



## Work-related values: A comparative study of individuals of the Generation Y from different socioeconomic classes in Brazil

João Vítor Simão Renda Lanfredi<sup>[a]</sup>, Flávia Feitosa Santana<sup>[b]</sup>, Cléber da Costa Figueiredo<sup>[c]</sup>

[a] Bachelor of Business Administration at ESPM, Sales Advisor at BRF, São Paulo, SP. E-mail: jvslan@gmail.com

[b] Doctor of Social Psychology at University of São Paulo, Professor at ESPM, São Paulo, SP. E-mail: flavia.feitosa@espm.br

[c] Doctor of Science in Statistics at University of São Paulo, Professor at ESPM and EAESP-FGV, São Paulo, SP. E-mail: cfigueiredo@espm.br

### Abstract

This study analyzes the characteristics and, mainly, the work-related values of Brazil's Generation Y from different socioeconomic classes. This theme has become more relevant since, in recent years, these young people have entered or are about to enter the labor market – a movement that is allegedly generating numerous conflicts in organizational environments. The main question that guides this research is: Do Generation Y individuals from socioeconomic classes “A” and “B” have different values in relation to those from classes “C,” “D,” and “E”? From the theoretical perspective, the concept of generations was studied, with emphasis on what has been defined as Generation Y globally as well as in the Brazilian context. In relation to values, the difference between attitudes and motivations was first established and, then, work-related values were studied, which are: leisure, intrinsic, altruistic, social, and extrinsic. The questionnaire was translated into Brazilian Portuguese and, later, back translation and content and face validity were carried out. The responses were divided into two groups: 137 answers from classes A and B and 91 answers from classes C, D, and E. Exploratory factor analysis was used to identify the order of importance of the values as well as MANOVA to detect differences between the groups. Afterwards, f-tests and t-tests were performed for all items individually in order to verify whether any differences between the items were observed in the two groups. It was established that individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B do not have different work-related values from the individuals of classes C, D, and E. In addition, values that provide intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were the most valued by Generation Y. Another result is that young people from classes A and B do not predominantly have values related to social rewards, when compared to classes C, D, and E. The opposite was observed. There were no significant differences in work-related values between individuals of Generation Y from socioeconomic classes A and B and C, D, and E; nor was there predominance of the first group in relation to social rewards. This study broadens knowledge about Generation Y, reinforcing that the more-prominent values refer to those that provide intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Moreover, it tackles the problem of

comparing social stratum in the State of São Paulo.

**Keywords:** Intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards. Altruism. Social rewards. Leisure.

---

## Introduction

The so-called Generation Y (“Ys”) is composed of people born from the end of 1982 until the early 2000s (HOWE; STRAUSS, 2000), although there is not consensus in the literature. This generation was marked by the easy access and propagation of information – due to the evolution of the internet – and, in the Brazilian case, by being born in an era of economic stability. However, interest in understanding them is still recent in the country. In addition, studies, predominantly North American, aiming to understand the expectations of the contemporary youth – notably with regard to their insertion in the labor market – have proliferated in the last decade (OLIVEIRA, 2012).

Authors such as Tulgan (2003) and Lombardía et al. (2008) emphasize that, in the work environment, these individuals seek challenges and want to feel that they are part of the organization by contributing in some way to it. Companies have difficulties in managing this generation as many managers are reluctant to assign them important responsibilities, since they have little or no previous experience.

Another aspect that arises in discussions on the subject is the generational conflicts with other members of the organizations: Ys have different behavioral characteristics from older members and probably from managers, producing challenges to both (KULLOCK, 2014; CIA DE TALENTOS, 2015).

When searching for articles in scientific journals related to the subject, it is possible to find authors who, besides mentioning the differences between previous generations and Y, questioned how the established characteristics found in the Brazilian studies can be assimilated to those found in international studies without historical context being accounted for.

Considering that the birth year of the individual is not enough to understand generations, since this is only a reference and cannot be used to classify or describe the way people act, one must also consider historical events or milestones that occurred in certain contexts (OLIVEIRA; PICCININI; BITTENCOURT, 2012). Studies on Brazilian society that do not address such aspects become uncertain when they affirm the existence of generations with uniform characteristics, since they do not consider social, economic, and gender inequalities in Brazil, distancing themselves from reality. Lemos (2012) questions the generalization of results obtained in studies with such characteristics, since they portray the generational groups as a homogeneous block and consider only individuals with higher education from middle-upper classes, ignoring the other classes.

Thus, stereotypes based on common sense are created, perpetuating the idea that all members of Generation Y are individuals with the same behavioral, socioeconomic, and cultural characteristics – a label whose solid ground is questionable, because it does not consider the environment in which these individuals are inserted.

Taking into account the aspects mentioned so far, this study intends to analyze the characteristics and, mainly, the work-related values of Brazilian individuals of Generation Y from different socioeconomic classes.

The general objective of this study is to understand the work-related values of members from different socioeconomic classes who belong to Generation Y in the State of São Paulo in order to assess if individuals of Generation Y from socioeconomic classes "A" and "B" have different values in relation to individuals of classes "C," "D," and "E."

Three specific objectives were formulated:

- 1) evaluate the main values of Generation Y in the State of São Paulo;
- 2) evaluate the main differences of values between the socioeconomic classes A/B and C, D, E; and
- 3) compare the results obtained from the different socioeconomic classes with the labels generated for Generation Y.

