | .451 |
| Management | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .06667 | .956 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .24167 | .522 |
| Economic Return | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .15000 | .683 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .18167 | .539 |
| Security | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | .07500 | .909 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .06667 | .919 |
| Surroundings | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | -.04167 | .973 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .06667* | .024 |
| Supervisory Relations | 1960-1980 | 1981-1999 | -.01667 | .995 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .02833 | .985 |
| Associates | 1960-1980 | 1986-1990 | .15833 | .783 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .48833 | .081 |
| Variety | 1960-1980 | 1986-1990 | .00000 | 1.000 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .22500 | .677 |
| Way of Life | 1960-1980 | 1986-1990 | .19167 | .561 |
| | | 2000-2025 | .42500* | .046 |

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

DISCUSSION

The results reveal that Generation X placed a higher value ($p < 0.05$) on supervisor relations when compared with Generations Z and Y. Supervisors can lead in an effective manner if they understand the differences and needs of older and younger workers.

The multivariate null hypotheses were calculated through Wilks' Lambda for the first research question: Can the three generations be differentiated by work values within a multigenerational

workplace? Based on Wilks' Lambda statistics ($U = .845$ at $p < .05$), the null hypothesis was rejected for all three generations across the 15 work values. It was observed that management and generational theorists develop general value profiles to demonstrate whether a difference exists between members of different generational cohorts irrespective of work value. Older employees are managed by younger managers based on success, power, money, competition, and job satisfaction. However, older employees find job satisfaction in comfort, pride, a sense of belonging, and security.

Moreover, the work value pairwise comparisons were performed for all three generations with $p > .50$ and $< .10$. The findings show that Generation X placed a higher value on altruism ($p = 0.041$) and way of life ($p = 0.046$) as compared to Generations Z and Y. No statistically significant differences were found for the remaining work values (i.e., aesthetics, creativity, intellectual stimulation, independence, achievement, prestige, management, economic return, security, supervisory relations, associates, and variety) in differentiating between the three generations.

A common stereotype holds that older employees may not be managed as effectively by supervisors and managers due to lower performance expectations, less monitoring of productivity, and assigning light-duty tasks. However, the findings from a study indicate that Generation X employees place a high value on work-life balance, similar to other generations, which is not consistent with previous literature. It has been observed that employees of all ages desire a strong work-life balance. The study also highlights that when organizations view their employees as assets and support their work-life balance, their productivity improves. It's important to note that these are generalizations and that individual employees may not fit into these stereotypes.

The workplace should recognize and meet the needs of its older workforce to increase and retain these employees within a shrinking labor force. A collaborative multi-generational workforce is needed in today's changing work environment. Communication is a basic difference among generations. This study claims that changes in work values mirror that found between the baby boomers and Thirteeners Generation. The source of change includes the attitudes and behaviors employees of both generations hold toward the same basic work values. However, the difference is created by communication styles and supervising skills (Cummins, 2019). The most considerable work values of the Thirteeners Generation were freedom in the workplace, relaxing working hours, and work-life balance (Queiri et al., 2016).

Organizations in the UAE have a diverse labor force and include employees from every generation. The study conducted in the UAE shows that each generation holds different work values. The Thirteeners Generation favors more democratic, transformational, and servant leadership and behavior. The value performance, leadership skills, and technical skills (Al Amiri et al., 2019; Ibrahim et al., 2022). The current study concluded that work values of the Thirteeners Generation are dependent on self-reliance, specifically among females. Job security and higher compensation levels are desired (Tipu, 2016). This younger generation is less loyal to their organization in comparison to previous generations. They demand recognition and authority in the workplace. Further, intensive work values are highly acceptable.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that employees of Generation X (through surveyed organizations) have a statistically significant difference toward the work values they choose to achieve or fulfill through their work. Surroundings, altruism, and way of life differentiated the three generations throughout the surveyed organizations. There was no statistically significant generational differentiation based on economic return, independence, intellectual stimulation, variety, management, aesthetics, associates, and prestige. It is advantageous to replicate this study by including differentiating variables to address demographic differences found throughout the generations. Gender, ethnicity, cultural background, geographic location, and education level can be included in these demographic variables.

