Abstract

This thesis is an exploratory study of the young Generation Y’s expectations to ethics at work in New Zealand. Chapter 1 sets out the structure of the thesis and introduces background information as well as the research question. The literature focuses on intergenerational conflicts in the workplace, and sees generations as an aspect of diversity that is often difficult to balance to human resource management. Generation Y has been highly criticised in relation to other generations in academic and popular literature, and are considered entitled, lazy and self-absorbed. The research aims to let Generation Y speak for themselves without stereotyping, while also focusing on the underlying values that drives ethics at work.

Chapter 2 discusses literature on the changing nature of work, as well as Generation Y before it moves on to business ethics literature. Ethics research found that values based ethical culture is needed to successfully run an ethical organisation, with ethical leadership playing a significant role. Further, the thesis discusses implications of a more complicated socialisation and prolonged formative phase of Generation Y in comparison to older generations, which makes Generation Y seem different. Scarcity theory discusses the impact that the abundance of human basic needs has on value preference, and it can therefore be argued that because Generation Y’s formative years were during a period of economic and social stability, they value other physiological means and fulfilment such as self-expression more than a basic income. A third argument of differentiating Generation Y from others, found particularly in popular media, is Generation Y’s focus on work with meaning and concern for the environment. Ecological Modernisation Theory advocates involving institutions in environmental concerns, where the focus on potential financial gain by an environmentally ethic organisation has brought the topic to public attention. This heightened focus developed in the period in which Generation Y was socialised, and provides the grounds to argue that it plays a major role for Generation Y’s focus on ethical work. These three theories form the basis of an argument as to how and why Generation Y is perceived as different, and can provide the knowledge needed to understand what the new workforce expect and want from work.

Chapter 3 discuss the Q-methodology that was used to investigate these expectations, while Chapter 4 analyses the findings. It found that Generation Y’s expectations centre around three
sets of values in relation to ethics at work. This is illustrated with The Achiever, The Ethical Employee, and The Public Conservationist ideal types. People associated with the first set of values want to be the best at what they do, and expect a good work-life balance in order to be able to do the best work they can for their organisation. Though they are hard workers and wish to add value to the organisation, they do not put much focus on ethics at work. In contrast, the second group values strong ethical cultures where managers are expected to set the tone in the workplace, and want to be in an organisation where they feel comfortable and where employee behaviour is regulated. For the final group, the focus is on preserving the environment and giving back to society. They expect to work with intrinsic motivation and see work as a holistic part of their lives due to their passion for what they want to do. Further, the participants agree that money is not the main reasons to work. They wish to have a say with innovative ideas and expect that all employees should be treated decently at work. Chapter 5 discusses the findings in relation to the literature before the thesis is concluded with discussions of limitations, implications and recommendations.

This research provides data on the differences and consensus within a generation, whilst providing information that can make it easier to understand today’s young workforce. This thesis adds to academic literature by providing a New Zealand based perspective of Generation Y’s various expectations about ethics at work, where some find it significantly more important than others.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Objective

The objective of this thesis is to explore the younger Generation Y’s expectations to work in New Zealand, with a particular focus on ethics and the underlying values the generation have. The younger half of Generation Y, born 1992-1999, are currently in the process of entering the workforce, and it is important to understand their expectations in order to have an organisation that can attract and retain talent, as well as minimising intergenerational conflicts. Much of the research on Generation Y in the workplace is often done in relation to older generations, who consider their own values the current norm, creating negative associations to the different values and ethics that the young Generation Y have. This thesis aims to let Generation Y speak for themselves, where the Q-study performed in this research maps the work expectations, values and ethics of the younger Generation Y. This way we can truly understand the current young workforce and therefore being able to develop an organisational culture and way of managing the workforce that will become more effective.

1.2 Importance for Human Resource Management

As work has become a more integrated part of peoples lives and the line between work and private life is getting increasingly blurred, more work-life conflicts arise (Kossek, Lewis, & Hammer, 2010), the employees of organisations demand more from work than just a pay-slip, and the employee-organisation relationship is getting increasingly complicated. The demand for ethical organisations are rising, however, ethics is under-analysed in the field of Human Resources (HR), and further research on business ethics and the employment relationship is in demand (Budd & Scoville, 2005). There is also a request for a heightened focus on work ethics, as well as a heavier responsibility on HR policies to advance ethical behaviour within organisations (van der Walt, Jonck, & Sobayeni, 2016). In today’s society, intergenerational conflicts are seen as problematic as the economy is increasingly complex and the labour market is insecure (Pritchard & Whiting, 2014), and therefore putting more strain on employees. Every HR practice leaves some employees as winners and some as losers,
influencing individuals, organisations and society in very different ways and it is often a procedure of justifiable explanations, granting the employees voice and interpersonal treatment that is to blame (Margolis, Grant, & Molinsky, 2007). The complex employee relation situation makes navigating ethical behaviour difficult, and it is therefore important to thoroughly understand the workforce and values of people within the organisation.

Even though business ethics are being put on the agenda all around the world, there are still unethical organisations and unethical employee behaviours coming to light every day (Johnson, Bagdasarov, MacDougall & Mumford, 2015). As the people is the focus of human resources departments, it is in their interest and responsibility, along with managers, to explore policies to develop an ethical culture and sustaining workplace ethics (Johnson et al., 2015), and therefore enable employee ethical actions such as whistle blowing (Budd & Scoville, 2005). HR’s role is becoming increasingly important as organisational values should be at the heart of the organisational culture, and the values based culture should be tied to all organisational processes (Jacobs, 2016). Values training is seen as one of the HR manager’s responsibility functions (Charles, 2003), in which the employees are being trained in the specific values the organisation hold, such as tolerance and participative management (Scott, 2005). Research has found that values training, specifically frame-of-reference (FOR) training, increase values enactment clarity and also has a positive effect on the organisational value actions (O’Neill, Travaglione, McShane, Hancock, & Chang, 2017). However, in order to make values training more suitable and effective, it is important to know where the employees are coming from when they enter an organisation, as there is no ‘best way’ of working with ethics in a diverse organisation. Values are at the core of the dynamic organisational culture and has come to exist as accumulated shared learning within an organisation (Schein & Scheiner, 2016). Further, HR practitioners have found that when trying to effectively manage employees, intergenerational differences prove to be challenging (Benson & Brown, 2011). However, due to the complexity of personal values and generations which have been found to require different leadership styles (Hui-Chun & Peter, 2005), and the accumulation of employee experiences developing organisational cultures, there is reason to argue that generations challenge current organisational cultures and may develop a compromise between current and new values, gradually changing the organisational culture over time.
Further, with New Zealand experiencing an employee shortage, and organisations are struggling to fill positions (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2017) it is important to be able to attract and retain the new workforce. Organisations must therefore make themselves attractive to the younger generations that are entering the workforce, and develop an organisational culture with aligned values connecting potential and current employees values with the organisation. Awareness and understanding of the new workforce’s values makes it easier to gain an increased person-organisation fit to drive productivity and commitment (Winter & Jackson, 2016), whilst a ‘values misfit’ is considered a push-factor for employees leaving the organisation (van der Wal, 2017). With HR being a key player in embedding organisational values and develop the culture in order to retain employees (Jacobs, 2016), it is crucial for HR practitioners to understand the complexity of the workforce values and ethical expectations. It is costly to continuously having to hire, train and lose employees due to employees having short tenures with the organisation, so by integrating ethics in the business and HR strategy, it will increase financial benefit and reputation of the organisation (McMurrian & Matulich, 2016; Primeaux & Stieber, 1994).

Theoretically, the thesis will provide a detailed explanation of the young workforce’s ethical values priority and expectations towards work. It adds to academic research by providing a piece of literature in which the generation gets to speak for themselves without being compared to older generations, and therefore avoids negative stereotypical bias from the older generations’ norms. Further, the use of Q-methodology provides a new perspective on the topic where the overall generational characteristics are explored in sub-groups, which possess different value prioritisations. In particular, the study adds to the developing field of ethics research by providing a New Zealand specific context, which has an especially diverse culture within a small population.

1.3 Background

New Zealand is different from other countries, as it has a small, mainly bicultural population and is geographically isolated and far away from other countries. The role of Maori models of leadership in business and society (Katene, 2010) sets New Zealand business out from traditional western business and makes for a particularly interesting research subject. The New Zealanders are also known for their laidback lifestyle, and many individuals from a wide
array of nationalities have migrated to New Zealand as it is seen as one of the top places for expatriates to live (New Zealand Story Group, 2018; NZ Herald, 2012). However, many New Zealand businesses are struggling to fill positions, and it is starting to restrict the abilities businesses have to grow (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2018). In December 2017, 49% of New Zealand businesses reported that they struggle finding skilled labour, whilst 31% also have issues finding unskilled labour (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2018) against 41% and 24% in May 2017 (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2017). The increased difficulty in finding new workers with the right skills increase competition and put extra pressure on organisations to be attractive for the workforce they require, putting a higher demand of skills and knowledge on the HR practitioners.

Not only is the competition for talents increasing, but the variety of employees that is found in today’s workforce with an ageing population and managers dealing with up to four different generations at a time, intergenerational conflicts often arise (Adecco, 2016). The conflict is most often due to younger and older generations having different views and opinions on how things should be done (Adecco, 2016), and with the generations’ socialisation in their formative years having shaped each generation’s values differently, the inherent perception of how you should behave or what role work plays in employees lives vary strongly. A report from the Institute of Business Ethics (IBE) argue that it is crucial to understand the different generational characteristics in order to develop an ethical values based organisational culture (Institute of Business Ethics, 2015). The authors of the IBE report move on to explain the different generations and their relations to work, where veterans have been brought up during political and economic uncertainty, and are therefore financially conservative and hard working. Baby Boomers are considering work as the main mean of life, as they were also socialised in a time of political and social change with a prospering economy. Generation X on the other hand ‘work to live’, and experienced growth in social issues such as divorce and therefore changed the nuclear family as the main institution for socialisation. Generation Y, or the millennials, are seen as digital natives, and as a result of growing up in a consumer economy, they expect to have the opportunity and being enabled to influence their work to a larger extent than previous generations. In comparison to previous generations, Generation Y is reported as wanting wealth, not money, and is more demanding of the workplace for transparency, feedback and strong leadership visions (Bahney, 2017). Despite being more demanding, Generation Y possess characteristics such as being resourceful, hard workers
(Rentz, 2015), want to achieve, good conduct (Howe & Strauss, 2000) and enjoy challenging work (Martin, 2005). By being shaped by common traits, each generation has their own ethical opinions and standards, and have different views of what is perceived as right and wrong behaviour at work (Institute of Business Ethics, 2015), thus can enhance intergenerational conflict at work. It is therefore important to understand the newcomers in the labour market, Generation Y, what they value in work and what they expect of workplaces.

Preceding generations tend to see the following generation as lazy, thinking they know everything and being disrespectful (Adecco, 2016) when in fact it is the misunderstanding or lack of knowledge of the generational differences being perceived as negative traits. Generation Y is highly discussed in media, and is sometimes seen as “the most entitled and self-absorbed in human history”, whilst there are also arguments that employers are unaware of how to use the younger generation to their full potential (Carey, 2017). On the other hand, though Generation Y often is considered to have poor work ethics, it is reported that 62% of Generation Y wants to work in an organisation which has a positive impact on society or the environment, as well as about half of the generation would rather have a job with purpose or meaning than a high salary (Jenkin, 2015). This illustrates that Generation Y rather have a focus on ethical organisation and ethical work, and is further enhanced by reports that the New Zealand Generation Y purchasing behaviour is motivated by concerns regarding sustainability (NZ Herald, 2013). It is stressed by Arnott and Dondé (2017) that New Zealand managers have an important task to incorporate values from the top, taking the personal responsibility for the operation of the organisation and leading by example to incorporate the values based ethical culture in all aspects of the organisation, as well as for employees in order to develop a more ethical organisation. It is therefore important that the sustainability values are also incorporated in to the organisational culture (Jacobs, 2016) in order to make work more meaningful and interesting for Generation Y, as well as high ethical standards which will enhance pride (Arnott & Dondé, 2017), work motivation, engagement and the organisation in a competitive market for labour.

New Zealand has a very diverse business environment, with limited mobility and increasing immigration bringing a multicultural workforce (Arnott & Dondé, 2017), complicating the workplace further with the intergenerational workforce. It is therefore even more important to understand the New Zealand values across gender, cultures and generations in order to
develop a values based culture that employees identify with and are proud of to make the most of the diversity and use it for the organisation’s competitive advantage. This thesis will contribute to this by providing information about values and what role business ethics play for the young Generation Y that is currently entering, or recently have entered the New Zealand workforce.

1.4 Research question and structure

The research question discussed in this thesis is as following:

*What ethical value expectations does the young Generation Y have towards work in New Zealand?*

To begin the discussion of the research question, the literature review start by briefly defining work as it is seen in this study, and further focus on literature surrounding ethics, ethical leadership and culture in organisations as well as the value theories that underlie human behaviour and ethical preferences before explaining the differences of motivational factors for employees in the public and private sector. The thesis then looks to cover some generation theory, focusing in particular on the current perceptions and characteristics of Generation Y. After examining literature related to the research question, the thesis delves in to three theoretical hypotheses; socialisation theory, scarcity theory, and Modern Ecologicalisation Theory, presenting three different ideas that may explain why Generation Y is different. After the literature review, the method chosen for the research, Q-methodology, is explained and discussed. Q-methodology enables participants to give their subjective perspective on a topic in a quantifiable manner (McKeown & Thomas, 2013; Wolf, 2014). The statements used for the Q-set, reasoning for the P-set (participants) and the analytical methods are presented. The analysis combines data from participants, in the form of Q sorts, with data from post-sort interviews. A discussion of the findings including implications and limitations concludes the research paper followed by a final conclusion.
2 Literature review

The literature review will first define and discuss terms from the research question, such as work, ethics and generations, before delving into theory related to possible explanations of Generation Y’s ‘differentness’. Socialisation theory is the basic theory of how generations are shaped by different situations and upbringing during their formative years, which moulds the way the generation will see the world when they become adults. It is questioned if the traditional family socialisation has changed to rely less on parents and more on other institutions and influences, complicating the new generation’s characteristics. Scarcity theory will introduce a hypothesis that people want what they lack in resources of, and as the financial situation of Generation Y’s life has been different to the older generations, it may have impacted Generation Y in to wishing for more than wages from work. Modern Ecologicalisation Theory has been introduced in waves throughout the past century, and had various levels of effect, however, the third wave seem to have made a bigger impact where people are realising that the world is running out of resources, and are determined that current unsustainable processes have to change. Socialisation, scarcity and ecological modernisation theory are all significant in explaining and understanding the changes that has occurred when making Generation Y seem different than previous generations, and are used in the findings to further explain how social changes relate to the opinions and expectations of the three types of Generation Y groups in this thesis.