The questionnaire of work-related values by Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, and Lance (2010), published in the *Journal of Management*, was used to reach these objectives. Therefore, to understand the proposed theme, it is fundamental to understand the concept of generation and its main characteristics and differences, without forgetting, however, that the focus of this work is the Generation Y.

### **The Management Concept**

According to Howe and Strauss (2007), in the article "The Next 20 Years," what constitutes a generation are events and circumstances lived according to each stage of life. The economic moment that a country goes through and remarkable public events create a sum of events that affect people, and define who they are. In other words, if a forty-years-old woman today is compared to another who lived in the 1950s or 1980s, different habits and custom can be found.

In general, Howe and Strauss (2007) define *generation* as a set of common characteristics, fixed by peers' personalities and determined by chronological location and age. They also explain that the difference between generations is not only due to age group, but also to generational personality, which is composed of attitudes related to family, religion, politics, culture, future aspirations, and lifestyle. Parry and Urwin (2009) complement such a concept by stating that a generational wave starts from an analysis of historical, political, or social events that impact the values, attitudes, and behavior of those people who experienced them in their socialization phase. For this reason, the start and end dates of a generation may differ depending on the reality of each country.

The start and end dates of generations that will be used in this work are those defined by Howe and Strauss (2007) as: The Silent Generation – born between 1925 and 1942; Baby Boomers – born between 1943 and 1960; Generation X – born between 1961 and 1981; Generation Y or the Millennial Generation – born between 1982 and the 2000s.

## Generation Y

There is no consensus in the literature regarding the start date of Generation Y. It is estimated that the individuals of this generation were born between 1980 and 2000. Several publications claim that Ys are somewhat different from their predecessors, "Xs," and "Boomers," although there is no consensus in scientific literature that proves this idea. As quoted by Macky, Gardner, and Forsyth (2008), texts found in popular press make stereotyped generalizations, without presenting reviews or scientific data.

Despite the scarce literature, there are authors who have carried out studies and investigations about the context of the generations in the workplace, their personality traits, and values. The main reason why there are not many studies on Generation Y is that their members are in the beginning of their insertion in the labor market, which started around the 2000s (MASTROLIA; WILLITS, 2013).

Among the authors who defined the behavior of different generations, Howe and Strauss (2000, 2003) are the most cited. They describe traits that distinguish Generation Y from others, such as: *optimistic* – nine out of ten Ys describe themselves as "happy," "confident," and "positive," and believe that their own professional ascension is easier compared to their parents; *altruistic* – they are guided by group activities and more concerned (in relation to their parents) with the environment; *acceptance of authority* – they identify their values with their parents' values. Nine out of ten say they are close to their parents, trust them more, and have less conflict with them; five out of ten believe in government, that measures taken by it serve the population, and the vast majority is in favor of rules that punish bad behavior in primary social groups and at other levels; they *follow rules* – they belong to the most "protected" – by parents, teachers, nannies, relatives – generation of all time, in addition to having spent more time on weekdays involved in school and domestic tasks in relation to the time spent watching TV, for example.

To better understand Generation Y, a review of a set of works and studies, described in the article "Millennials: what do we really know about them?" by Mastrolia and Willits (2013), was carried out, showing the main characteristics found. Thus:

a) Twenge (2006) compared Generation Y with other generations and concluded that its members are confident and extroverted, possess narcissistic characteristics, and suffer from anxiety and depression.

b) Wong, Gardiner, Lang, and Coulon (2008) examined personality traits of the generations and identified few significant differences: Ys are less loyal to businesses; and compared to other generations, they are fonder of being surrounded by people, they are more ambitious, and see greater importance in work.

c) Cennamo and Gardner (2008) investigated work values, satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The results showed that the main differences of Ys in relation to other generations are related to autonomy in work and status, while there were no significant differences for altruistic, extrinsic, intrinsic, and social values.

d) Kowske, Rasch, and Wiley (2010) examined the effect of generational characteristics on attitudes at work (satisfaction, safety, intentions to change) and concluded that these generally differ, but very little, and that there is much data that

support or refute the idea that there are differences between generations in terms of behavior.

e) Twenge et al. (2010) compared generations by taking into account work-related, leisure, intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, and social values, and discovered that leisure-related values have gained more importance over time, while those related to work decreased. For the Ys, extrinsic values are stronger than for the Boomers, while intrinsic and social values were less important for the Ys than for the Boomers. Regarding altruistic values, there were no significant differences between the generations. Their final conclusion indicated small to moderate differences between generations in job preferences and rewards, such as salary bonuses or promotions.

f) Smith and Galbraith (2012), Quin (2010), and Altes (2009) emphasized that Ys contribute to the organization in which they work, they work well in teams, have motivation to make big impacts in daily life, are communicative, and at ease with new technologies. The authors also observed that this generation tends to continue employment when their managers offer flexibility, personal satisfaction, and growth opportunity.

g) Ng, Schweitzer, and Lyons (2010) carried out studies on the behavior of Generation Y at work and concluded that there are different expectations and priorities among its members, based on demographic differences such as gender and race. The authors suggest that such individuals need constant feedback, want a balance between personal and professional life, and give great importance to corporate social responsibility.