REFERENCES

- Al Amiri, N., Daradkeh, F., & Al Kaabi, A. (2019). Leadership styles and competence among Generation Z Emirati nursing students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching, and Educational Research*, 18(9), 23–45.
- Al-Marzooqi, L. A. (2017). *Exploring differences in work values among multigenerational workforce: Leadership approaches in selected higher educational institutions in the UAE* [Doctoral dissertation]. The British University in Dubai (BUiD).
- Aziz, K. A., Rahman, R. H. A., Yusof, H. M., & Yunus, W. M. A. W. M. (2018). A review on generational differences and work-related attitude. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*, 8(8), 346–360. doi:10.6007/IJARBS/v8-i8/4473
- Bains, E. (2009). Raising standards and aspirations. *Middle East Economic Digest*, 53(51), 38–41.
- Beckett, C., Maynard, A., & Jordan, P. (2017). Values and ethics in social work. *Sage (Atlanta, Ga.)*.
- Bejtkovský, J. (2016). The current generations: The baby boomers, x, y and z in the context of human capital management of the 21st century in selected corporations in the Czech Republic. *Littera scripta*, 9(2), 25–45.
- Bolton, B. (1980). Second-order dimensions of the Work Values Inventory (WVI). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 17(1), 33–40. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(80)90012-3
- Borg, I., Hertel, G., Krumm, S., & Bilsky, W. (2019). Work values and facet theory: From intercorrelations to individuals. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 49(3), 283–302. doi:10.1080/00208825.2019.1623980
- Carruthers, T. E. (1968). Work values and chosen careers: Note on a trial of an American work values inventory with British subjects. *Occupational Psychology*, 42(2), 111–117.
- Cummins, G. (2019). *An investigation into what factors need to be considered in the management of different generations in a financial services company in Ireland in relation to each cohort's work values and attitudes to work* [Doctoral dissertation]. National College of Ireland.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Abu Dhabi's new economy: Oil, investment and domestic development. *Middle East Policy*, 16(2), 59–79. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4967.2009.00391.x
- Devi, A., & Sheriff, A. M. (2017). Changing work place value amongst generational cohorts in Indian public and private banks. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 5(2), 119–133.
- Du, Y. (2022). Promoting inclusive organizational identity: Suggestions for leaders to reduce communication disconnect caused by cultural differences. In *Implementing diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging management in organizational change initiatives* (pp. 45–64). IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-6684-4023-0.ch003
- Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). (2009, January). The GCC in 2020 the Gulf and its people. *The Economist Impact*. <https://impact.economist.com/perspectives/economic-development/gcc-2020/white-paper/gcc-2020-gulf-and-its-people>
- Enam, A., & Konduri, K. C. (2018). Time allocation behavior of twentieth-century American generations: GI generation, silent generation, baby boomers, Generation X, and millennials. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2672(49), 69–80. doi:10.1177/0361198118794710
- Forstenlechner, I., Madi, M. T., Selim, H. S., & Rutledge, J. E. (2012). Emiratisation: Determining the factors that influence the recruitment decisions of employers in the UAE. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(2), 406–421. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.561243
- Galli, B. J. (2020). Impact and role of motivation theories in continuous improvement environments: A reflection of literature. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 11(1), 1–13. doi:10.4018/IJSSMET.2020010101
- Gera, R., Mittal, S., Batra, K., & Prasad, B. (2017). Evaluating the effects of service quality, customer satisfaction, and service value on behavioral intentions with life insurance customers in India. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 1–20. doi:10.4018/IJSSMET.2017070101