2.1 Work

For the sake of clarity for this thesis and the participants, work is defined as traditional formal work performed in an organisation for a wage under a contract. However, it is still important to note the significant debate surrounding modern forms of work, where it was previously seen as the means to survive through the economic activity of paid employment (Edgell, 2011) it now takes a variety of forms. Glucksman (1995) defines work through the ‘total social organisation of labour’ which is structured by economic relations, but the development of a knowledge society has brought flexible work arrangements where employees can work from home resulting in an overlap of the private and work spheres (Kalleberg & Vallas, 2017). Further, various forms of informal work such as domestic labour, voluntary work
(Taylor, 2004), and undeclared work (Williams & Nadin, 2012) or ‘invisible work’ (Hatton, 2017) are perceived as work. In addition to this, Williams and Nadin (2012) argue that formal and informal work are also merging together in to semi-declared work, complicating the work-relationship further. The variety in forms of contractual labour also brings complexity to the work-sphere, especially for work in for example the culture industry where musicians, artists and actors work under full-time and part-time work, other works on contracts, get paid per project or other forms of agreements (Gibson, 2003). Work can take many forms, and the more flexible and merging of various work relationships bringing complex aspects of postmodern work, and might be subject to individual perceptions especially for Generation Y who has been socialised during the increase of new forms of work. It is therefore clarified to participants in this research that work is seen as working for an organisation under a paid contract.

2.2 Generation Y

2.2.1 Defining generations

Generation is a well-used term, but have proved to be difficult to pinpoint in relation what it actually is, and there is no consensus on when each generation start and end (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). Parry and Urwin (2011) claims that the term generations are sociological in nature, and Mannheim is seen as the first to identify generational issues. Mannheim (1970) identifies a generation as a social location in which the members are not mentally or physically close to each other, and therefore it is not a concrete group. Further, Parry and Urwin (2011, p. 84) defines a generation as “a set of historical events and related cultural phenomena [which] have impacted in a way that creates a distinct generational group.” The generational characteristics are developed during the formative years of each generation, and are heavily influenced by the current societal situations at those times (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Even though each individual member of a generation have their uniqueness and exceptions, the members of the generation most often than not have a common outlook on life (Strauss & Howe, 1991). A generation is a cohort of people born within a 20-year period, the approximate time between people are born and grow in to adulthood, before a new generation is born (Sims & Sauser, 2012). Though individualism is still significant and individuals within a generational cohort are different and shaped by their own upbringing and
experiences, all generations have specific characteristics and collective upbringing that have shaped the generational cohort to have a set of values and opinions on life.

Because generations have fundamental differences, conflicts arise and it is easy to misunderstand or have negative connotations to generational cohorts a person is not a member of. Currently, Generation Y is seen as ‘different’ compared to previous generations, and is stereotypically considered lazy, entitled and over-confident (van der Wal, 2017). The concept of generations has also caused confusion due to various names and discussions of how to define the different generations (Pritchard & Whiting, 2014). Commonly, western societies classify the current generations as Veterans, Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y (Parry & Urwin, 2011), whilst the newest addition is Generation Z (Bencsik, Horváth-Csikós, & Juhász, 2016). However, one of the issues in academic literature on generations is to define when a new generation start and stop, and causing confusion surrounding who is in or out of the cohort. Table 1 shows an example of discrepancies and agreements in birth years associated with each generation identified in literature, with especially Generation Y varying with a four year gap on the beginning of the generation (between 1979 and 1983), and a 10 year gap for the end years (between 1994 and 2004). For this thesis the young Generation Y is defined as individuals born between 1992 and 1999, where year 2000 is the move to Generation Z. It is also a wide array of names to generations throughout literature and popular media, with the most common names for the generation in question being Generation Y and Millennials covering the same generation, however this study uses Generation Y.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 1: Literature definitions of generational cut off years.*
2.2.2 Characteristics of Generation Y

Generation Y is well known for its’ negatively loaded stereotypical characteristics such as wishing instant gratification and feedback from managers (Adecco, 2016), being lazy, over-confident, impatient, ‘high maintenance’, as well as ‘emotionally needy’ (van der Wal, 2017). Generation Y is highly criticised and has also been labelled the ‘Snowflake Generation’ (Lastner & Taylor, 2015), signifying that the generation think they are special, but also vulnerable. Due to all the negative associations to the name ‘Millennials’, the media has discussed a name change of the generation to ‘free’ them from a negative first impression (The Wall Street Journals, 2017), but as it is not negative in relation to the name, but rather to the generation itself, it is concluded that a name change will not change the perception of Generation Y (Lufkin, 2017). Like every generation, throughout Generation Y’s formative years, they experienced a wide variety of cultural, economic, technological and historical events that is different to previous generations, something that have shaped Generation Y to have a unique set of values, knowledge and perspectives (Sims & Sauser, 2012). Being seen as ‘different’ from the norm that people already know, brings insecurity and a lack of knowledge of how to manage and deal with the newcomers at work, and it is therefore easier to see the weaknesses rather than the strengths of the cohort.

Though the negative aspects of Generation Y has gained a lot of attention, there are many positive aspects that set them out to be able to contribute in a well managed and open minded organisation. Goldgehn (2004) found that when communicating with Generation Y, it is important to be honest, real and ‘raw’ as the generation does not want to be told what to do, but prefer to experience and find the answers themselves. The truth is important to Generation Y, and being technological savvy gives them the skills to quickly do research and find information as they have almost unlimited knowledge easily accessible online. Research has also found that the ‘spoilt’ and entitled Generation Y (Lastner & Taylor, 2015) is not only expecting a lot, but they are also hard working, has strong technological skills, high standards and take initiative as well as being resourceful (Rentz, 2015). Adding to this, challenging work makes Generation Y thrive, they are innovative and wish to drive organisations forward (Martin, 2005). Howe and Strauss (2000) argue that Generation Y is focusing much more on teamwork, modesty, achievements and especially good conduct than any previous generation did when they were young. This shows that the bad reputation Generation Y has is not painting the whole picture, and it is important to move past stereotypes and focus on the positive features they have. As Generation Y grows older they will have more influence, and
society will be changed based on Generation Y’s values. It is therefore important to truly understand the complexity of characteristics this generation brings to the future.

2.2 Business Ethics

2.3.1 Defining Business Ethics

Business ethics has gained increasing exposure in business schools since the late 1980s and early 1990s (Sims & Sims, 1991), and has been a growing concern, gaining more attention after corporate scandals (Sims & Felton, 2006). Ethics is seen as ‘a system of value principles or practices and a definition of right and wrong’, and adds to the law as it can not always cover the complexity of the ethics around what is considered right and wrong behaviour within a society or organisation (Raiborn & Payne, 1990, p. 897). Organisations are built up by structures, processes and organisational values which needs to be aligned in order to effectively develop organisational goals and determine the path the organisation is taking to reach said goal (Campell & Kitson, 2008). The organisational values and culture are developed over time through the collective knowledge and norms of the people in the organisation (Schein & Scheiner, 2016). Even though ethics is a current topic, discussions on work ethics can be traced back to religious traditions in work, such as the Protestant work ethic (De George, 1987). In the traditional writings of Max Weber on the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism published in 1904/1905, Calvinism, a Protestant religious doctrine, and the spirit of modern capitalism are connected (Hughes, Sharrock, & Martin, 2003). Weber argues that as a result of the predestination doctrine, the Calvinists were in a state of self-isolation as well as self-examination, and they therefore turned to hard labour and work to challenge their self-doubt (Morrison, 2006). This meant that the European Calvinists developed a work ethic from the challenges they had with their religion which made them work hard to convince themselves that they were God’s chosen ones. Even though it is argued that the Protestant Ethic is related to economic growth, Furnham et al. (1993) found that countries with a high gross national product (GDP) such as Germany, Britain, the United States, Australia and New Zealand have low connections to the Protestant Work Ethic though it was western countries that the Protestant Ethic first made its mark and played a role in developing modern capitalism (Peter & Deborah, 2007). The previous theories of the relationship between religion and work ethic are further criticised by Miller, Woehr, and Hudspeth (2002) who defines work ethic as a collection of attitudes and beliefs people have in
relation to work. They argue that work ethics are characterised by a variety of factors such as multidimensionality, that it is learned and motivational, is only seen in relation to work in general, and secular as it is “not necessarily tied to any one set of religious beliefs” (Miller et al., 2002, p. 455). Though the Protestant Work Ethic, or other religious factors, have been criticised and not seen as significant in current New Zealand business ethics (Peter & Deborah, 2007), it is important to look back at the history of where business and work ethics stem from.

In more current writing, Hosmer (2011) argues that with an increasingly complex and competitive global economy, managers and employees are being pushed to increase productivity and sales, which may encourage employers as well as employees to take unethical actions to cope with the demanding pressure. Many organisations have been criticised for ‘dark sides’ and gang aspects within work organisation (Stein & Pinto, 2011), unethical treatment of workers in the supply chain (Schleper, Blome, & Wuttke, 2017) and there are also reports bullying and other unethical workplace behaviours in a hostile work environment (Einarsen, 2000), especially in light of the recent #MeToo social media campaign which caused a mass discovery and reports of sexual harassment and media coverage (Lawton, 2017; MacKinnon, 2018). Integrity violations, or unethical behaviours, are divided in 10 categories; (1) corruption in the form of bribing; (2) corruption in the form of favouritism from supervisors or employees; (3) fraud; (4) theft; (5) conflict of interest via gifts; (5) conflict of interest via jobs; (6) abuse of authority; (7) manipulation and misuse of information; (8) discrimination, sexual harassment or indecent treatment of colleagues or citizens and customers; (9) abuse and waste of organisational recourses; and finally, (10) misconduct in private time (Lasthuizen, Huberts & Heres, 2011). Even though an increased productivity pressure in some way encourages unethical behaviour, and the media simultaneously put pressure to reduce some types of unethical behaviour, research find that a good use of quality ethics does in fact drive a successful organisation (Joyner & Payne, 2002). The current focus on organisational and employee ethics has proved that good business ethics and the associated values are in fact more important than ever.

2.3.2 Ethical leadership and culture
The key to a successful and ethical organisation is through ethical leadership (Brown & Treviño, 2006), and scholars such as Treviño, Weaver, Gibson, and Toffler (1999) found that a value based organisational culture works best to encourage employees to act ethically. An
ethical culture include aspects such as employee awareness, providing a culture that is open to employees speaking up about unethical behaviours (Treviño et al., 1999), managers and supervisor as ethical role models (Kaptein, 2011) and a strong set of corporate codes of ethics that are followed through (Stohl, Stohl, & Popova, 2009). An ethical leader’s core characteristics is to perform integrity-focused leadership (Lasthuizen, 2008), but most important and effective is to be an ethical role model for employees (Huberts, Kaptein, & Lasthuizen, 2007). Academic literature clarifies what is needed for a culture and leader in which ethical behaviour overruns the unethical and antisocial behaviour that can be damaging to organisations as well as individuals, but it is still difficult to take action, control and successfully apply an ethical cultural change.

Even though ethical leadership literature have produced good quality knowledge on the topic, Voegtlin (2016) criticise the ethical leadership term for not considering the future enough, and claims it is rather about working with what is and has happened. Voegtlin further encourages use of the term ‘responsible leadership’ in which the leader focus on collective problem solving, shared responsibility, being critical to norms, and being more forward looking as well as always considering the environment. The responsible leadership theory takes ethical leadership a step further to actively enhance the ethics of an organisation and at the same time taking responsibility for the effects the organisation has on the environment and society. Further, Heres (2014) questions ethical leadership theories by considering the complexity of organisations, and found that based on the interpretations, expectations and conceptualisations of the people in an organisation, there are five types of ideal leaders who all manages ethical leadership in different styles. Developing a culture and a leadership style to ensure an ethical organisation is complex due to the many interpretations of what is ethical and not, but it is nevertheless important to incorporate it in the best way possible.

2.3.3 Values

Values can be seen as the basis of ethical behaviours and opinions for all individuals and groups of people, as values have significant weight in human action. Based on generational theory, it is assumed that different generations have different values, ethics and expectations towards work, often causing tensions within organisations (Pritchard & Whiting, 2014). For example, Generation Y has been seen as having unrealistic expectations to public sector work, where the younger generation and the older managers hold conflicting values (Winter & Jackson, 2016). Even though Schwartz set a benchmark of measuring and defining values that
are present to some degree in all cultures around the world, other research shows that there are many factors influencing the values individuals hold (Ralston, Egri, Stewart, Terpstra, & Kaicheng, 1999). It is also argued that despite the best intentions to act ethically based on own values, factors such as reasons and rationalisations, may influence individuals to perform unethical behaviours (Warnell, 2012). The many influences of determining values sets makes developing an organisational culture that employees identify with difficult, but Treviño et al. (1999) argues that the results of a values-based culture has impressive results on ethical and compliance management. The benefits of a values-based approach overrides the complex process of developing a new organisational culture, and with much research arguing that generational cohorts bring a shift in values (Inglehart, 1990; Inglehart, 2008), it is interesting to explore what values the new New Zealand workforce possesses.

2.3.4 Public and private sector motivations

It is frequently suggested that the ethics and values of the public sector are different to the private sector, and is usually reflected in the intrinsic and extrinsic reward. Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) show that the private sector rewards good performance with extrinsic motivators such as economic rewards, whilst the public sector employees are less driven by these rewards and rather get fulfilment from the purpose of the work itself. Self-determination theory see intrinsic motivation as the interest and enjoyment in the activity or work itself, whilst extrinsic motivation is driven by external regulation such as reward and punishment; introjected regulation like performing an activity in order to feel worthy; the identified regulation based on the importance of your own goals, regulations and values; and finally the integrated regulation of the coherence between a person’s goals, regulations and values (Gagné & Deci, 2005). Depending on the values employees have, it can influence what motivates the employee, and this knowledge can help manage the workforce in a more sustainable and effective manner. Generation Y is known to value meaningful and impactful work whilst putting less emphasis on the monetary rewards, and this may cause a change in the current motivational structures of public and private work.