Therefore, it was possible to establish that there is a certain complexity around the values related to Generation Y, since the studies discuss different characteristics. There is a shortage of material that can prove the existence of characteristics unique to Ys, and it is possible to question articles published on the internet, newspapers, magazines, as well as academic studies that present suggestions and advice on how to “manage” Ys (MASTROLIA; WILLITS, 2013).

However, several authors analyze Generation Y and its singularity, indicating numerous ways to manage it. As examples, we mention Amble (2003), who presents motivational issues from a managerial aspect; Tulgan (2009b), who makes it clear that Ys' careers have to be managed; and Martin and Schmidt (2010), who clarify that companies need to learn to retain these talents, even though they have no experience. Similarly, the non-academic universe also shows aspects that need to be managed. Melo (2014), for example, presented a manual with seven rules (and a counterpoint) to administer Generation Y; and the website Catho.com (2014) published an article on the challenge to manage Generation Y (Millennials).

The evaluation of Generation Y requires numerous in-depth analyzes. If, in fact, there are differences in relation to other generations, a qualitative evaluation of these differences must be developed. There is no way to generalize ideas about the subject. Differences may be regional, demographic, or behavioral, reinforcing the need for studies like this one, which seeks to understand what issues are relevant in Brazil to the study of Generation Y in relation to work.

## Generation Y in Brazil

According to the census conducted by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) in 2010, 35.8% of the Brazilian population (68,507,234 million) belonged to Generation Y, taking into account individuals who were born from 1980 to 2000.

For Grupo DMRH (2009), Brazilian Ys are agile and immediatists; they care about the future, but they value the present; they are impatient and restless, which contributes to their anxiety about professional and personal decisions; quality of life for them is linked to pleasure and personal fulfillment; and they dominate and follow technological advances because they were born in the digital age. In addition, Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and Statistics' (IBOPE) (n.d.) report on Generation Y in Brazil points out that Ys are constantly connected to the internet, they are ambitious and desire professional success, they want to be independent from their parents and have their own assets, they are impulsive, and care about fashion.

In relation to professional life, the consultancy firm HAYS (2015) carried out a study that demonstrates that, more than just a high salary, Ys seek flexible workloads that allow more time for leisure. Moreover, they want to be entrepreneurs and have their own business. The study also shows that 37.8% of the interviewees study and work full time.

By evaluating Brazilian studies, it was established that they replicate situations analyzed in international research and affirm that Ys are different from individuals of other generations regarding the following characteristics: they are impatient, they value leisure, they are ambitious, they are connected with new technologies, and they want financial independence.

It is possible to affirm that studies carried out internationally are being incorporated into Brazil without considering particularities and historical events that lead to the formation of opinion and behavior of Brazil's Generation Y. Disseminated by means of communication, the description of Generation Y in Brazil contains generalizations that ignore social differences such as access to higher education – a privilege for the few people – and digital insertion, which still challenges public management (OLIVEIRA, 2012). For Oliveira, the main factor that unifies individuals of the same generation are historical events, and birth year is only a reference.

Oliveira, Bitencourt, and Piccinini (2012) think that, for a generational analysis, temporal markers do not determine behaviors and ways of acting of an age group; however, events of global impact occur, such as September 11 in the US, might make some sense to the generation that have behaviors or ideas reflected by them. Thus, trade liberalization, economic stabilization, or the new economic and political moment in Brazil have much greater relevance for the formation of Ys' personalities in Brazil than September 11.

Individuals' socioeconomic class is also a factor that can determine behaviors. Tomiziaki (2010) explains that, when undergoing group experiences, subjects attribute different meanings to activities. If they were the same, individuals would be homogeneous. Thus, considering social inequality in Brazil, it is not possible to state that there is only one standard behavior among the Ys. However, it is not possible to

affirm either that the disadvantaged portion of Ys – those without access to technology and/or higher education – would not fit into the Generation Y concept.

On the other hand, according to Oliveira, Bittencourt, and Piccininni (2012), when classifying a group, it is necessary to take into account the qualification and technological knowledge of various classes, since there is a great difference between them. For these authors, behavior in relation to work will not be the same for a young person who needs to develop his/her career, compared to another who needs to survive. A young person who goes to work with his/her own car and another one who needs to use public transport and takes two hours to get to work will also have different behaviors.

Therefore, Ys in Brazil can be divided into two subgroups: 1) those who have economic necessities and need to help their families with their own resources; 2) those who have families with higher purchasing power and are mainly interested in building solid foundations for their professional career. Then, the following hypothesis was formulated:

*H1: Individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B have different work-related values from individuals of classes C, D, and E.*

According to the IBGE (2012) there are 65.8 million families in Brazil. From these, 25.8% earn more than five minimum wages per month, belonging to the socioeconomic classification A and B; 47.5% live with one to five times minimum wages, belonging to class C; and 26.7% live on less than one minimum wage per month, belonging to classes D and E, according to Critério Brasil (Brazilian Research Company Association, 2015). These data show that there are large differences in income distribution in the country.

As Kliksberg (2006) highlights:

in the current reality of Latin America, a young person's trajectory is associated with the social stratum to which they belong. Poor young people have limited chances in the labor market – basically compromised by low quality education, which, in many cases, is their only option.