- Gimbergsson, E., & Lundberg, S. (2016). *Work values of Generation Z: A quantitative study explaining different groups of Generation Z's work values* [Bachelor's thesis]. Linnaeus University, Växjö, Sweden.
- Gupta, P., Bhattacharya, S., Neelam, N., & Kunte, M. (2016). Boomers like to confront, Generation Y is okay with withdrawal, but they all love to negotiate in India. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 33(4), 403–435. doi:10.1002/crq.21163
- Hajari, M., Hamidi, M., & Aslani, A. (2015). Generations of technology intelligence in the SMEs: A Science Park case study. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(2), 50–62. doi:10.4018/ijssmet.2015040104
- Harhara, A. S., Singh, S. K., & Matloub, H. (2015). Correlates of employee turnover intentions in oil and gas industry in the UAE. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(3), 493–504. doi:10.1108/IJOA-11-2014-0821
- Hattke, F., & Znanewitz, J. (2017). Retaining employees—A study on work values of the millennial generation. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2017(1), 1–33. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2017.13968abstract
- Ibrahim, M., Yusheng, K., & Adam, D. R. (2022). Linking service innovation to organisational performance: Mediating role of employee productivity and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 13(1), 1–16. doi:10.4018/IJSSMET.295558
- Jaskyte, K. (2016). Work values of public, non-profit, and business employees: A cross-cultural evidence. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(3), 184–193. doi:10.1080/01900692.2014.1003386
- Jiří, B. (2016). The employees of baby boomer's generation, Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z in selected Czech corporations as conceivers of development and competitiveness in their corporation. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(4), 105–123. doi:10.7441/joc.2016.04.07
- Karthikeyan, C. (2022). Workplace cyberbullying in organizations with criminal intent and subtle means: A very pleasant and safe organization culture brings in a better work culture in an organization. In *Handbook of Research on Digital Violence and Discrimination Studies* (pp. 568–588). IGI Global.
- Klaffke, M. (2020). Managing generational diversity: Lessons German companies can learn from Silicon Valley. In *Socioeconomics, diversity, and the politics of online education* (pp. 127–141). IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-3583-7.ch008
- Kostanek, E., & Khoreva, V. (2018). Multi-generational workforce and its implication for talent retention strategies. In *Psychology of Retention* (pp. 203–221). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-98920-4_10
- Latkovikj, M. T., Popovska, M. B., & Popovski, V. (2016). Work values and preferences of the new workforce: HRM implications for Macedonian millennial generation. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 4(4), 312–319. doi:10.12720/joams.4.4.312-319
- Lechner, C. M., Sortheix, F. M., Göllner, R., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2017). The development of work values during the transition to adulthood: A two-country study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 99(1), 52–65. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2016.12.004
- Leuty, E. M. (2013). Stability of scores on Super's work values inventory, Revised. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, 46(3), 202–217.
- Lu, L., & Lin, G. C. (2002). Work values and job adjustment of Taiwanese workers. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 70–76.
- Merchant, S., & Merchant, J. E. (2011). Diversity orientation and cultural differences in the implementation of information technology. In *Handbook of research on culturally aware information technology: Perspectives and models* (pp. 27–48). IGI Global.
- Mulia, D. (2019). The differences in risk perception between millennials and baby boomers in online transactions. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 23(3), 375–392.
- Öztürk, İ., & İkiler, M. E. (2021). The differences in leadership styles among generations. In *Handbook of research on recent perspectives on management, international trade, and logistics* (pp. 316–334). IGI Global.