In addition, the public service motivation theory is based on ideas that individuals choose to work in the public sector due to their values towards the society (Benson & Gottschalk, 2017). However, there is little variation found between public and private sector physiotherapists in Denmark, with the biggest difference between the workers being that private sector physiotherapists had a more concentrated focus on the user, whilst public sector
physiotherapists were more oriented towards the public interest (Andersen, Pallesen, & Holm Pedersen, 2011). This confirms Ralston et al. (1999)’s argument that factors such as the industry a person is employed in is influenced by the values an individual possess. Further, van der Wal, De Graaf, and Lasthuizen (2008) found that there are common values at the organisational level such as accountability, reliability, expertise, efficiency and effectiveness between the public and private sector. Distinctive for the private sector was the value prioritisation of profitability, honesty and innovativeness, whilst the public sector organisational values lawfulness, impartiality and incorruptibility. This shows that though the public and private sectors have some overlapping values, they have core values that clearly set them apart.

Further, as it is important of discussion conceptual theories on the topic, the thesis explores theories that can provide hypotheses explanations of the generational values shift that has happened, mainly focusing on socialisation, scarcity and ecological modernisation theory.

2.4 Socialisation Theory

Generation literature has built on socialisation theory to explain how and why generational cohorts are shaped during their formative years, but a shift from family as the traditional socialisation institution to a wide range of institutions influencing young people play a major role in generational change. Inglehart (1990) presents a hypothesis in which he implies that values are not changed rapidly, but rather develops gradually in mainly the earlier years of life and are then relatively stabile for the rest of a persons life. Socialisation is also seen as a process of development for young people to gain skills that are necessary to be a successful and competent member of the relevant social cultures and groups (Smetana, Robinson, & Rote, 2014). It is important to be aware that value changes may also happen at an older age, but the early socialisation are more impactful, hence why a period of economic distress may affect the value prioritisation of the different generations to various extents (Inglehart, 1990). Socialisation is traditionally characterised by mainly the parents influence in developing preferences, aspirations, habitual behaviour and knowledge (Lersch & Luijkx, 2015), but Parsons and Bales (1956) argues that issues such as the increasing number of divorces in modern society due to ‘the disorganisation of transition’, in which traditional kinship, or marriage norms and values are thrown off by the modernisation and restructuring of the rest.
of society. This means that issues surrounding ‘the functions’ in the stereotypical nuclear family, such as economy and domestic labour are not clear in the new postmodern society. This contributes to a conflict between family and personal values leading to many ended relationships, which again cause instability in the formative socialisation process of young individuals.

Further, Parsons and Bales (1956) explain that the family as a core socialisation process clearly influence children’s values and opinions during their formative years, but as the family is part of the structure of society, children are also exposed to other institutions such as family friends, kindergarten and school, all shaping the new generation in different ways. Media, both traditional film and TV medias, as well as social media are also becoming an increasingly strong influence to the socialisation process, affecting many areas such as sexual education, stereotyping, aggression, helping, social networking, and identity development (Prot et al., 2014). Though the family is seen as the most important socialisation institution, Heinz (2002) argues that post-modern society has changed socialisation from being something happening within the family, to individual construction and self-initiated development and learning. This may explain why Generation Y is considered different and difficult to manage, as the significantly different socialisation they have been exposed to in their formative years may provide Generation Y with a non-traditional view of life.

In generation literature, the ‘peer personality’ of the generational cohort is the individual characteristics of a person, but is the same characteristic patterns over the whole generational group (Strauss & Howe, 1991). These characteristics are collective opinions on topics such as politics, lifestyle, religion and the future, which brings mutual behaviour, beliefs and values (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Inglehart (2008) found that older generations value materialism, prioritising physical and economic security, whilst younger generations prioritise the post-materialist values of self-expression and autonomy. According to Inglehart, this may be explained by the economic growth and the development of the welfare state in developed countries having changed the experience and socialisation of the generations who are in their formative years after the increase in living standards, where life has gained other purposes than mainly trying to survive. These changes contribute to the argument that a focus on life quality and ‘meaning’ of life for the younger generation will have brought different priorities and expectations than the older generation. For example, the values used in Schwartz’s (2012) Value Theory remain the same, however the structure of the value prioritisation has changed.
When values change like Inglehart describes, new social norms are developed and according to Parsons, the order of society is normatively secured in the way that most people act according to the shared norms and values in our society (Pollini & Sciortino, 2001). When generations have different normative understanding of behaviour, the discrepancy between two sets of values cause conflicts between generations both thinking their norms are the right norms to follow.

Even though there is a feeling of a group identity and commonalities in beliefs, behaviours and values, there are always individuals who decide, or are aware that they do not conform to the norm of their generation (Strauss & Howe, 1991). This has been especially enhanced with post-modern individualisation where people are more responsible for their own life course and are less guided by institutions, and thereby take on more ‘self-socialisation’ (Heinz, 2002). The combination of collective norms and increased individualisation bring conflicts within society and organisations, as the habitus that shapes human behaviour, social structure and the socially structured situation in which individuals’ interests and motivations are challenged (Bourdieu, 1977). Due to patterns of increased individualisation and a decline of homogenous groups with younger people (Roberts, Clark, & Claire, 1994) in combination with growing popularity of formal and informal organisational HR practices such as flexible work arrangements (De Menezes & Kelliher, 2017), individualisation is further enabled and can cause more conflicts between generational norms and values in the workplace. Increased individualisation is a pattern of the younger generations that can cause conflict between individuals of Generation Y, but also increase intergenerational conflicts and structures at work more than between previous generations.

Organisational socialisation is common in regards to ‘training’ newcomers to follow the organisation’s cultural norms, and to develop a harmonious atmosphere. Though the effectiveness of organisational socialisation can be questioned in regards to the socialisation hypothesis explaining that early socialisation is more effective than later socialisation (Inglehart, 1990), organisational socialisation has become important in academic literature to understand the integration of newcomers in organisations and to develop systems for a cohesive culture across the organisation (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). It is easy to assume that the young newcomers will most likely already have a set of established values, morals and ethics influencing their motivation and behaviour, however, Arnett (2014) introduced the term ‘emerging adulthood’, arguing that full adulthood is reached later in life now than previously.
This is due to social influences such as increased levels of higher education, birth control, and lesser emphasis on marriage, which all extend the youth period leading them to develop the set values and beliefs at a later stage, even though many still see themselves as ‘adults’ before finishing education. Further, Arnett (2014) claims that it can therefore be argued that organisations may have a stronger socialisation power for shaping the young newcomers’ values and ethics today, and may change the values they have when entering work life and realise that they have to conform to the organisational norms in order to succeed in work.

2.5 Scarcity Theory

Scarcity theory can be related to generation literature because of the social environments and events that have shaped previous generations in their formative years. Scarcity is seen as the difference between, or the supply and demand, of what people have and what people need or want in life, and is characterised as an insufficiency of human or natural resources such as time or money (Kincaid, 1983). Inglehart (1990) introduces a discussion on a scarcity hypothesis in which the priorities and values of an individual reflects the situation of the socioeconomic environment, therefore putting more focus on what the individual have a short supply of. The idea of values developing from scarcity theory stems from Marx’ economic writings on The Theory of Value, in which a commodity only has value due to the social framework developed through the relationship to another commodity (Morrison, 2006). It explains why the generation of veterans, are characterised as hard working and financially conservative as they grew up in a time of financial instability (Institute of Business Ethics, 2015) where a lack of capital had devastating consequences. However, there is an inconsistency with social psychology research and economic consumer focus in regards to scarcity theories (Lynn, 1989). There is a strong argument that people in poverty have a reduced cognitive capacity resulting from the level of capacity concerns that poverty demands, which lead people in worse-off situations to make poor decisions and unethical actions (Mani, Mullainathan, Shafir, & Zhao, 2013). For example, people in starvation will go much further to obtain food, often acting unethically in comparison to people with enough food as the starving people value food more. However, for wealthier people, basic needs does not have as much value, but rather self-expression, esteem and other more physiological sustenance are valued higher and seen as a ‘need’ (Inglehart, 1990). Another point of view is that of human behaviour inherently being relative to contexts. This means that a situation of
scarcity will decrease the level of influence the context has, and standardise the person’s action to value and focus on what is needed by ignoring the contextual effects (Anuj, Eldar, & Sendhil, 2015). According to scarcity theory in its simple form, individuals will always value and want what they have little of at that moment and will have more or less focus on their ‘needs’ or ‘wants’, so when recession kicks in, we are all more focused on the necessary material goods.

However, due to the nature of social behaviour being much more complex when social contexts are taken into account, Sehnert, Franks, Yap, and Higgins (2014) found that when giving people a choice between option A, a single instance (solitary-high salience) and option B, a duplicated instance (abundant-low salience), the positives and negatives with each option are enhanced. This is due to the scarcity of one of the options changing the person’s value of both options. It has also been discussed in work-family literature that the scarcity hypothesis claims that a fixed amount of time which is to be divided on several roles such as parent, primary labour, secondary domestic labour and emotional labour, brings conflict of to which role gets more value, and therefore more time and focus (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996). This is often the issue presented in work-family conflict literature (Higgins, Duxbury, & Julien, 2014), where enhancing the demands, needs and guilt arise when trying to find a sufficient work-family or work-life balance. So, when making any action, Rational Action Theory (RAT) claims that individuals calculate the cost/benefits of different actions, in which the goal is to maximise gains and minimise losses in personal everyday life (Goldthorpe, 1998). However, it is often difficult for a person to perceive the actual outcome or value of an experience when making a decision or action, such as ordering food when you are really hungry can lead to regret or disappointment if you cannot finish the final course, and the result is reduced actual experience value (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984). This is due to the conflict between decision values and the experience values (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984), which may also be the result of scarcity theory. When a person is experiencing scarcity, he or she may put excessive value to something that they are in demand of and in return it may result in disappointment due to a lower actual experience value. Scarcity theory is then divided in two situations, where it may in some cases minimize rational thinking for the benefit of what a person is valuing, but it can also focus and drive decisions and actions to benefit what is most important in the current situation, i.e. paying bills instead of going to the movies when low on financial resources.
According to scarcity theory as well as socialisation theory, generations growing up through depression or during wartime have experienced a lack of financial resources during their formative years, and therefore are more likely to value money more. Situations of scarcity does influence individual behaviour (Anuj et al., 2015), and when a generational cohort has been exposed to for example financial scarcity in their formative years. It is debated that Generation X, who grew up during economic uncertainty as their parents were made redundant, have a different relationship to work and income (Parry & Urwin, 2011) than later generations that experienced financial sufficiency. This results in the older generation’s main motivation for work is to earn money to make ends meet and support their family income, however, when Generation Y has experienced financial security in their formative years, they are more likely to more psychological substance.

There has been a value shift from modern values of physical and economic security to more postmodern values such as freedom and quality of life due to the natural process of younger generations replacing older generations (Abramson & Inglehart, 1995). This is reflected by universal processes in developed countries where value changes has happened as generations growing up after or during a period of economic prosperity and higher security (Abramson & Inglehart, 1995). The new precariat class, known for their precarious forms of work and young members, have a different relationship to money as it is not a stable income as it is for people in permanent work (Standing, 2016). This can be connected to a new value preference for Generation Y in the precariat where they might be more willing to take on other forms of work such as contractual work in order to satisfy their demand for meaningful work. The theory of value changes due to economic prosperity can also be translated to changes in nature and growth, such as running out of natural resources, as many may see the environment as a new scarcity and more necessary for survival than previously. This, in relation to scarcity theory, suggest that as economic freedom increase, the new generation’s values will move away from a demand for financial security, and rather focus on other aspects they find more meaningful such as environmental resources, society and self-fulfilment.

2.6 Ecological Modernisation Theory

Reports of Generation Y being more focused on environmental issues, concerned about sustainability and wanting work with a purpose raises questions regarding the background of
this increased concern. About 30 years ago, the environmental movement started to flourish as the public realised the pollution and devastating effects human behaviour have on the planet and the natural resources (Jennings, 2014). Ecological Modernization Theory (EMT) has seen an immense rise in popularity and influence in the past few decades, and covers four different perspectives, namely (1) the school of ecological modernisationist/sociology; (2) it is seen as a way of describing prominent ways of environmental policy; (3) some scholars use the theory to relate almost any environmental improvement; and finally, (4) EMT is seen as a strategic environmental management perspective (Buttel, 2000). The overarching focus of EMT is to re-embed the economic aspects of social practices as well as institutions and organisations in a more environmentally friendly way, and at the same time connect the ecological sphere with the socio-ideological, political and economic sphere so they are not seen as separate entities (Mol, 1995). Even today, academics such as Urry (2015) argues that the whole system of social, technological and economic practice must change, as it is not considered enough for only individuals to modify their behaviour. EMT is a strong theory which aims at reorganise the whole society into making it sustainable both in respect of natural resources, but also for financial gain.

Environmental concerns has come in three different waves of interest, starting with a wave of focusing on reducing natural landscapes for the benefit of expanding urban areas and industrialisation in the twentieth century. Following the first wave, a second wave of environmentalism in the 1960s and 1970s demanded a radical change due to Baby Boomers increasing the world population as well as the development of a society of consumption of commodities reducing the ecosystems and the survival of the planet (Mol, 1995). Further, Mol argues that the second wave was seen as unsuccessful in achieving the sustainability action wished for due to a lack of institutional response. The third wave set off from the 1980s onwards (Mol, 1995), with a kick-start from the well recognized Brundtland report from the Norwegian prime minister at that time, encouraging economic growth that does not harm the ecosystem (Brundtland et al., 1987). Since the Brundtland Report was published, it has been increased attention to sustainability in society (Manfredo, Jerry, Rechkemmer, & Duke, 2016), and people are more aware that human behaviour is the only thing that can slow down global warming (Urry, 2015). The Brundtland Report helped modernise the focus on environmentalism by focusing on its economic benefit rather than cost, and therefore made sustainable development more attractive to commercial organisations as well.
Both institutions and individuals today are fully aware of climate change and greenhouse gases, issues which were first established in 1959 after measuring the CO$_2$ levels on the Mauna Loa volcano in Hawaii when it was discovered that the oceans did not completely absorb the CO$_2$, and sea levels were rising (Urry, 2015). Later on, many data collections confirm that temperature levels are rising (Urry, 2015), whilst the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2014 report points to human behaviour post-industrialisation to be the biggest driver of climate change (IPCC, 2014). Climate change has become one of the most talked about environmental issues, and has brought strong non-governmental organisations (NGOs) into politics to fight their fight against the environmental issue they work to improve (Gough & Shackley, 2001). As a result of the pressures from NGOs and single issue parties like the Green Party, countries and areas such as the European Union has put many climate change policies in place (Biesbroek et al., 2010). Even though the collective public opinion is a key part of enhancing focus and developing climate change policies, there are still a wide variety of opinions and perceptions of climate changes in which people to various extents believe that climate change is real or not (Shwom et al., 2015). The Paris Agreement is a step towards slowing down climate change, but not everyone agrees. The U.S. president, Donald Trump announced in June 2017 that he would withdraw the US from the agreement due to what he considered an unfair deal for the US (Shear, 2017). Donald Trump is a powerful world leader, who has been highly critical to ‘fake news about climate change’ (Ward, 2018) and published Tweets stating that “the concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive” already before he was elected president (Trump, 2012). Despite powerful climate change sceptics, a study done by Roser-Renouf, Maibach, Leiserowitz, and Zhao (2014), suggests that increased citizen activism may promote particular views and believes of climate change, increasing interpersonal communication and build stronger belief that political activism can make an impact, and therefore influence the public perception in the future. Climate change is one of several environmental issues the society is facing, and with a wide range of opinions on it, most policy makers are still trying to find the best solutions to reduce the speed of climate change. This includes efforts such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals in which UN countries, including the New Zealand government are aligning its policies with (Ministry of Foregin Affairs and Trade 2018).