Generalizing Generation Y in the Brazilian context is the same as referring to a group belonging to a higher socioeconomic class, which does not represent the entire Brazilian population (BITENCOURT; PICCININNI; OLIVEIRA, 2012). It is not possible to say that all the individuals of Generation Y in Brazil have the same characteristics. The differences between Ys in Brazil should be analyzed by taking into account their realities and conditions, characteristics of the regions in which they live, ethnic and cultural differences, and access to technology. The existence of individuals who fit the generalization of homogeneous characteristics mentioned by some authors is not ruled out, as already presented.

## Values

Rokeach (1973) defines values as the convictions and principles of the human being and, from this, the opinions of individual are formed and behaviors are defined. Values contain an element of judgment based on what the individual believes to be correct, good, or desirable. It is worth emphasizing that values influence our perceptions and establish the basis for understanding attitudes and motivation.

Birou et al. (1976 *apud* ALMEIDA; SOBRAL, 2009, p. 105) describe value as "the ability of an object (thing, idea, or other person) to satisfy a human desire, need, or aspiration, considering economic, legal, ethical or moral, cultural, and religious values as the main categories of values."

More than this, according to Rokeach (1973), values can be classified as terminal and instrumental. Terminal values are goals that the individual wants to achieve and instrument values are behaviors and means that they prefer to adopt in order to achieve them (ROBBINS; JUDGE; SOBRAL, 2010). Although they are related to each other, it cannot be said that one depends on the other, but both values are linked to the motivation of the human being.

Individual values are considered to be ends of human action, whose purpose is to satisfy basic needs, such as social interaction and, ultimately, survival and group well-being (ALMEIDA; SOBRAL, 2009). In general, according to Rokeach (1973), values are considered useful indicators in relation to the decisions and actions of an individual. There is a consensus that they are permanent, resist changes (MEGLINO; RAVLIN, 1998; ROKEACH, 1973), and related to the behavioral choices that individuals make.

Values are part of the varied decisions of human beings, reflected in day-to-day choices and the way in which they interact with others in society. In the organizational context, values are studied to understand the behavior of the individual and the group, which translates into organizational culture (ALMEIDA; SOBRAL, 2009, p.103).

It is a fact that values can be related to behaviors (SCHWARTZ, 1992), so it is important to understand the meaning of attitude and motivation.

## Attitude and Motivation

Attitude is directly associated with values, but both do not have the same meaning. According to Robbins, Judge, and Sobral (2010), attitude is understood as evaluating affirmations about objects, people, or events, and they can be favorable or unfavorable. They reflect how individuals feel about something. There are three components associated with attitude: 1) the cognitive component, which describes something according to the individual's opinion; 2) based on the former, the affective component, which reflects the emotional dimension of attitude; 3) the behavioral component, which, according to the same authors, refers to the intention to behave in a certain way towards someone or some situation.

Motivation is usually all that drives the person to act in a certain way or, at least, everything that gives propensity to specific behaviors. This impulse to act can



be provoked by external stimuli (coming from the environment) or generated by the individual's mental processes (FERREIRA; DEMUTTI; GIMENEZ, 2010).

When talking about values, interest is in their bearing on individuals' behaviors or attitudes. Values influence perceptions and establish the basis for attitudes and behaviors. From studies on this, it is possible to compare potential behaviors of individuals. The interest, then, lies in the potential behaviors of Ys in relation to work and, therefore, work-related values.

### **Work-related values**

The concept of work-related values is studied by several authors in many ways. They are mostly understood as outcomes of what people desire and feel they must achieve through work (TWENGE et al., 2010). Such values directly influence the individuals' perception, attitude, and behavior in the workplace.

According to Twenge et al. (2010), there are two classifications that separate work values: extrinsic and intrinsic. The first focuses on consequences or results at work, which are tangible rewards, such as salary, promotion opportunities, and status. On the other hand, intrinsic values focus on work processes, which are intangible rewards, such as the inherent interest in work and learning new things.

There are also other work-related values, such as influence or autonomy in decision making; job stability or security; altruistic rewards (helping other individuals or contributing to society); social rewards (interpersonal relationship at work); leisure activities (travel, freedom, absence of supervision) (TWENGE et al., 2010). This set of values will be the focus of this work's investigation.

According to Twenge et al. (2010), the following denominations will be used to define the work-related values: leisure values (leisure), intrinsic values (intrinsic rewards), altruistic values (altruistic rewards), social values (social rewards), and extrinsic values (extrinsic rewards). From this review, the second hypothesis was formulated:

*H2: Individuals of Generation Y from the socioeconomic classes A and B have, predominantly, values related to social rewards when compared to classes C, D, and E.*

Regarding leisure value, authors such as Cennamo and Gardner (2008), Ng, Schweitzer, and Lyons (2010) mention that Ys strive for freedom and balance between work and personal life. Intrinsic values are the least important for them, although they are confident, anxious, ambitious, and motivated, according to Twenge (2006), Wong et al. (2008), Smith and Galbraith (2012), Quin (2010), and Altes (2009). Being altruistic is also a characteristic of Ys as they care about society and the environment (HOWE; STRAUSS, 2000; GRIFFIN, 2002). According to Kultalahti and Viitala (2014), social relations are important for Ys. Regarding extrinsic values, Howe and Strauss (2000) mention that the Generation Y seeks status at work and believes in professional growth.

In sum, it can be said that, in general, research on Generation Y tends to indicate that there is always a characteristic valued by these individuals among the five

values mentioned. This work intends, therefore, to establish the order of importance of these values in the population and if there are differences between individuals from different social classes, regarding work-related values.