- Papavasileiou, E., Lyons, S., Shaw, G., & Georgiou, A. (2017). Work values in tourism: Past, present and future. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 64(C), 150–162.
- Papavasileiou, E. F., & Lyons, S. T. (2015). A comparative analysis of the work values of Greece's 'millennial' generation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(17), 2166–2186.
- Patro, C. S. (2015). Employee welfare measures in public and private sectors: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(1), 22–36.
- Queiri, A., Dwaikat, N., & Yelwa, H. (2016). Generation Y's work values and fit assessment: A study in Malaysian context. *Journal of Southeast Asian Research*, (1), 1–10.
- Rani, N., & Samuel, A. (2016). A study on generational differences in work values and person-organization fit and its effect on turnover intention of Generation Y in India. *Management Research Review*, 39(12), 1695–1719.
- Sanner-Stiehr, E., & Vandermause, R. K. (2017). Can't we all just get along? A dual-theory approach to understanding and managing the multigenerational workplace. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 17(2), 103–110.
- Simmons, D. R., Iorio, J., Taylor, J. E., & Li, D. (2018). Work values across generations among construction professionals in the United States. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 144(10), 04018096.
- Super, D. E. (1970). *Work Values Inventory manual*. Riverside Publishing Company.
- Tipu, S. A. A. (2016). Predicting entrepreneurial intentions from work values. *Management Decision*, 54(3), 610–629.
- Tursunbayeva, A., Di Lauro, S., & Antonelli, G. (2021). Exploring shared work values and work collaboration with a network approach: A case study from Italy. In *Using strategy analytics to measure corporate performance and business value creation* (pp. 43–58). IGI Global.
- Vivek, S. A., & Raveendran, D. (2017). An empirical study on perceived work values among employees of information technology sector. *Srusti Management Review*, 10(1), 14–18.
- Vu, Q. M., Liao, Y. K., Thi, Y., Truong, G. N. T., Nguyen, P. M. B., & Wu, W. Y. (2022). The influence of personality traits on intention to purchase green products. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 13(1), 1–17.
- Wang, Y., & Lin, L. (2019). Research on the influence of new generation employees' work values on employee voice behaviour. In *1st International Conference on Business, Economics, Management Science (BEMS 2019)*. Atlantis Press.
- Winter, R. P., & Jackson, B. A. (2015). Work values preferences of Generation Y: Performance relationship insights in the Australian Public Service. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(17), 1997–2015.
- Wray-Lake, L., Syvertsen, A., Briddell, L., Flanagan, C., & Osgood, W. (2009). *Exploring the changing meaning of work for American high school seniors from 1976 to 2005*. Network on Transitions to Adulthood Research Network Working Paper. Pennsylvania State University. www.transad.pop.upenn.edu/downloads/views_on%20work.pdf
- Wu, P. J., Wu, T. J., & Yuan, K. S. (2019). Green information promotes employees' voluntary green behavior via work values and perceived accountability. *Sustainability*, 11(22), 1–16.
- Xing, Y. (2018). *A comparative study of teacher-student relationships among different Chinese generations* [Master's thesis].
- Yang, J., Yu, C. S., & Wu, J. (2018). Work values across generations in China. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(3), 486–505.

Mohammed Yasin Ghadi is an Associate Professor in the School of Business and Quality Management at Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University. Prior to his appointment, Dr. Ghadi worked for more than six years at Mutah University in Jordan and as a Chairman of Department of Business at Mutah University. He also taught some Management courses at the University of Wollongong in Australia. Dr. Ghadi's teaching experience includes Human Resource Management, Staffing, Compensation Management, Strategic Human Resource Management, Training & Development, and Organizational Behaviour. Dr. Ghadi's research interests include Happiness in work, meaning in work, work engagement, loneliness in work, transformational leadership, turnover intention, workplace envy, job crafting, work spirituality, strategic human resources management.

Ahmed Al-Nakeeb is the Chair of Quality and Operation Management Programs at Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University. Dr. Al-Nakeeb received his university education in the United Kingdom. Dr. Al-Nakeeb has publications in various International Journals and his research interest is mostly in Quality Management, Marketing, HRM, IT, and Change Management.

Tahir Masood Qureshi holds MBA, MS, and Ph.D. degrees in Management/HRM, Academic FCIPD, and FCAHR status. He is a recipient of nine research, teaching, and training awards from institutions of international repute. He has been extensively involved in the AACSB accreditation processes. Tahir is a member of world high-ranked societies such as the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development (CIPD), Academy of Management (AoM), and Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM). His training and research interests are related to HRM, Management, and Leadership. He has done numerous training sessions and consulting projects with different organizations. In addition to 46+ research publications and 2000+ citations, there is a book and 45+ international conference presentations in his credit.

Omar Y. Ghadi is a senior Ph.D. candidate at California Miramar University in the USA. His research interests are related to Strategic Management, Management, and organizational behavior.