Food security is another topic that keep growing in public significance, focusing on being able to provide enough food for the world population as well as questioning energy and
nutrient levels, animal diseases and the economic demand (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2009). As Popp, Pető, and Nagy (2013) explains, the growing population is putting increased pressure on agriculture and our planet to grow more food with less natural resources such as land and water. They also address the question of use of pesticide solutions to control pest and to increase productivity, but the issues related to the lack of knowledge on the human and environmental side effects of using pesticides on the food we eat are yet to be addressed thoroughly enough, questioning the ethics of food production (Popp et al., 2013). The International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) 2016 Annual Report showed an increase of the American organic food market size from 20.9 billion US to 81.6 billion US from 2001 to 2015, illustrating the increased consumer interest in organic produce (IFOAM - Organics International, 2016). Research from Spain (Briz & Ward, 2009), Turkey (Gunes & Tekin, 2006), Italy (Boccaletti & Moro, 2000) and Kenya (Kimenju, De Groote, Karugia, Mbogoh, & Poland, 2005) show that the general awareness of Genetically Modified (GM) and organic food sources are relatively low even though the organic industry has had a remarkable growth, especially in Europe (Briz & Ward, 2009). The pressures to satisfy a high demand for food has pushed farmers to use pesticides and genetically modify products to increase productivity, which brings ethical questions regarding knowing what is being put in to the consumer food and animal welfare.

In relation to increased pressure for productivity, the ‘world overshoot day’ has gained increased media recognition every year (BBC, 2016; Frangoul, 2017; Howard, 2015). The first to use the term “overshoot” in regards to human consumption and the post-industrial utilisation of natural resources was Catton and Udall (1980), in which they very early on discussed the restrictions of the planet’s natural resources and how much pressure it can undergo. According to Cairns (2014), the ecological overshoot is seen as one of eight interactive global crises (the others being human economy, the growing overpopulation, biotic impoverishment, climate change, energy allocation, environmental refugees, renewable resource depletion), and is defined as the human behaviour using the natural resources faster than earth can produce the resources. Every year, the Global Footprint Network (2018) calculate the yearly Earth Overshoot Day which estimates the day each year from when we are using resources the earth cannot regenerate itself, and was placed August 2nd in 2017. The Earth Overshoot Day has been published widely in big media outlets (Scott, 2017), which shows the increased focus on sustainability outside of academia and prominent social movements. With the enormous power and influence media has on people (Couldry &
Curran, 2003), the focus on natural resources enhance the importance, popularises the topic and influence individuals to form an opinion on environmental issues through campaigns such as the UN sustainable development goals (United Nations 2018).

The relationship between pro-environmental behaviours and individual values are well researched, and the three value types of egoistic, altruistic and biospheric values have different conditions to act in certain ways (De Groot & Steg, 2009). According to De Groot and Steg (2009), altruistic and biospheric values are naturally more inclined to act pro-environmentally, so a generational value change to these types of values, would bring a more environmentally concerned behaviour and expectancy. Media has identified that Generation Y has a focus on sustainability, and wants ethical businesses (Jenkin, 2015; NZ Herald, 2013), showing that the increased focus on environmental issues and the EMT are significant. This provides relevant arguments that the younger generations have stronger values in relation to preserving the planet than previous generations, and will therefore place larger emphasis on the environmental effects of a potential work organisation.

All in all, the new forms of socialisations in combination with scarcity theory and the Ecological Modernisation Theory explain some of the major changes society has been through. These theories, are key theories which contributes to explaining how Generation Y’s values and world views has been shaped and why they are different than the older generations. The wide array of socialisation and institutions influencing young people today in addition to the extension of the ‘youth’ period opens up for further individualisation of members of a generation. However, the social and economic situations during the formative years of a generation still impact their values, and a relative financial security and consumer society has shaped Generation Y to demand more, put less emphasis on pay as they see it as a matter of course, and as they have shaped the consumer product companies put on the market, they expect to be influential in the workplace as well. An increased focus on sustainability throughout Generation Y’s socialisation has put it on their values agenda, and brought a widespread concern for the environment.

Moving on, the thesis looks to the methods used in this project, and explores the results of the study by identifying Generation Y’s priorities in relation to ethics at work.
3 Methods

3.1 Methodology

Pragmatism is a philosophical underpinning that values different viewpoints and subjects, as both objective and subjective perspectives can contribute to knowledge (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). These ideas are embraced in this research, as Q-methodology uses subjective data in a quantitative analysis. Pragmatism is also aligned with the social constructive notion of generations, as generations and society change over time and how the society is today, is not the way it has been previously or will be in 20 years. Even though the results of this study cannot be generalised to the wider population, it provides generalisation about human behaviours and offers rich research that brings an important perspective of the issues that have the potential to benefit managers and organisations in New Zealand.

3.2 Q-Methodology

Q-methodology is a highly versatile set of philosophical principles and methods. This research uses Q-methodology, a novel method that can be used to research any topic about which people have an opinion or a subjective perspective on (Wolf, 2014), and allows for a systematic study of subjectivity (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). The key benefit of using Q-methodology is that it helps the researcher understand and explain the participants’ underlying beliefs and values, which transfers to specific human opinion and attitudes (Wolf, 2014). When combining qualitative and quantitative aspects of social research, it provides a broad exploration of the topic with both inductive and deductive reasoning (O’Leary, 2017). Q-methodology suits the research on the younger Generation Y’s expectations to ethics at work, as it can grasp the underlying values participants have by letting them organise their subjective opinions in form of statements representing situations at work, where they themselves can decide what is important to them.

Before being in touch with participants, the researcher develops a sample of statements (the Q-set) related to the topic being studied, as well as a grid into which participants will place
the statements in the Q-sorting exercise (see Appendix 2). From a theoretical population of opinion statements on the topic (called a ‘concourse’), a representative Q-set is selected for ordering in the Q-sort by the P-set (participants) (McKeown & Thomas, 2013). In a Q-sort, all statements are sorted in relation to each other, from highly positive (strong agreement) to highly negative (strong disagreement). Researchers find patterns in correlated Q-tricks through factor analysis in programs especially developed for Q-methodology. After the Q-sort has been performed, it is common to have a post-sort open-ended interview about the Q-sort. This is to get a clear and more detailed picture by letting the participant explain why he or she chose to organise the statements in the way they did. A common feedback from respondents are that they usually enjoy participating in the Q-sort, and feel a greater control of what they are giving to the study as well as becoming more aware of their thoughts on the topic as they have to think more when they are comparing statements (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). Further, they have a stronger awareness of what is actually being used in the study as they have the opportunity to change the sort after they have done it, to ensure that it truly represents the opinions they want to put forward.

The basis of Q-methodology is that similar demographic groups, or generations as in the case of this research, has several explanations and patterns of decision making (Wolf, 2014). Q-methodology uses a smaller number of participants to do a test on a bigger number of items compared to traditional factor analysis, which use many participants for a smaller set of tests, and therefore values the participants instead of the test itself. By using correlations of the individual Q-sorts, a Q factor analysis can find the similarities and differences in subjective opinions on a topic (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005).

3.2.1 Limitations
Q-methodology does not allow for generalisation, but rather explore certain sets of viewpoints that can help understand human behaviour. In this case, it is very helpful to understand the underlying values that will help organisations further understand both younger employees’ opinions and actions, as well as what they expect from work. It provides a good guide to enhance the organisational culture by being open and understanding of what the employees see as important. Q-methodology force participants to choose from the pre-selected p-set, and does not let multiple positions to coexist, however, this is discussed in the post-sort interview with the participants. Further, Q-methodology can be very time-consuming. Extensive work can be required to develop the Q-set, and making sure it is extensive enough to cover as many
viewpoints of the topic as possible. Q-sort instructions must be clearly explained to the participants (see Appendix 1), as they are unfamiliar with the method and it is not immediately clear what is demanded of them.

3.3 Q-set

The Q-set, the statements used in the Q-sort, is highly important in Q-methodology, and aims to cover all opinions and views on a topic (Heres, 2014). It is time-consuming to develop the Q-set, but it is important that the concourse is broad enough and that statements are thoroughly thought through (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). Firstly, literature on ethics, business ethics and ethical leadership as well as research on Generation Y, older generations and their work values, were carefully reviewed. The Q-set is ideally written in the ‘natural’ language of the participants (McKeown & Thomas, 2013) but it is also important to test and reference previous work done on the topic, so a selection of statements were developed to represent previous academic literature on values and ethics in relation to work. Following a HEC approval, a focus group with participants from the late Generation Y was conducted to explore what connotations they had to ethics at work (see Appendix 4). It was important to perform this focus group in order to fill gaps that had not been found during the literature review on ethical expectations, but also to develop statements that are written in Generation Y’s language. By formatting statements to suit the way Generation Y speak and think, the statements are easier to understand and the participants are more likely to feel like their opinions are represented in the Q-set. The final step was to draw a subset of statements from concourse (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005) that represents a wide variety of opinions of ethics at work from Generation Y and previous literature. This provides a hybrid sample (McKeown & Thomas, 2013) which is more diverse than statements coming from only one type of sources.

Pilot interviews were executed (see Appendix 4), and the process of wording and choosing statements was performed carefully. The final Q-set (see Table 2) of 36 randomly numbered statements consists of clear examples of actions as well as more abstract statements on meaning and work situations that can be subjectively interpreted. This ensures that participants may put their individual thought into statements, and organise them into a complete picture. They explain their choices and thoughts further in the post-sort interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I expect to have flexible workplace arrangements.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I want to do work I find interesting and meaningful.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The workplace should be modern and forward-looking.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want to work for an ethical company where the CEO is known for his/her integrity.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work security and stable income is important.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A good work-life balance is key.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The workplace should have better technology than I have at home.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>All employees should have the opportunity to raise and discuss ethical issues.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work colleagues should be willing to work longer hours to finish a project by the deadline.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The organisation should encourage innovation and be open for suggestions from employees.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The management should have a line drawn for when laughter and jokes go too far.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I want to do work that makes me proud of myself.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is mainly to make a living for myself and pay the bills.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I want work to encourage creativity so it is not the same mind numbing thing all the time.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I want to work for an organisation in which I can excel and be the best.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I should have the opportunity to take breaks when I need to and have time to sort out personal situations.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I expect my colleagues to not be treated indecently or made to feel vulnerable.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Everyone, including managers, should accept responsibility for their mistakes and not blame others.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I wish to be able to see a change in the future of what I am trying to do.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The company’s goals and missions should be aligned with my own values and norms.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The organisation should try to offset their carbon emission and reduce their environmental footprint.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I expect my managers to understand my values.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It should be obvious that the company is actually doing things for the wider environment.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The managers should set the tone for the workplace, so it is an environment people feel comfortable in.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I want a workplace where co-workers share success and teamwork is rewarded.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Unethical behaviour must be punished.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The organisation has to be honest and transparent.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Colleagues and managers should focus on common goals rather than individual goals.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There should be clear guidelines regarding employee conduct.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It is important that the organisation gives back to society in some way.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Q-set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For me, work is about contributing to something larger than myself.</th>
<th>Focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>If the organisation is multinational, they should make sure that all employees in all countries are treated the same.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For me, work is a trade off. If I have to answer work related phone calls in my personal time, I can make private phone calls during work hours.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reports about unethical behaviour should be acted upon in a fair and consistent manner.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I want work to challenge me and give me opportunities to develop my skills.</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Employees should not be constrained by the rules too much, and have some space to achieve the best results.</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 P-set

In Q-methodology, the sample of respondents is called P-set, and is often selected to be diverse with different backgrounds and interests to cover a wide range of perspectives (Heres, 2014). The population for this study is New Zealanders born between 1992 and 1999, aged 18 to 25 at the time of data collection. The P-set does not have to be very large, but it is the variety of participants that is influential. Even though it is a small participant number, McKeown and Thomas (2013) argue that a small P-set can still provide a meaningful generalisation about human behaviour, though it cannot be completely generalised to the proportion of people in the population relating to each factor. To ensure that a wide range of opinions is being heard in the study, an extensive person sample is often used in Q-methodology to find participants with a wide variety of attitudes on the topic (McKeown & Thomas, 2013), therefore, a non-random sampling method was used. This enables the study to develop a P-set that matches some demographic characteristics of the New Zealand young Generation Y population. The overall goal of Q-methodology is, however, to understand why and how people have certain opinions, not how many have a specific opinion (McKeown & Thomas, 2013). Therefore, Q-methodology relies on different perspectives rather than representativeness.

For this study, 19 respondents were found using handpicked and snowball methods following a HEC-approval (see Appendix 4). When using a handpicked sample, it has a particular purpose, usually for a wide variance of viewpoints (O'Leary, 2017). It is, however, important
to try to avoid bias, and theoretical considerations were used to find suitable participants due to their relevance to the final goal of the study. This led to using snowballing to recruit participants who have not been in university, seeking intentionally to have different interests by recruiting across various interests within the university, specifically law students and students in sustainability societies, and inviting participants from outside the urban area of Wellington.

Overall, the sample consisted of 10 females and 9 males, were born between 1992 and 1998, some having attended university, some being current students, whilst some had never attended university and instead started working after high school (see Appendix 3). Some of the participants had entered university as a mature student after gaining some years work experience. There are a wide variety of university courses and occupations covered, such as, but not limited to, occupational therapy, law, management, sciences, arts and teaching. The participants are also from a variety of cultural backgrounds such as Maori, Indian, and various European countries as well as people identifying as New Zealanders. This has brought together a diverse group of people with different upbringings and backgrounds that qualify for a broad array of opinions.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data from the Q-sorts were inserted in the PQMethod software (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014), and a factor analysis was performed to find correlations between the 19 Q-sorts (See http://schmolck.org/qmethod/ for further information on the PQMethod software). According to Q-methodology, instead of the individual statements, it is the respondents, or sorts, that are being factor analysed (Heres, 2014). This way, respondents’ opinions are grouped together with similar sorts, and a detailed list of the views of each group is developed.