In the next section, the methodology used is presented, describing how the phases of this research were carried out to investigate the values of São Paulo's Generation Y in relation to work.

## Methodology

In this section, the methodology adopted to investigate the proposed theme is presented, which is whether the individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B have different values from individuals of classes C, D, and E. Quantitative, descriptive methodology was adopted, including field research and a survey. In addition, the target audience is comprised of people from 17 to 37 years old, in 2017, who are residents of the State of São Paulo. Therefore, for convenience, non-probabilistic sampling was used, and 228 questionnaires were collected. Even though a sampling quota was not adopted, this research sought to balance the number of respondents from groups A and B and C, D, and E.

For data collection, a questionnaire with 29 questions was used, based on the survey by Twenge et al. (2010). This research portrayed differences in work-related values among Baby Boomers, Xs, and Ys. They interviewed students who were in the last year of high school in the United States, from 1976 to 2006. The sample totaled approximately 15 thousand respondents aged 17 to 18. The questions were closed and fragmented, according to the respective values (leisure, extrinsic, intrinsic, altruism, social), and measured by a five-point Likert scale.

The first step was to translate the questionnaire into Brazilian Portuguese. The translation was carried out by the author and the back translation by two people fluent in English. The item "a job in which you have more than fifteen days of vacation" has been adapted, since Brazilian workers are entitled to thirty days of vacation by law, while in the US some companies give a maximum of fourteen days. Therefore, since the original article was written for young Americans, it was necessary to adapt the vacation period from fifteen to thirty days.

Subsequently, face and content validity of the scale was performed by three psychologists in order to evaluate whether the questions in the questionnaire applied or corresponded to the determined value to be measured. Thus, it was noticed that in the original article two items, previously associated with "leisure", represented better the value "intrinsic rewards"; an item associated with "intrinsic rewards" represented "other values"; and two items associated with "other values" represented, respectively, "intrinsic rewards" and "leisure."

It should be noted that the translation of the questions did not change after face and content validity. The change was only applied when analyzing the results.

Table 1 shows the changes. The first column shows what value was associated with the item before validity. The third column shows the value after the validity.

**Table 1** - Summary of the Questionnaire Validity

Value before the validity	Question	Value after validity
Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A job that frees you from others' supervision.</li> <li>• A job that allows you to work at your own pace.</li> </ul>	Intrinsic rewards
Intrinsic rewards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A job in which the skills learned will not become outdated.</li> </ul>	Other values
Other values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I hope my work is a fundamental part of my life.</li> </ul>	Intrinsic rewards
Other values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like the type of job and can forget about tasks and problems after the day is over.</li> </ul>	Leisure

Source: Research data.

The virtual tool Google Forms was used to collect data and the questionnaire was sent to the respondents via Facebook and email. A pretest with a small sample of people was carried out. Besides the ease of understanding the questions, the response time and the questionnaire's layout was assessed. The three who responded to the pretest participated in a conversation to find out if they had doubts or difficulties.

The greatest difficulty faced during the data collection was to find respondents of the classes C, D, and E. Thus, three commercial establishments (a supermarket, a bakery, and an accounting office) were visited, where professionals such as clerks, shelf-stackers, and administrative assistants were approached and asked to participate in the research and help obtain contacts of colleagues and friends.

With the data collected, value reliability measures were calculated using Cronbach's alpha and the software SPSS (COSTA, 2011; HAIR et al., 2009; MAROCO; MARQUES, 2006). Then, exploratory factor analysis and all tests of difference between the means were carried out, with the aid of the software SPSS Statistics 22 and Microsoft Excel 2013.

**Table 2** – Result of Scale Purification

Value	Maximum alpha	Itens	Deleted itens
Leisure	0.458 Low confiability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L1</li> <li>• L2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L3</li> </ul>
Intrinsic rewards	0.811 High confiability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I2</li> <li>• I4</li> <li>• I5</li> <li>• I6</li> <li>• I8</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I1</li> <li>• I3</li> <li>• I7</li> </ul>
Altruism	0.661 Medium confiability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1</li> <li>• A2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>
Extrinsic rewards	0.811 High confiability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1</li> <li>• E2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E3</li> <li>• E4</li> </ul>	
Social rewards	0.756 High confiability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S1</li> <li>• S2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none</li> </ul>

Source: Research data.

Table 2 shows that, for intrinsic rewards, from the eight items evaluated, five (I2, I4, I5, I6, and I8) increased reliability. For altruistic values, extrinsic and social motivations, there was no change.

After data reliability was validated, factor analysis was performed, which aims to analyze the correlation between variables, indicating the order of importance of values (HAIR et al., 2009; MINGOTI, 2005).

It must be emphasized that, for the set of items identified as "other values," it is not possible to use scale purification or factor analysis. For these items, only the technique to measure if there was a difference between the means, via t-tests, was used. Through these t-tests, it was possible to compare if there were differences in the responses between the individuals from class A and B and C, D, and E, and also to verify if, among the groups A and B or C, D, and E, the respondents think in the same way or disagree with each other.

In order to gauge the possible difference between the answers of the questionnaire, the data were organized into two groups: G1, for data related to classes A and B; G2, for the interviewees of classes C, D, and E. MANOVA was performed to detect any difference in values between the two groups.