A centroid factor analysis followed by a varimax rotation was tested on various numbers of factors to find the best number according to the sorts. The analysis found that three factors stood out as statistically significant with lower correlations between the three factors, as well as a strong connection to the sorts. It was also important to note how many respondents loaded significantly on each factor in order to ensure that it is a factor with a shared point of view. More or fewer factors either provided higher correlations, or had factors where none, or
only one sort was significantly related. Further, the statements were considered for each factor in the two, four, five and six-factors options in a more in depth qualitative analysis, and confidently concluded that the three-factor centroid analysis result was indeed the most theoretically appropriate and valid for this research.

The three-factor solution showed relatively low correlations across the board, with each of the factors explaining the viewpoint of Q-sorts that ranked the statements in a similar fashion, and therefore have similar expectations to work. The correlations between each factor are between 0.30 and 0.33 (see Table 3). The overlapping viewpoints may be characteristics of Generation Y, whilst the differences between the factors provide insights on the individualism within the generation. Overall, 12 of the 19 sorts loaded significantly on just one of the factors, whilst the remaining seven loaded on more than one factor (see Appendix 3). One sort loaded low on all factors, only barely reaching significance >0.33 on one factor (loaded .34 on factor B), which it is possible that in a larger P-set, this person (and others) may have defined a fourth factor. In this study, 32% of the respondents loaded on Factor A, whilst 25% loaded on Factor B, and 15% loaded on Factor C. It is important to note that the Q-sort contains a relatively small sample, and cannot be generalised to the wider population of Generation Y, other than showing viewpoints they have.

Moving on, the next chapter will focus on the main analysis of the three factors, and will discuss one factor at a time. It highlights the distinctive and characterising statements of each factor, mainly factors that scored +2 or higher, as well as –2 and lower. These extremes are most heavily weighted when distinguishing the factors, and explain what are the most and least important to each factor. Even though the statements are mainly distinctive for one factor, it may also be an overlapping statement with one or both of the other factors. This is notable with the least important statements as there are overlaps near the extremes. Further, it also highlights statements that are statistically significant at p <.05, which are statements that make the factor distinguished from the others, with statistically significant differences in the score of the statements across the factors. Whilst discussing the statements, the factor analysis results will be reinforced with quotes from the relevant post-sort interviews, enhancing the interpretive approach of Q-methodology. Finally, the consensus statements will be discussed to understand the correlations between the different factors, which will provide insightful information to the differences and consistencies in opinions across the Qsorts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Correlations between factor scores*
4 Results and analysis

This chapter presents the results of the factor analysis, and discuss the results in relation to the post-sort interviews, providing a more detailed explanation of the results. The analysis found three ideal types of the young Generation Y, who have collective expectations to work and ethics. The three ideal types are The Achiever, The Ethical Employee and The Public Conservationist (see Figure 1). These three ideal types do not represent everyone in Generation Y, but represent ideal opinions individuals relate to in various extents and are helpful when trying to understand the generation at work.

**THE ACHIEVER**

The Achiever is a determined group of employees who are productive and thrive of challenges and constant development to be creative. They expect their work tasks to be interesting so they can be proud of what they do in order to excel and be the best they can in their area of expertise. The Achiever sees business ethics as something external, which does not influence their work, and mainly focus on what value they can add to an organisation. Even though they are hard workers, they expect a good work-life balance in order to sustain their productivity and not get burnt out.

**THE ETHICAL EMPLOYEE**

The focus of the Ethical Employee is that the organisation they work for has strong ethical policies that are followed through. It is significant that the management set the tone for the organisational culture, and that there is an openness to talk about ethical issues. They expect that employees conform to the standards set by the management, such as for when laughter and jokes may go too far within the workplace. The Ethical Employee expect that unethical behaviour is punished, and that the reports on unethical behaviour is acted upon consistently.

**THE PUBLIC CONSERVATIONIST**

The Public Conservationist has a strong passion for sustainable development in order to look after the natural resources and people in the society. They see the world as a whole, where all actions are interconnected and have consequences. Their activist approaches to work means that they see work as an extension of their interests, and expect organisations to be transparent. They have a strong emphasis on working for a CEO with integrity, and feel like organisations have a wholesome responsibility for internal and external ethics.

*Figure 1: Generation Y’s expectations to ethics at work ideal types.*

4.1 Factor A: The Achiever

Persons loading on the Achiever, strive to be the best in what they do and value hard work, but know they need a good work-life balance in order to work to their best capacity at work.
They expect to have training and development opportunities, and want to feel valued by the organisation through doing important tasks with the opportunity to bring creativity and innovation. The Achiever is mainly in work to develop themselves, feel like they produce good quality work and wish to add value to the organisation they are in. Even though they think that people should be treated in an appropriate manner at work, they believe ethics and behaviours are second to their actual work efforts and do not place much importance on business ethics or ethics at work.

To the Achiever, the most important aspect of work is that it catches their interest and gives work a purpose (Statement #2), but they also want to continuously develop and learn (#35). These statements are the highest ranked and the Achiever does not think work is needed if it is not something they are interested in, clearly standing out from the other factors. Participants claim that “you want to be there and have some sort of interest in what you are doing, if not there’s no point of being there” as well as “if work is meaningful, then it would probably make me proud to do it, otherwise there is no point” and talks about having a passion for the work they do. When it comes to challenges and development (#35), there is a strong consensus and opinions on the topic across the factor. “I think it’s important that your employees are always improving their skills in the long term so it benefits them and it makes them look good and helps them by having more qualified staff. What you put in to your staff will get back on you too” said one participant focusing on company benefit, whilst another added that “I really want to be good at what I do, whatever that may be, so yeah, I want work that is challenging and not repetitive, I want to do stuff that makes me feel like I am adding value to the company rather than doing menial tasks.” Further, the participants spoke about continuing learning opportunities and that there should never be a point where people stop learning, but rather be given development opportunities, take responsibility for them and progress to further advance their skills in order to do continuously “get better”. For the Generation Y individuals that load on the Achiever, it is important to always improve in order to do the best job they possibly can, but also to have a job where they can use the skills they learn and do a job that they are interested in and feel like are important and add value for the organisation itself.

Other distinguishing features are the emphasis they put on having pride in the work they do (#12), where they refer to “coming away feeling good”, and “I want to be able to go home at the end of a day and think oh that was cool.” They also connect the meaning, interest and
pride in work together as “everything I do, I pretty much like to feel proud of it for myself because it makes it more rewarding and gives you a purpose to what you’re doing”, where a circle of having pride in work giving it a purpose and meaning to them so that they can continue to achieve. They also see encouraged creativity (#14) as an important feature. This relate to their focus on innovation and influence, and think that if they can be creative with the tasks they do, it will give them more purpose and feel like they are of value to the organisation. More than any other group they value a good work-life balance (#6) in order to “keep you sane” and “I do find that when I am doing too much work, and I don’t have enough time to actually sit down and relax and do stuff with my friends then I end up just burning myself out by the end of the week.” Because the Achievers put so much effort and thought in to work they need some time off in order to clear their mind to “help concentration” and to perform better at work. They agree that too much work will reduce their capacity to produce good results at work, and that they therefore have to have time to focus on other things.

In comparison to other factors, the Achiever has a stronger focus on themselves and how they can benefit from work. They therefore want to work in an organisation that enables them to excel and become the best (#15), and even though some may think they can excel in any organisation, there are also demands for organisations to give them the opportunities. As one participant explained, “I would like the opportunity to try to be the best, and given the opportunity to work some... some places that don’t offer extra training or development of skills, I think sort of, it is not setting you up for failing, but you don’t have the full opportunity to excel.” Organisational support seem to be a big part of their success, as the participants mentioned that “I do want to be in an environment that will help me and push me to be proud of myself and you know, excel.”

Slightly more than the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist, it is important to the Achievers that the organisation is innovative, but also listens to their employees (#10), as “I feel like it helps with progression especially in the environment we are living in right now where everything change so much. You need to be creative and [have] innovative thoughts.” This builds on wanting to feel like a valuable asset to the organisation and being able to contribute with new perspectives and suggestions to drive the organisation forward. So far, the Achievers have little focus on business ethics as “I feel like it is an external thing, what matters is the internal things, what I can do to do the best job”, however, along the same lines
as the other factors, they do expect that employees are comfortable at work and not being treated in an unethical manner (#17). Their focus is still on their own interest in the job itself as “I think that because I love the idea of having a job that I am really passionate about, that in turn makes me want to a work in a place where everyone is really passionate about it as well, and you’re not going to be passionate about something if you don’t feel great working there.”

There is a strong pattern in what is important to the Achievers, and they therefore also stand out with some preferences about what is not as important. Across all factors there is a strong consistency in income (#13) and private time misconduct (#33), but what makes the Achievers stand out, is that they do not think that the management should have control over when there is enough jokes in the workplace (#11) as they see it as people’s own responsibility to not step over the line. “It’s about discipline to me, ... I guess it’s everyone’s job to stop inappropriate behaviour” and “you’ve also got to have your own sort of line I suppose” but the main argument was regarding professionalism as well as not being too controlled to not have fun. One participant said “it’s kind of like a professionalism in our profession that must be obtained to the higher standards, so that is the idea, and the reason why I put it at the bottom there was because it was kind of a given that you act in a professional way at work” whilst another argued that “I don’t agree with that because I think laughter is really important, and if you have management draw a line for that then, yeah, it’s just really wouldn’t make a nice workplace”. Laughter in the workplace is often seen as having a diffused line between having a good working environment and bullying in the workplace, as it is difficult to know when people feel like jokes are unwanted and uncomfortable. Further, they are critical to organisations publishing their environmental efforts (#23) as “it doesn’t need to be obvious, if they’re doing something then that is great, but that’s more important to be doing something rather than just say that you’re doing something but not really.”

Reflecting their lack of strong emphasis on the importance of business ethics or ethics at work, they stand out by rating the CEO’s integrity (#4) to a low importance, and does not feel like guidelines on employee conduct must be in place at work (#29). Neither do they think that employees in all countries should be treated the same (#32) as cultural differences should be used “to your advantage and kind of make sure that blossoms rather than trying to make everyone conform”. They feel like individualism is important to make an impact, and that
“individual goals are much more important than common goals” (#28) as people are more likely to hold themselves more accountable for individual goals. One participant said, “I think that a good organisation and a good manager and stuff find a way to make them overlap anyway, so that by doing your individual goals you’re doing your common goals as well”. The Achievers are smart and hard-working people who do not seem to consider business ethics nor ethics at work very important, as it is more about what they can gain and give to and from a job themselves in order to progress and become successful. Even though they value hard work for the organisation, they are mainly in it for their own gain and demand more from the organisation in regards to development and expect to be involved and do challenging jobs that will develop them as they want to play a strong role in the work they do for the organisation.
Table 4: Key statements for Factor A. Statements that are considered statistically significant at $p < .05$ are indicated in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I want to do work I find interesting and meaningful</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want to work for an ethical company where the CEO is known for his/her integrity</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A good work-life balance is key</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The workplace should have better technology than I have at home</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The organisation should encourage innovation and be open for suggestions from employees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The management should have a line drawn for when laughter and jokes go too far</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I want to do work that makes me proud of myself</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is mainly to make a living for myself and pay the bills</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I want work to encourage creativity so it is not the same mind numbing thing all the time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I want to work for an organisation in which I can excel and be the best</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I expect my colleagues to not be treated indecently or made to feel vulnerable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Everyone, including managers, should accept responsibility for their mistakes and not blame others</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I wish to be able to see a change in the future of what I am trying to do</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The organisation should try to offset their carbon emission and reduce their environmental footprint</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It should be obvious that the company is actually doing things for the wider environment</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Managers should set the tone for the workplace, so it is an environment people feel comfortable in</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Colleagues and managers should focus on common goals rather than individual goals</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There should be clear guidelines regarding employee conduct</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>If the organisation is multinational, they should make sure that all employees in all countries are treated the same</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For me, work is a trade off. If I have to answer work related phone calls in my personal time, I can make private phone calls during work hours</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I want work to challenge me and give me opportunities to develop my skills</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Factor B: The Ethical Employee

The Ethical Employee value explicit business set structures that reinforce ethical behaviour, and expect those in management jobs to take a position of ethical leadership. They expect to have an ethical culture in which they feel comfortable and can rely on the organisational business practices to function the way they are meant to. It is also important to them that managers take great responsibility to ensure all aspects of environmental factors are managed in an ethical manner. Fairness is a key component of work as they expect everyone to have the opportunity to whistle blow, all reports should be taken seriously and when unethical behaviour is discovered, it should be reacted to in a suitable manner. Though the Ethical Employee does not have a strong focus on environmental effects of the organisation, it is the internal workplace ethics that is important to this group of people.

The most important aspect to the Ethical Employee is that when reports of unethical behaviour in the workplace are being made, it should be dealt with consistently every time (#34). This means that they expect a set process of how reports are dealt with, and should reflect fairness no matter what. The participants talk about “the amount of publicity it has been on [sexual harassment] recently”, and some have strong opinions on it, arguing that “if anything comes up there is something that can like nip it in the bud and be like nope, shut it down or the person that is involved get some professional help to sort out their problems.” Others speak from their own experiences as “well, I think it’s the fair and consistent manner, there have been times where incidences have occurred in the workplace where they were treated differently because of who they are, because they are different people”, where it is indicated that power structures within the organisation played a role in the reaction. Another statement that set this group out from the others is their expectation that the managers should set the tone for the workplace (#24), in which they have to ‘walk the talk’ and be an example for the expected employee behaviour within the organisation. Participants discussed their dislike of double standards, and their strong feelings towards this. “I have been in a couple of jobs … where I have absolutely hated it because the boss has just been horrific, like really catty and you know like gossiping in the workplace behind people’s back. You know I just don’t have time for it, it shouldn’t be like that in a professional situation” one argues whilst it is also pointed out that “I feel that counts for each level of managers, they do set the tone, they set the ideals for the workplace in regards for the standards”. The participants had strong opinions on manager behaviour and expect them to be the prime example to everyone
in the workplace, covering all levels of managers so that employees know their responsibilities and are comfortable with their job.