Then, an item-by-item analysis was performed as similarly done by Twenge et al. (2010). To use the t-test, it was necessary to previously calculate the variance of the answers – if for the same question there was a same pattern of response between the groups – and utilize an f-test. This is required because there are two types of t-test: one that assumes that the groups are homogeneous and another that assumes that the groups are heterogeneous in relation to the responses they assigned to the items. Like the t-test, the F-test returns a p-value. If the result is less than 0.05 or 5%, there is no indication that the groups homogeneous. Therefore, they disagreed about the particular item that was evaluated.

## Analysis Of Results

This study's sample was composed of a total of 228 responses, with the following distribution: classes A and B with 137 responses (60.1%) and classes C, D, and E with 91 responses (39.9%). Regarding the age group, 43% are aged between 21 and 25, 23% between 26 and 30, and, finally, 17% between 31 and 35. It is important to emphasize that most of the sample is part of the "population of active age" (PIA), which, according to the IBGE (2012), are those able to carry out an economic activity – that is, currently working or have worked for some period.

## Order of importance of the values

To verify the importance of the values, a factor analysis was performed only with the questions that maximize the scale's reliability. Therefore, to verify whether the data were adequate for the factor analysis, KMO and Bartlett's test were carried out, which presented favorable results (p-value were less than 0.001). The KMO measure that resulted in 0.816 indicated that the factor analysis could be applied to the data set.

When forcing the existence of five constructs, an explanation of approximately 70% of the variability (68.96%) was verified. Thus, the following order of importance of the factors was reached:

- Factor 1: intrinsic rewards, where the largest factor loads presented were for items I2, I3, I4, I5, and;
- Factor 2: associated with questions E1, E2, E3, and E4, extrinsic rewards;
- Factor 3: social value, with higher factor loads for questions S1 and S2;
- Factor 4: represents the altruistic value; and
- Factor 5: represents the value related to leisure.

Therefore, it is possible to affirm that, among the values studied; those that bring rewards were the most valued by Generation Y. From this, knowing if there were differences between groups for each value was sought. However, after carrying out MANOVA, it was found that there was no significant difference between the values for any of the groups, since all p-values resulted in values higher than 0.05.

It is worth mentioning that, with a level of significance of 10%, when analyzing the result of the p-value for altruism, it is possible to consider the existence of a certain difference between the groups, since the p-value of this comparison was 0.093. Following this reasoning, it was necessary to discover which group had more-altruistic values. By analyzing the mean of the two groups, it was found that G2 is more altruistic than G1, on average. That is, individuals from classes C, D, and E are more concerned with contributing to society than individuals from classes A and B. This result may reaffirm what was stated by Howe and Strauss (2000) that young Americans are altruistic. However, these authors do not distinguish socioeconomic classes, which can generate questions such as: Is altruism present in the various groups of Generation Y from any social class? It is interesting to note that altruism affects social classes C, D, and E more and it is the only item that indicated a difference between social classes. Although it is not a very significant difference, which requires caution in analyses, it may be the object of future research.

## Comparison of responses, item by item

The F-test showed the following results: only the comparison between items I5 and I7 resulted in p-values lower than 5%; the other items have high variance, which means the answers follow a certain standard. Item I5 refers to a job that allows you to see the results of what you do, while item I7 refers to a job where you do not have to pretend to be the kind of person you are not.

When calculating the individual variances for groups G1 and G2, the result showed that the responses of the first group varied less for items I5 and I7. The values of the variances obtained for item I5 were 0.30 for G1 and 0.67 for G2. For item I7, 0.85 for G1 and 1.49 for G2. The closer the result is to 0 (zero), the smaller the variation in the responses. Therefore, it is inferred that classes A and B are more homogeneous than classes C, D, and E for "want see the result in their work" and "not pretending to be the kind of person they are not."

After completing the variance test, it was verified if there was a difference between the responses of the groups by applying the t-test. The only item that showed a difference in responses between the groups was item E3 (a job that would allow you to earn a lot of money). This question is associated with the value "extrinsic rewards" and presented a p-value of 0.013 or 1.3%, which is below the significance level of 5%.

When calculating the mean of the answers, identifying which of the groups, G1 or G2, had a greater preference for making more money through work was sought. The first group had a result of 4.10 and the second 3.73. These results show that the individuals of G1 value financial returns more than those of G2. Thus, this analysis can be associated with the conclusions of Wong et al. (2008) and IBOPE (n.d.), which show Generation Y is ambitious and desire professional success.

By observing that in G1, item E3 (a job that would allow you to earn a lot of money) represents the preference of this group, while altruism appears more often in G2, it is inferred that there is a relationship between these two aspects, which can be studied in future investigations.

### **Analysis of the "other values"**

For the other values (from item 1 to 9), the same methodology in the item-by-item comparison was used. However, there were no significant differences between G1 and G2 – that is, for both groups the result of the p-values was greater than 0.05 or 5%.

From these results and by analyzing the means of the responses of the two groups in a uniform way, it was established how important each variable is for Ys. It is worth remembering that the answers were given through a five-point scale (1 to 5), in which 1 is "totally disagree" and 5 "totally agree."

Questions 1, 5, and 6 had the highest means, close to 5, showing that for Ys these subjects/values have great relevance. Briefly, these questions mention skills learned not becoming outdated, participation in decisions, and a secure future being provided. It is inferred, then, that such issues tend to be more important for Generation Y. Although these questions are isolated and described as "other values", they are related to intrinsic motivation.

On the other hand, the mean of responses was closer to 1 for question 2, which refers to work as "nothing more than earning a living." As it is a question in reverse order, it is concluded that more importance is given to employment than just to earning money. According to Wong et al. (2008), Ys see importance in their work. This result makes it possible to infer that this generation seeks something more, which can be directly related to intrinsic, extrinsic, and social rewards.

Items 3, 4, 7, and 8 had their respective means close to 3, indicating some impartiality on the subject. They referred to being the best at work; having a challenging job; having a stable job, which does not require changes between places; and remaining in the same job for a long time. Therefore, these items have no influence in favor or against Generation Y.

Finally, item 9 ("If you had enough money to live comfortably for the rest of your life, would you still work?") had the options "yes" or "no" as answers and obtained the following result: 78.5% of the respondents answered "yes" and 21.5% answered contrary. Since it is a hypothetical question, it is not possible to evaluate whether this would be their attitude in case the situation did occur.

### **Analysis of the research hypotheses**

After analyzing the data, whether the hypotheses raised at the beginning of this study were valid was investigated. The first hypothesis was:

*H1: Individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B have different work-related values from individuals of classes C, D, and E.*

This hypothesis seeks to clarify the main objective of this study: if there are differences in the work-related values between the socioeconomic classes of Ys. In order to answer this question, the results of the factor analysis followed by MANOVA, which indicated that there were no significant differences between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, social, altruism, and leisure values at a significance level of 5%, should be considered. Thus, H1 is refuted. However, if a level of significance of 10% is considered, it can be said that there is some difference of values between classes A and B and C, D, and E. This difference refers to altruism and has already been discussed. The second hypothesis stated that:

*H2: Individuals of Generation Y belonging to the economic classes A and B have, predominantly, values related to social rewards when compared to the classes C, D, and E.*

When comparing the means of the responses to the social value, it was possible to verify that G1 has a lower mean than G2. Therefore, it was concluded that the second group is more prone to the presented value, appreciating interpersonal relations and refuting H2. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the characteristic regarding social value was not mentioned by the researched authors.

### **Conclusion**

The main objective of this study was to find out what values São Paulo's Generation Y have in relation to work. The initial motivation for this study came from the fact that one of the authors belongs to Generation Y and will enter the job market.

In order to achieve the desired objective, the first step was to find specialized references on generations and secondary data from recent research related to Ys. Most of the studies found were carried out in the USA and suitable for the North American reality. Narcissistic, disloyal to business, ambitious, anxious, working well in teams, wanting a balance between work and personal life (HOWE; STRAUSS, 2000, 2003; GRIFFIN, 2002; TWENGE, 2006; WONG et al., 2008; SMITH et al., 2009; NG;

SCHWEITZER; LYONS, 2010) were characteristics cited in the bibliographies found, including in works that indicated ways of managing Ys in companies (AMBLE, 2003; TULGAN, 2009).

Parallel to the American reality, some companies, such as Grupo DMRH (2009), IBOPE (n.d.), and HAYS (2015), also carried out studies portraying the profile of young Brazilians, but they did not consider the heterogeneity of socioeconomic and demographic profiles in Brazil or São Paulo. Authors such Bitencourt, Piccininni, and Oliveira (2012) defend the idea that it is not possible to generalize studies for the whole population. It should be taken into account that approximately 70% of Brazilians belong to socioeconomic classes C, D, and E, and not all of them have access to higher education and technologies, as described in the studies.

According to the field study, significant differences related to values were not found between socioeconomic classes. At first, large differences between the groups were expected, but the only value that presented little difference, even with a high level of significance (10%), was altruism. The comparison of this value between the groups showed that the less-favored socioeconomic classes are the ones that are most concerned about society.

Relevant results concerning Generation Y as a whole were found. Ys do not seek work only as a source of income, they also want growth, learning, and meaning. In addition, it was possible to establish, from the mean calculation, that G1 values financial return, according to the result for the item "a job that allows you to earn a lot of money." At the same time, it is hypothesized that there is a relationship with the fact that G2 tends to altruism, presenting a counterpoint.

Thus, the main results of this study are: a) there were no significant differences in work-related values between individuals of Generation Y from socioeconomic classes A and B and C, D, and E, which refutes the first hypothesis that individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B have different work-related values than those from classes C, D, and E; b) the hypothesis that the individuals from socioeconomic classes A and B have, predominantly, values related to social rewards when compared to the classes C, D, and E was not confirmed; c) the main differences in the values between socioeconomic classes A and B, and C, D, and E were evaluated, as proposed in the initial goals. There are no conclusive results in this sense, because the differences were not very significant from a statistical point of view, but pointed out issues that can be deepened, for example, by qualitative studies: d) this study expands the knowledge about Generation Y, reinforcing that the more-prominent values refer to those that provide rewards and advances in the problem of comparing social stratum in Brazil, but it is not enough to reach conclusive results.

In addition, it is necessary to consider that this study was limited to a specific region: The State of São Paulo. In order to develop a study that portrays Brazil, samples from all regions of the country should be collected and then compared in order to obtain a final conclusion that covers all of Brazilian. The way the items were formulated is another point to be considered as the questionnaire was based on the study by Twenge et al. (2010) to, later, compare results and questions were not added, but only adapted. Thus, the measurement of social values and altruism was limited to two questions for each variable, which made Cronbach's alpha far from ideal.