The Ethical Employee further places much importance on being able to discuss ethical issues (#8) as “in the workplace, everyone should feel safe and that they are in a safe environment, so like if there is something going wrong, I feel like they should have the right to speak up and say that no, this isn’t right.” Building more on ethical aspects in the workplace, in similar fashion to the Achievers, they expect everyone to take responsibility for their own mistakes (#18) “because if you have done something wrong and you don’t blame others you are more likely to improve”, and similarly to the Public Conservationist, they wish to work under a CEO known for his/her integrity (#4).

Other distinguishing statements that are important to the Ethical Employee is that they think it is important that unethical behaviour is punished (#26), and in particular that the management should draw the line when jokes should stop (#11). This is to ensure that what one person see as a joke is not seen as bullying from the receiver, and that this behaviour can be controlled to a certain extent. One participant spoke about an example in which someone was being made fun of due to their religion and culture “and I don’t think they realised what they did, ... and when he was told and got some hints, it stopped, so that’s really important.” In more similar fashion to the Public Conservationist it is also important that the organisation is honest and transparent (#27) as it was pointed out that “I think that goes without saying, because you don’t want to work for a dishonest organisation because you are representing them, and you have a contract with them, and you don’t want to get in trouble for something you didn’t expect.” The people loading on the Ethical Employee think it is important to work for an organisation where ethics at work are strong, and there is a structured way to deal with misconduct as well as setting standards.

The Ethical Employee stands out in the way that they do not care much about the organisation’s environmental footprint (#21), one participant linked it to the prioritisation of values in which the participant claimed that “to be honest, I’ve never really cared too much. ... That’s just not one of my priorities at the moment, within my workplace it is just not the priority right now”. Neither do they put much importance on taking breaks when they need too (#16) as they expect the organisation to give them sufficient breaks times. Further, they are not concerned with the organisational norms being aligned to their own values (#20), and
do not think it is important to see a change in the future of what they are doing within work (#19). In agreement with the Achievers, it is not important that the organisational environmental efforts are visible (#23), but they do stand out by not expecting the managers to understand their values (#22). There were various discussions around this such as they are not bothered in the first few months, but after being in the organisation for a while, the manager should have built up a stronger knowledge about the individual employees. One participant mentioned that “I do not expect the manager to understand my values, but I need them to respect my values”, clarifying that the cultural differences are not necessarily important to understand, but respect for every employees individual traditions and needs are highly a crucial element of ethical management.

The Ethical Employee is what can be associated closest to literature on ethical leadership in the way that aspects such as management setting the tone, structures of reporting unethical behaviour and being sure that the reports are enacted on in an ethical manner are in place and working in a place where respect widely spread throughout all levels of employees and management. It is important to the Ethical Employee that the workplace is a place where they feel comfortable and can thrive without feeling anxious or out of place, with a strong focus on quality practices surrounding workplace ethics. The way the Ethical Employee speak about being comfortable and feeling safe at work point towards a wish for an organisation with a culture based on strong ethical values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want to work for an ethical company where the CEO is known for his/her integrity</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The workplace should have better technology than I have at home</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>All employees should have the opportunity to raise and discuss ethical issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The management should have a line drawn for when laughter and jokes go too far</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is mainly to make a living for myself and pay the bills</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I want to work for an organisation in which I can excel and be the best</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I should have the opportunity to take breaks when I need to and have time to sort out personal situations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I expect my colleagues to not be treated indecently or made to feel vulnerable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Everyone, including managers, should accept responsibility for their mistakes and not blame others</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I wish to be able to see a change in the future of what I am doing</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The company’s goals and missions should be aligned with my own values and norms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The organisation should try to offset their carbon emission and reduce their environmental footprint</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I expect my managers to understand my values</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It should be obvious that the company is actually doing things for the wider environment</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The managers should set the tone for the workplace, so it is an environment people feel comfortable in</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Unethical behaviour must be punished</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The organisation has to be honest and transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For me, work is a trade off. If I have to answer work related phone calls in my personal time, I can make private phone calls during work hours</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reports about unethical behaviour should be acted upon in a fair and consistent manner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Key statements for factor B. Statements that are considered statistically significant at \( p < 0.05 \) are indicated in brackets.
4.3 Factor C: The Public Conservationist

The final factor, the Public Conservationist is a strong advocate of solving issues surrounding the environment and society. Some participants loading on the Public Conservationist sees themselves working in the public and/or health sectors, has experience with volunteering or would like to work for 3rd sector organisations. The Public Conservationists are caring people who have a strong passion for their interests and what they work with, and see work as a holistic part of life and as an extension of the issues close to their hearts. Business ethics that are important to the Public Conservationist is mainly in relation to transparency and environmental footprints, and they do not wish to work for an organisation that does not do anything to support the wider society, as they do not see the point in not doing something ‘useful’.

What clearly distinguishes the Public Conservationist from other groups is that the most important that the organisation try to reduce carbon emission and environmental footprint (#21) as well as the importance organisations put on giving back to the society (#30). The participants recognised the current importance of climate change and carbon emissions, and stated, “it is important that the people at the top, and big organisations set an example” as well as “that’s basically a function of the fact that we live in a global world where impacts are not isolated to individuals and there is a responsibility to the wider population to try and minimise your impact.” As some participants were bringing up the importance of the topic and the responsibility organisations have as key institutions in a world where everything is interconnected, some participants expressed frustration:

“I definitely think that should be at the forefront of any organisation because people aren’t doing enough and it’s getting to the point where there isn’t anything people can do anymore and then the future generations are going to be completely screwed, and I find that terrifying. And like even in New Zealand where we’re supposed to be this clean, green country, it’s a joke. It’s an absolute joke!”

The participants associated with the Public Conservationist showed great passion surrounding the statements on environmental impacts and claimed that it is important to be enthusiastic about it and in order to make a change, somebody “at the top” should carry and help as “the more people you have onboard, the more successful you are.” The Public Conservationist
displayed concern and a feeling of responsibility to ensure the future of the world as we know it, but also focused on the common good for society (#30). “I just think that benefiting the rest of society, especially productivity and retirement, benefit and I just think that if you’re going to have a company, then why not make it useful rather than just earning money?” one participant stated. Others focused on the causes of their occupation in the health services in particular where the means of their job was to help people, whilst this group also draw strong lines to work in the public sector. One participant claimed that:

“I believe that business, and particularly because I work in a government department, has a role to serve the populace of New Zealand. So it’s basically a core function to give back to society in some way. [Private] Business itself, I believe there is an interdependency between society and business and that the cost of externalities for the business on people and on the environment... obliges them.”

Further, out of the three factors, the Public Conservationist is the group that think an honest and transparent organisation is important (#27), where it is pointed out that “I think it is important to feel like you know what is going on, and you don’t want to feel like someone is going behind someone else’s back. That would make me very uneasy.” In agreement with the Ethical Employee, they also want to be in an organisation under a CEO well known for his or her integrity (#4) and participants referred to pride as “I do want to be proud of my work, and if I know that the CEO is good then I can be, it’s just someone I look forward to working for.” Slightly stronger than other groups, they find it important that colleagues are treated decently at work (#17).

What sets the Public Conservationist out as having their own separate values as well, is that they wish to see a change in what they are doing (#19), questioning the relevance of an organisation without a more impactful goal; “why have a business if you’re not going to try to make an impact?” The Public Conservationist finds it relatively important that reports made on behaviour in the workplace should be acted upon (#34), as well as looking to the manager to set the tone for the organisation (#24). Finally, a clearly distinguishing factor is the importance the Public Conservationist puts on the openness about what the organisation’s environmental contributions are (#23). Everything that is important to the Public Conservationist shows that they have an environmental and societal concern and wish to contribute and improve contemporary issues.
Similarly to the other factors, it is not important to the Public Conservationist to have flexible workplace arrangements (#1), or the newest technology (#7). They do not see work as the main reason to work (#13), nor is work considered a give-and-take (#33). In contrast, they do not care much about working for a modern and forward-looking organisation (#3) as one participant said, “you can have older organisations that I would be happy to work for. Or it wouldn’t be a negative thing for me”, and they do not have strong opinions in regards to managers or employees owning up for mistakes (#18). Neither do they put much emphasis on punishment of unethical behaviour (#26) as they have high expectations in relation to professionalism “so there should be minimal unethical behaviour within our workplace.”

In complete opposite fashion to the Achievers, they do not see work-life balance (#6) as an expected part of work, mainly because the Public Conservationist are so passionate about their work so it is seen as a more holistic and integrated part of their lives. The Public Conservationist is the only group that has an opinion on working overtime to finish projects (#9), as “other people can do what they want, sure, if they are willing to work longer hours that’s good, but I don’t think as an individual you should be expecting others to do the same.” Others had different suggestions, “I think that instead people should have a medium in place to sort out how they can finish things more efficiently and on time so that everybody can leave by the time” or was worried about health issues such as burnout “I don’t like the idea of it running you into the ground, and also you should have time for your family and yourself ... because you’ll just get completely bummed down and you won’t have any time to think or to look out for yourself. Burnout!” Also special for the Public Conservationist is that they do not think it is very important to be able to excel in what they do (#15). This reflect their wish to contribute to the society more than benefiting themselves, with one participant saying “for me being the best isn’t that important. I’m happy just to contribute to something in general, like I’m happy doing whatever.” Another participant spoke about the difference of focusing on the individual success versus contributing to something more than yourself, “it would kind of make me work on more of an individual kind of whim, and I am here because of my own kind of work, and I want to materialise, and I want to be this. I don’t think it should be like that, yeah you want to do well for the organisation, but it shouldn’t be about me doing the best I can, but about using my skills to contribute to the organisation as a whole.” The Public Conservationist shows great enthusiasm of working for others rather than themselves, making an impact and making a change for the better.
The Public Conservationist draws strong connections between business, society, environment and the wider world, and shows a concern about everything around them. They are caring people who wish to help others and reduce greenhouse gasses, and expect work to be more “useful” than just making a financial gain. This group see work as a more holistic part of their lives, and therefore do not feel the need for a good work-life balance. They thrive when they can see results of their work, and feel strongly for working under a CEO with strong integrity. The Public Conservationist does care about ethics at work, but places much more importance on the business ethics as a whole, but their main focus is on the environmental effects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>STATEMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>FACTOR</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I expect to have flexible workplace arrangements</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The workplace should be modern and forward looking</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want to work for an ethical company where the CEO is known for his/her integrity</td>
<td>(-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A good work-life balance is important</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The workplace should have better technology than I have at home</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work colleagues should be willing to work longer hours to finish a project by the deadline</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The management should have a line drawn for when laughter and jokes go too far</td>
<td>(-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is mainly to make a living and pay the bills</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I want to work for an organisation in which I can excel and be the best</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I expect colleagues to not be treated indecently or made to feel vulnerable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Everyone, including managers, should accept responsibility for their mistakes and not blame others</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I wish to be able to see a change in the future of what I am trying to do</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The organisation should try to offset their carbon emission and reduce their environmental footprint</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It should be obvious that the company is actually doing things for the wider environment</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The managers should set the tone for the workplace, so it is an environment people feel comfortable in</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Unethical behaviour must be punished</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The organisation has to be honest and transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It is important that the organisation gives back to society in some way</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For me, work is a trade off. If I have to answer work related phone calls in my personal time, I can make private phone calls during work hours</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reports on unethical behaviour should be acted upon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Key statements for factor C. Statements that are considered statistically significant at p < .05 are indicated in brackets.
4.4 Consensus Statements

Consensus statements are the statements that do not distinguish between any pair of factors with score differences that are not significant at P>.01, whilst the statements marked with brackets are non-significant at P>.05 (See table 7). In Q-methodology, the consensus statements are just as important as the distinguishing statements, as the consensus statements usually say something about the similarities across the Q-sorts (Van Exel & De Graaf, 2005). Although statements may appear as consensus, this does not necessarily mean that the sorter assign them the same meaning. That possibility was considered in this research, but in this case, with the exception of one statement, it was found that the meanings were similar across the factors. In this analysis, the Q-sorts had an agreement on 14 statements, which could indicate a generational consensus.

All factors have agreements on some of the least important statements, where they do not put much emphasis on technology (#7) as “[this] has not historically been true for me, and has not really affected the work I do” and “as long as the stuff is good enough so that I can do my job, then I don’t really care.” The participants seem to take it as a matter of fact that organisations have a high enough level of technology to get the job done, and do not require more modern technology over that. Being focused on technology and using social media while at work has been seen as counterproductive behaviour and time wasting at work, and the participants agree that there is no need to use the phone for private time during work hours (#33). The participants talked about work as “I think that work is a holistic thing, so if you’re at work, you do your job, and if you’re at home and have to make a phone call, then that’s what you do. That’s just life” as well as highlighting the interruption of progress if someone makes a non-work related phone call and loose the train of thought and being professional at work as “you know, it’s a time and a place.” As a general work value, the participants see activities such as using work hours to make private phone calls as out of place at work, and do not mind having work calls outside of work hours.

Further, there is a general consensus that even though there is a varying importance of a stable income and secure job (#5), the main means of work is not to earn money (#13). This is explained by an Ethical Employee as “for me, work is more about doing something I enjoy doing and getting paid is just a side benefit of that”, as well as an Achiever arguing that “if you’re just doing it for the money, then you’re not going to want to put any extra effort in.”
These quotes illustrate the consensus, but reinforce the overall interpretation of those factors as the Achiever talks about work effort whilst the Ethical Employee talks about enjoying work. The participants had a lot to say about an income not being the main focus of work, but rather focus on how a job can benefit them in the future, and that “you spend so much time at work, if the only function of your work is to earn enough money to perpetuate yourself outside of work, then it’s a waste of time” as well as “[to] be honest, if you were purely working for the money, work would be relatively unfulfilling.” This support the arguments that Generation Y wants more meaningful work, and wish to be enthusiastic, interested and get some sort of deeper fulfilment from the work they do.

For the statements participants considered important, there were a strong consensus that it is important for employees to not feel vulnerable or like they are treated indecently at work (#17). This has been a frequently cited topic in popular media outlets over the past year, and all the exposure has put unethical behaviour towards employees or co-workers high on the agenda for both individuals and organisations. It was mentioned that “you’re not going to feel passionate about [work] if you don’t feel great working there” and that “everyone should feel like they are valued and not scared to come to work, or nervous to come to work or anything like that.” This was enhanced by another participant drawing lines to organisational values, as “... it kind of presides of what the kind of values of the organisation have,” showing that not only does Generation Y see it as a factor that decrease motivation and productivity, but a larger reflection of the organisation as a whole. In particular, one participant spoke about their own experiences, “I’ve been a victim of this at work, and I see a lot of other people be a victim of this ... when you are being bullied, not bullied but picked on. A classic example happened today, I just could see the look on his face. Man, I know exactly what it feels like.” All of the participants had a relationship to the statement, whether from their own experiences previously or their friends and family’s experiences, and all agreed that there is no reason to treat other people badly at work.

Finally, consensus statements that the participants do not have a strong opinion about are still seen as important statements (seeing as participants are asked to sort from most important to least important). Throughout the Q sorts the participants mentioned that all of the statements are somewhat important, so statements ranked 0 or 1 are still important, but are less important than statements ranked 2 and higher. None of the factors had strong opinions on flexible workplace arrangements (#1), where the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist
ranked them with less importance, whilst the Achiever put some emphasis on it. Neither did the Achiever or the Public Conservationist have strong opinions on the need for flexibility surrounding breaks for personal reasons (#16), whilst the Ethical Employee thought it was less important in comparison to the other statements. It was of relevant importance for all factors that work enabled innovation and that employee suggestions are taken in to account (#10). Teamwork (#25) and alignment of organisational values with their own values (#20) had little importance across all factors, where only the Ethical Employee put less importance on alignment of values. Even though participants talk about wanting to enjoy work and feel like their work gives them a purpose, they do not see work as contributing to something larger than themselves (#31) as having a particular importance.

The Achiever and the Ethical Employee agree that the importance of working longer hours to finish a project (#9) has moderate importance, whilst the Public Conservationist rates it as less important. Creativity and variety (#14) has some importance for the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist, but are much more important to the Achiever. The honesty and transparency (#27) has an interesting ranking pattern where even though all factors consider them important, it is of a gradual increase. Where the Achiever places least emphasis on it of the three factors, the Ethical Employee sees it as rather important, whilst the Public Conservationist places transparency and honesty to second highest importance. Even though this does not show a particular consensus, it is an interesting pattern to consider across all factors. Finally, the statement regarding treatment of employees across countries in international organisations (#33) gained varying importance and interpretations. Though the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist find it relatively important to have a fair and consistent international standard, the Achiever disagreed, and referred to the cultural differences and beliefs demanding separate employee relations standards in respect to diversity and range of traditions across the world.

The consensus statements and similar rankings can give an idea of the view Generation Y in New Zealand has on ethics at work. As a general rule, they want more intrinsic motivation from work and do not put much emphasis on money, nor on technology. A basic salary and a standard of technology that enables them to do their job adequately are assumed to always come with a job. On the other hand, they have strong opinions of human behaviour at work, and expect everyone to be treated with respect and without feeling uncomfortable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I expect to have flexible workplace arrangements.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The workplace should have better technology than I have at home.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work colleagues should be willing to work longer hours to finish a project by the deadline.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The organisation should encourage innovation and be open for suggestions from employees.</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work is mainly to make a living for myself and pay the bills.</td>
<td>(-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I want work to encourage creativity so it is not the same mind-numbing thing all the time.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I should have the opportunity to take breaks when I need to and have time to sort out personal situations.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I expect my colleagues to not be treated indecently or made to feel vulnerable.</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The company’s goals and missions should be aligned with my own values and norms.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I want a workplace where co-workers share success and teamwork is rewarded.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The organisation has to be honest and transparent.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>For me, work is about contributing to something larger than myself.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>If the organisation is multinational, they should make sure that all employees in all countries are treated the same.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For me, work is a trade off. If I have to answer work related phone calls in my personal time, I can make private phone calls during work hours.</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Consensus statements.

4.5 Additional Observations

As Q-methodology use a small but diverse group of participants, the results cannot be generalised to the wider population of the New Zealand Generation Y. However, it is still interesting to consider some demographic information as it did show some interesting trends that may raise some hypothesis that could encourage further testing with other methods (see Appendix 3). The three different factors show different trends of what could be considered.
forms of individualism, or a division into smaller groups within the generational cohort, whilst the consensus statements brought together a clear set of opinions that were agreed upon across all participants. The consensus statements therefore, might point to what is considered characteristics of what Generation Y expects, or do not expect, from work.

Further, there were no patterns in the distribution of gender across the various factors, as all groups had an even number of males and females loading on just one factor. However, everyone, with the exception of one participant, who loaded on more than one factor was female. Neither the year the participant was born in, nor the cultural backgrounds played a role in what factors they loaded on.

However, people with work experience seemed slightly more likely to load on the Ethical Employee and be more concerned about ethics at work. The level of education had little impact, as participants without higher education loaded on both the Achiever and the Ethical Employee. The Public Conservationist was the only factor where none of the participants who went to work with a high-school diploma loaded on, however, students and graduates had a variety of loadings and did not show a trend of particularly placing more importance on environmental or social impacts. Interestingly, the Achiever has the highest amount of participants loading on it, showing that a wide variety of influences may still leave Generation Y’ers wanting to do well at work, working hard, continuously develop and produce good results. Due to the similar age of participants, age effects are not accounted for, but it would be interesting to repeat this study later to explore possible age effects on expectations to ethics at work. For all these indications to demographic patterns, but particularly for the latter, it would be beneficial and very interesting to pursue a quantitative study on this topic to get data that can be generalised and an analyse the socio-demographic distributions on factors in more detail.
5 Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

This thesis has been examining the expectations the young Generation Y have to ethics at work in New Zealand, and found three different perspectives. The first factor, the Achiever strive to be the best they can be in what they are doing, expect continuous learning and want to provide valuable work for the organisation, but do not see ethics at work as very important. Next, the Ethical Employee expect ethics to be an integrated part of the organisational structure so that work is a comfortable place to be, and they expect management to take charge in leading an ethical culture. Finally, the Public Conservationists main expectation is the ethical concerns regarding the impact the organisation has on society and environment, where integrity and transparency are key elements. This research therefore shows that Generation Y cannot be seen as a single entity and or be managed in the same way just based on the generation they are born in. However, this thesis provides knowledge to what the generation do expect and can help understand and manage Generation Y members better.

Discussions regarding various forms of work was outlined in chapter two, and this study found that the young Generation Y are rather open minded when considering what work is. They see it as a more integrated part of their lives they are therefore happy to do precarious work as long as it gives them a deeper fulfilment and purpose in life. This may also explain the trends of younger generations having shorter tenures and less commitment to organisations than Baby Boomers (Benson & Brown, 2011). The increase of new forms of work has widened the meaning of work and generations have therefore attached further demands to work than simply paid employment. This change in value prioritisation may make managers from older generations believe the younger workforce is lazy, but this stereotype is associated to the younger generations being driven by more intrinsic motivations rather than making money to survive.

One of the main consensus findings, that the young Generation Y does not see income as the main focus for work can be clearly related back to hypothesis on scarcity theory (Kincaid, 1983), in which the priorities and values reflect the socioeconomic environment (Inglehart,
1990) during the generation’s formative years. The financial security Generation Y grew up with, has socialised the group to have a lower prioritisation of the value of money as they assume it will always come with a job, and rather focus on the physiological sustenance (Inglehart, 1990) they can gain from work such as benefiting society, fulfilling their interests and feeling like they are doing a valuable job for their organisation. As Generation Y has not had to struggle for basic needs, they need to find other goals to make their lives fulfilled and meaningful, and therefore expect a more purposeful job.

Each of the factors’ expectancies can be explained in some way as they all have distinct characteristics, but this study found that the Generation Y characteristics previously found is not the same for all persons in the generational cohort, but rather represent subgroups of the generation. The Achievers for example, work hard in order to achieve for themselves and wish to be the best whilst adding value to an organisation, showing strong relations to the generalisations of Rentz (2015) and Martin (2005) where they argue that Generation Y thrive from challenges, are hard working with high standards, and have a desire to drive organisations. The Achievers’ focus on hard work and success can also be linked to having a strong work ethic (Miller et al., 2002). Some participants who spoke about materialism and going to work with the main purpose of earning money is not how it should be, confirms a potential prospective intergenerational conflict area as Inglehart (2008) argues that the older generations value materialism and economic security whilst younger generations including Generation Y and X increasingly prioritise post-materialist values. The Achievers valuing creativity and innovation again confirms previous literature, but mainly in characteristics that is specific to the factor of the Achievers.

The Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist do not however match these generational theories to the same extent as the Achievers. The Ethical Employee on the one hand, aligns with Howe and Strauss’s (2000) theories that more than any previous generation, Generation Y focuses on modesty, teamwork and good conduct at a young age. Further, the Ethical Employee brings strong associations to business ethics academic literature (Kaptein, 2011; Stohl et al., 2009; Treviño et al., 1999) where a value based ethical culture, managers as ethical role models and implemented corporate codes of ethics are seen as important. This shows that for organisations where employees have values similar to the Ethical Employee, the enactment of ethics strategies will be appreciated and effective, and can therefore develop a great ethical organisation. The Ethical Employee’s focus on an ethical workplace means that
if their expectations are met, they will have good job satisfaction, increased intention to stay, and also have a stronger commitment to the organisation and will therefore be reliable employees that works for the organisation itself (Ruiz-Palomino, Martínez-Cañas, & Fontrodona, 2013). Goldgehn (2004) claims that Generation Y wants the truth, something both the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist show by expecting to work in a transparent organisation.

Howe and Strauss (2015) also argues that achievement is a key value of Generation Y, something that aligns with the Achievers to a much greater extent, but are not clearly reflected in the characteristics of the Public Conservationist. The Public Conservationist want to work for the common good, and is not as motivated by achievement for themselves, but rather wish to do work that makes impacts outside of the organisation. The impact they wish to make is a different type of achievement, and though their ways of working may be seen as the stereotypically lazy Generation Y, they measure achievement differently than others such as the Achievers who focus on their own success. The individuals identifying with the Public Conservationists have more altruistic and biospheric values (De Groot & Steg, 2009), and may be seen as one of the main drivers for corporate social responsibility efforts (Weber & Wasieleski, 2018). This group also show a much stronger connection to the intrinsic motivations related to public sector employees (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007), further enhanced by participants talking about their experience volunteering and their wish to work in the health industry or public sector, agreeing with Benson and Gottschalk (2017) that individuals choose to work within the public sector because of their value prioritisation towards the society. Ecological Modernisation Theory aims to reorganise society to become sustainable, and argues that sustainability and economic profit is possible for organisations (Mol, 1995), which shows strong associations with the Public Conservationists. The strongest connection between the Public Conservationists and Ecological Modernisation Theory is the capability of combining the economic, ecological, socio-ideological and political spheres together in to one sustainable sphere. This is demonstrated by the Public Conservationists when participants spoke about the interdependency between business and society, and how “impacts are not isolated to individuals” whilst arguing that it is everyone’s responsibility to minimise the impact of their own behaviour on others.

Due to the focus the Public Conservationists have on workplace ethics such as transparency, integrity and treatment of employees combined with their concern for society and the
environment, the study found that there is a strong association to Voegtlin’s (2016) responsible leadership theory. The Public Conservationists is the only factor that did not find it important that the managers should take responsibility for their mistakes, which enhances the connection with responsible leadership through the focus on shared responsibility and collective problem solving. The Public Conservationist do relate to literature on Generation Y, but mainly through the focus on meaningful work, and do not show strong correlations to other characteristics. They do however match the stereotype of Generation Y through their care for the environment and wanting honesty. There is a strong relation to responsible leadership and ecological modernisation theories, which can be explained through the increasing popularity of ecological modernisation theory during Generation Y’s socialisation.

The three ideal types are based on three levels of concern (see Figure 2), where the Achiever focus on themselves at an individual level, the Ethical Employee are concerned for the community and ethics for people within the workplace. At the outer level, the Public Conservationist has a concern for the society outside of work and the impact the organisation has on the planet. It is proposed that these ideal types are all needed within an organisation, and can represent the triple bottom line and the three P’s of profit, people and planet (Elkington, 2013). Though the individual level represents the Achiever to whom work is to benefit themselves and make a profit, the middle and outer levels are also of significant interest. Business ethics emerged as a field in the 1970s (De George, 1987) when Generation X were in their formative years, and it became more widespread as Generation X entered the workplace and the second level of the people within the organisation grew. Generation Y enhanced this and the internal ethical behaviours has been established as a core concern at work. What Generation Y has brought to this development is the outer level and their concern for the planet and the external ethical effects organisations have, and argue that there is a responsibility that needs to be acted upon.
The thesis found that the three ideal types have different prioritisations of Schwartz’s (1992) values. Schwartz (1992) is known for his contribution to academic research through his value survey, which he tested in multiple countries, and based the theory of 10 basic human values on. These values are power, security, universalism, benevolence, tradition, self-direction, conformity, hedonism, stimulation and achievement, which all individuals have some relation to varying extents. Schwartz outlines how values, attitudes, beliefs, traits and norms influence human behaviour, where values are the core beliefs that refers to our goals, which again translates in to human actions. Further, we order our values by how important we see them, and the combination of values and importance leads us to use these values as our standards or criteria for human action (Schwartz, 2012). This study illustrates the different value prioritisations for the young Generation Y where the Achiever value achievement and stimulation, the Public Conservationist prioritise universalism and benevolence, whilst the Ethical Employee find conformity important. This demonstrates the wide variety of values that all human behaviour is ultimately based upon, and Generation Y agree that money has less value than gaining fulfilment from other sources. This can be connected to the post-modern society and rise of the precariat class (Standing, 2016), where the structure of the social world is continuously changing and unsettled, throwing off the stability of generational
theories. It is not as simple as just to manage generations within an organisation based on when and where they were born. The diversity of ethical expectations and underlying values within Generation Y shows that it is important to be open to a variety of expectations and values, and it is more crucial than ever to look at the individuals within an organisation. Further research on the ideal types and associated employees with the following proposition of ideal types associations to certain sectors (see Figure 3) may be interesting. However, none of the participants identify with the factors 100% (see appendix 3) and therefore also have additional values than what is found in this study. This is not complete map to what the young Generation Y value in relation to ethics at work, but more of a set of guidelines to the variety of opinions and values they possess.

![Figure 3: Proposed employment sector for ideal types.](image)

In contrast to previous research on generations, this study shows how the stereotypical characteristics of Generation Y cannot be associated to the cohort as a whole, but is separated in smaller subgroups due to the ‘differentness’ of Generation Y. This is because the consensus statements do not cover all aspects associated with Generation Y previously, and some of the ideal types demonstrate opposite characteristics to literature. Generation Y is considered ‘different’ to previous generations (van der Wal, 2017), and it is argued here that a combination of factors may have caused the difficulty in pinpoint and understand the younger generations. The extension of the formative period of generations and ‘emerging adulthood’ today (Arnett, 2014) along with the ‘disorganisation of transition’ (Parsons & Bales, 1956) opens up the socialisation of generations to new influences from a wide variety of social
institutions in a globalising world, complicating the socialisation process and the traditional formative socialisation of generations are disturbed. This is illustrated in this study where a minority of the statements were organised in consensus across the participant group, whilst the majority of participants had strong values relating to how and to what extent they expect the workplace and ethics to be influencing the workplace.

5.2 Implications

5.3.1 Practical Implications

Even though it is argued that there are no ethical crisis in the workplace (Danley, Harrick, Schaefer, Strickland, & Sullivan, 1996), ethics is an increasingly important topic for Generation Y. As ethical and unethical behaviour is based on the human values and actions within the organisation, it is a core concern of HR practitioners to understand employees and work with employee relations. HR plays a major role of being an intermediate between employees and the organisation, but even though HR are seen as holding an ethical stewardship role, practitioners report that they have difficulties in taking on this role to the fullest, as conflicting expectations of the HR department role in organisations makes it difficult (Parkes & Davis, 2013), such as when they are expected to only act as on behalf of the organisation’s ethical requirements (de Gama, McKenna, & Peticca-Harris, 2012). As one of the core functions of HR, employment relations is key for a well run organisation and it is therefore important to develop mutual trust and a good interdepent bond between employees and management (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). This thesis provides HR practitioners with knowledge about the young Generation Y, which has recently, and is currently entering workplaces all around New Zealand.

First and most importantly, ethics should be an integrated and holistic part of the workplace and not be seen as an add-on, as ethics and sustainability is a way to make a profit. It is recommended that the HR practitioners use this knowledge to continue working towards a more flexible approach where individuals from different sub-groups of Generation Y can work together well to form a cohesive team with a broader values base to benefit the organisation. In cases where Generation Y are unhappy at work, they seem to feel less constrained and are more likely to leave the organisation, so in order to reduce the turnover rate, Generation Y must satisfy their values at work, whether it be in the way the Achiever,
the Ethical Employee or the Public Conservationist through a positive values-fit with the organisation. In order to successfully develop a good employee relationship, it is important to understand their expectations and values in an effort to reduce intergenerational conflicts and develop a strong ethical culture.

5.3.2 Social Implications

As mentioned in previous chapters, New Zealand organisations are struggling to find the right employee for positions, and it is therefore important to be able to understand the workforce in order to build strong connections for a good employee relationship. By getting to know the values and expectations of the young Generation Y, organisations will be able to attract and retain talent, by developing a workplace that is open to differences and takes advantage of the diversity within the organisation. By filling workplaces and developing a better and more ethical organisational culture, it brings a better work life for employees and by following the ethical expectations to for example the Public Conservationist and Ecological Modernisation Theory, organisations can benefit the environment and society at a more fulfilling level.

This thesis gives clear examples for what a growing part of the workforce want, and raises awareness of the ethical expectations the younger generation have to work, particularly in relation to workplace culture and corporate social responsibility. Additionally, the research is highly topical as the recent #metoo-campaign brought new attention to ethics at work, and put a heightened pressure on and criticised organisations and particularly HR departments to deal with reports of unethical behaviour towards employees in a more thorough manner. This focus is reflected in the research as all factors think it is important that people are to be treated in an ethical manner and should not feel at unease while at work. It is therefore recommended that HR departments in particular introduce further knowledge and practices in relation to ethics in the workplace. The Ethical Employee shows that ethics at work is very important for a subgroup of Generation Y, and there is a demand for further advancements in policies and ethics structures at work. Business ethics and ethics at the workplace must be an integral part of all HR policy, as well as being integrated in all business strategy.

5.3.3 Theoretical Implications

Theoretically, this thesis critiques previous literature, and adds a new perspective on an increasingly significant topic with growing diversity and individualisation. The theoretical relevance of this thesis is that it provides a broader understanding of the young Generation
Y’s ethical values prioritisation, and shows that it is not viable to put all members of a generational cohort under one set of characteristics. There are still similarities to earlier generations through the Achievers and the Ethical Employee, but the Public Conservationist has developed as a new strand of core values. The methodology used in this thesis provides a new way of exploring generations, and brings attention to the variety of opinions on ethics within one generational cohort. The study shows that Generation Y see ‘meaningful work’ as different things, whether it be the interest in the job, the value they add to organisations or the influence the organisation or job have on the environment and society. As the definition of unethical and ethical behaviour is questioned and debated every day, it is important to see the aspect where a group of people have several points of view of the importance of ethics, and how it should be prioritised within organisations. Further, it adds to academic literature by providing a New Zealand specific perspective on the topic, and therefore develops the field of business ethics and generations at work.

During this thesis, it has been suggested that generational theories might have to be reimagined to fit the current forms of dynamic socialisation and formative experiences that has changed radically from traditional socialisation in the family. It also invites to further research on each of the three types discovered in this research. Along with literature on modern socialisation in a digital time the thesis criticises previous literature on generations, and suggests that it would be beneficial to further research the effects of socialisation today. As a response to the request for further research on ethics for HR (Budd & Scoville, 2005), it explores expectations to ethics within the workplace for the new workforce. Even though Smola and Sutton (2002) found that work values are more strongly shaped by generational experiences than age effects, it is proposed that further research should be done on age effects and ethical expectations for generations, hypothesising that the ethical value prioritisation may change. It is also important to follow up this study with a similar approach to Generation X and Baby Boomers in order to being able to thoroughly compare the differences between generations. This study also brings up questions regarding preferred and most effective leadership styles for each ideal types of Generation Y. Even though individuals loading on the Ethical Employee who desire ethically sound practices within the workplace, it cannot be assumed that these employees always behave ethically themselves, and it is therefore proposed that further research on the relationship between ethical expectations and unethical behaviour in organisations should be explored.
5.3 Limitations of the study

This thesis focused on exploring the young Generation Y’s expectations to ethics at work in New Zealand, and the underlying value prioritisation they have. It has provided a greater understanding as to why Generation Y is seen as different and difficult to manage in association to other generations in the workplace, and concluded that there are three values sets of the Achiever, the Ethic Employee, and the Public Conservationist. However, as in any study, this thesis also has limitations that need to be discussed.

The main methodological limitations such as the small sample size were noted in chapter 3, but there are also further issues to consider. Firstly, due to the small and handpicked sample, a sample bias may exist. The cultural diversity of the sample is not representative of the overall New Zealand population, and the study may lack the perspective of certain cultural groups. However, this thesis has done what Q-methodology aim to do, to find and present different opinions on a topic, which can only be achieved from a diverse sample where the participants are from different backgrounds, social groups and locations. The study therefore provides a strong piece of research that allow for valuable insight to various ethics prioritisations and expectations of Generation Y in New Zealand. Further, the focus on only one half of one generation is rather narrow, and including the older half of Generation Y could bring further perspectives. However, it was a conscious decision as the participants have little work experience, have recently gone in to jobs after graduation or are still studying and are about to enter the workplace in the next few years. An extended version of this study could have older participants and tested for age effects. This study therefore provides an insight to the attitudes the late Generation Y has to work before or in the very beginning of their work lives.

Finally, maybe the biggest limitation of the study is the Q-set. The statements in the Q-set have been discussed, studied and collected at length and in great detail in order to give a strong representation of all opinions on the topic, but it is however possible that some opinions have been missed. Participants were asked if there were any statements or opinions they thought might be missing from the Q-set, and whilst everyone reported that they felt like the final sort did in fact represent their opinions and values, they might not have thought of statements that could have been more suitable. Not all of the statements are on ethics, but this was done intentionally to ensure that participants who did not find ethics very important also
had their voice and opinions reflected. This strengthened the study by showing that not everyone in Generation Y are very focused on ethics at work, and does not think it plays a major role for their career in comparison to others within the same generation.

Another concern in regard to the statements is the individual interpretation of each statement. The main example is the statement “If the organisation is multinational, they should make sure that all employees in all countries are treated the same” (#32) which was intended to represent the fair treatment of employees across boarders, to reduce exploitation of employees in developing countries. The possibility of different interpretations were illustrated well with this statement, as some participants disagreed with the statements and argued that employees in different countries should be treated differently to suit their cultural norms and economic situations, whilst other participants found this statement important as they were interpreting it as not taking advantage of less privileged workforces in other countries where employment relation laws and standards are not to the same high standard of New Zealand. However, due to the post-sort interviews, this was talked about and explained, and provided insightful information in the way the participants think and analyses the statements. The post-sort interviews provided invaluable feedback and explanations for the sorting of the statements. This study has gotten to know the young Generation Y, and encourage further research on demographics, sectors and job choices or how expectations and values set translate to own behaviours. To further understand how Generation Y has these values and expectations to ethics at work, it is proposed that further quantitative research would be beneficial. Despite its limitations, this thesis provide valuable knowledge about the way the late Generation Y think about the workplace, and helps clarify what expectations they have in relation to ethics and organisations.

5.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, the late Generation Y has varying expectations to ethics in the workplace, as illustrated by the Q-study analysis where three sub-groups of the late Generation Y were found. The three groups, the Achievers, the Ethical Employee and the Public Conservationist, all have their specific expectations to what extent ethics should be implemented in the workplace. All groups found it important that employees should be treated with respect and not made to feel vulnerable, but there were distinct differences in other aspects. The
Achievers focus on their own career development and think ethics at work play a secondary role in comparison to their main priority of their own work effort and results. They work hard and wish to do valuable work for the organisation they are in, and expect the organisation to provide them with opportunities to do so. Opposite to the Achiever, the Ethical Employee expects a workplace led by an ethical culture with managers leading as great examples. They think it should be policies in place to ensure a workplace where they feel comfortable and be sure that ethical behaviour is handled according to set organisational policies. The final factor, the Public Conservationist has strong expectations to the environment and society as stakeholders, and has high ethical standards in relation to organisational effects. They bring together the influences an organisation has to the world in an interconnected net, and expect the organisation to benefit the society and preserve the environment as well as the organisation can. Finally, the consensus statements showed what the participants on a whole agreed upon, and found that as long as the technology is good enough to perform the job to an adequate level, they are not worried about high-tech equipment. Further, they want more intrinsic fulfilment and reward from work as they expect to find work interesting and meaningful due to the amount of time spent at work. They expect that a basic salary comes with any job, and therefore puts more emphasis on the more purposeful aspects of work, such as being a valuable asset to the organisation, having a job that aligns with their interests, or benefit the wider environment and society.

Theoretically, the results align with literature on changing socialisation and the growing impact of Ecological Modernisation Theory, whilst it contributes to research such as generation literature as it provides a more detailed image of the value and ethical expectations the young Generation Y has to work. The review of scarcity theory also found that the reasoning to what can be seen as a more ‘demanding’ Generation Y, is their socialisation in an economically sound environment which brings expectations to a basic salary for any job and leaves the individuals longing for further fulfilment in order to have a purpose, which for previous generations was to make a living. An extension of the youth period might mean that the late Generation Y is just now coming to the end of their formative period, and have therefore not gained the set values as previous generations had when they entered their 20s. This thesis has provided theoretical arguments as to why Generation Y is perceived as different to previous generations, as well as providing a more detailed explanation of what the new workforce expect in relation to ethics at work in New Zealand.
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7 Appendix

7.1 Appendix 1 – Guide to Q-sort

Instructions to the Q-sort
(go through the steps with participant)

1. Take the deck of cards and the score board and go sit at a table. Lay down the score sheet in front of you. All 36 cards in the deck contain a statement of opinion about ethics at work. I will ask you to rank-order these statements according to your own opinion. My question to you is “to what extent do you see these statements as important for you at work?” The numbers on the cards have been assigned to the cards randomly and are only relevant for the administration of your response.

2. The study is about ethics at work, and I am interested in your opinions of what is the most and least important aspects of work ethics.

3. Read the 36 statements carefully and split them up into three piles: a pile for statements you find the most important, a pile for statements you find the least important, and a pile of cards that you are undecided about, that are not relevant or that you do not care much about. I am interested in your opinion, so there is no right or wrong answer.

4. Take the cards from the most important-pile and re-read them. Select the statements you find the most important and place them in the two last boxes on the right of the scoreboard. It does not matter which one is on top or below. Next, from the remaining cards in the most important pile, select three statements you find the most important and place them in the boxes next to the ones you just placed your first cards in. Follow this routine for all the cards from the agree-pile.

5. Then take the cards from the least important-pile, and re-read them. Do the same as step four, but start to the very left of the scoreboard.

6. Finally, take the remaining cards and read them again. Arrange the cards in the remaining open boxes of the scoreboard.

7. When you have placed all cards on the scoreboard, please go over your placement again and make any changes you see needed.

## 7.2 Appendix 2 – Q-board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Least important
7.3 Appendix 3 – Factor loadings of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT NUMBER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>YEAR BORN</th>
<th>WORK EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WORK EX</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>BCOM</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3rd year BSC/BCOM</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>Bachelor of Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>&gt; 5 years</td>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>&gt; 5 years</td>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4th year LLB</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3rd year LLB/BCOM</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design (Hons)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3rd year BCOM</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2nd year BEd/BA</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>MCOM</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>2nd year BCOM</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>BCOM (Hons) / 2nd year LLB</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>MCOM</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>&gt; 5 years /Student</td>
<td>2nd year BMus</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year / Student</td>
<td>3rd year BEd/BA</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>MCOM</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total defining sorts

6 4 2

Note: Q sorts that load heavily on one factor and is seen as a defining sort is marked in bold.
7.4 Appendix 4 – Technical information

7.4.1 Focus group
Following a Human Ethics Committee approval (Application reference number: 00000255547), suitable participants were contacted through snowball sampling. The focus group lasted for approximately one hour and consisted of five participants who all received participant information sheets about the study and a participant consent form. The participants were asked the following open questions, and were encouraged to debate on the topic:

• What do you want from your work?
• What should employers do to make you want to work in an organisation?
• Do you think you have different expectations to work than your parents? If so, how are you different?

For areas covered by the literature that did not appear in the focus group discussion, the researcher asked questions such as ‘should management understand your values?’ and ‘what do you expect to happen if you report bullying at work?’ The focus group concluded by asking respondents if they had further opinions or thought on the topic.

7.4.2 Pilot interviews and interviews
A Human Ethics Committee approval was obtained (Application reference number: 0000025620) before two pilot Q-sorts and interviews were performed to prepare for the study. Afterwards, the pilots were asked questions regarding the representativeness of statements, the wording of the statements, and if there were statements they did not understand. They were also encouraged to provide any additional thoughts they had on the Q-sort itself as well as the post-sort interview. After the pilot studies were reflected upon, the data collection for the study commenced.