Therefore, it is suggested that, once the questionnaire is validated, it should be revised and expanded, including more questions about social values and altruism.

The conclusion of this study is that, different from what was expected, social stratum does not generate significant differences regarding work-related values. It is suggested that qualitative studies be carried out to deepen knowledge on work-related values. It would also be interesting to review and expand the scale developed by Twenge et al. (2010).

## References

ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE EMPRESAS DE PESQUISA (ABEP). 2015. Available from: <http://www.abep.org/criterio-brasil>. Last accessed: Sep/2017.

ALMEIDA, F. J. R.; SOBRAL, F. J. B. de A.. O Sistema de Valores Humanos de Administradores Brasileiros: Adaptação da escala PVQ para o estudo de Valores no Brasil. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie* (online), v.10, n. 3, 2009.

AMBLE, B. Aggressive managers get ahead faster. *Management issues*, 2003.

CENNAME, L.; GARDNER, D. Generational differences in work values, outcomes, and person-organization values. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, v. 23, n. 8, p. 891 – 906, 2008.

FERREIRA, A.; DEMUTTI, C. M.; GIMENEZ, P. E. O. A Teoria das Necessidades de Maslow: A Influência do Nível Educacional Sobre a sua Percepção no Ambiente de Trabalho. XIII SemeAd, p. 1 – 17, 2010.

HAIR, J. F.; ANDERSON, R. E.; TATHAM, R. L.; BLACK, W. C.; BABIN, B. J. *Análise Multivariada de Dados*. 6ª ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman. 2009.

HAY GROUP. Geração Y. 2009. Available from: <http://www.haygroup.com/br>. Last accessed: May/2017.

HAYS. Geração Y e o Mundo do Trabalho. (2015). Available from: [http://www.hays.com.br/cs/groups/hays\\_common/@br/@content/documents/digitalasset/hays\\_1352257.pdf](http://www.hays.com.br/cs/groups/hays_common/@br/@content/documents/digitalasset/hays_1352257.pdf). Last accessed: Sep/2017.

GRIFFIN, M. D. Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, v. 19, n. 3, p. 282 – 285, 2002.

HOWE, N.; STRAUSS, W. *Millennials Rising: the next great generations*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.

HOWE, N. *Millennials go to college: strategies for a new generation on campus: recruiting and admissions, campus life, and the classroom*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 2003.

HOWE, N. The next 20 years: how customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*, v. 85, n. 7-8, p. 41-52, 2007.

IBGE. CENSO 2010. (2012). Available from: <http://www.ibge.gov.br>. Last accessed: May/2017.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE OPINIÃO PÚBLICA E ESTATÍSTICA (IBOPE). Gerações Y e Z: Juventude Digital (s.d.) Available from: [http://www4.ibope.com.br/download/geracoes%20y\\_e\\_z\\_divulgacao.pdf](http://www4.ibope.com.br/download/geracoes%20y_e_z_divulgacao.pdf) Last accessed: Set/2017.

KOWSKE, B. J., RASCH, R.; WILEY, J. Millennials' (lack of) attitude problem: An empirical examination of generational effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, v. 25, n. 2, p. 265 – 279, 2010.

MARTIN, J.; SCHMIDT, C. How to keep your top talent. *Harvard Business Review*, 2010. Available from: <https://hbr.org/2010/05/how-to-keep-your-top-talent>. Last accessed: Set./2017.

LEMOS, Ana Helóisa da Costa. Juventude, gerações e trabalho: ampliando o debate. *Organização & Sociedade*, v.19, n. 63, 2012.

LOMBARDÍA, P.G.; STEIN, G.; PIN, J.R. Políticas para dirigir a los nuevos profesionales: motivaciones y valores de la generación Y. 2008. Available from: <http://www.iesep.com/Descargas/spdf/Gratis/R130.pdf>. Last accessed: Jul/2017.

KLIKSBERG, B. O contexto da juventude na América Latina e no Caribe: as grandes interrogações. *Revista de Administração Pública*, v. 40, n. 5, p. 909 – 942, 2006.

KULLOCK, E. Qual o perfil de carreira da Geração Y? *Revista Exame*, 2014. Available from: <http://exame.abril.com.br/carreira/noticias/qual-o-perfil-de-carreira-da-geracao>. Last accessed: Sep/2017.

KULTALAHTI, S.; VIITALA, R. L. Sufficient challenges and a weekend ahead – Generation Y describing motivation at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, v. 27, n. 4, p. 569 – 582, 2014.

MACKY, K.; GARDNER, D.; FORSYTH, S. Generational differences at work: introduction and overview. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, v. 23, n. 8, p. 857 – 861, 2008.

MAROCO, J.; GARCIA-MARQUES, T. Qual a fiabilidade do alfa de Cronbach? Questões antigas e soluções modernas? *Laboratório de Psicologia*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 65 – 90, 2006.

MASTROLIA, S. A.; WILLITS, S. D. Millennials: What Do We Really Know About Them? *Advances in Accounting Education*, v. 14, p. 45 – 72, 2013.

MEGLINO, B. M.; RAVLIN, E. C. Individual values in organizations: concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, v. 24, n.3, p. 351 – 389, 1998.

MELO, L. Empresas ainda não compreendem a geração Y, diz estudo? *Revista Exame*, 2014. Available from: <http://exame.abril.com.br/negocios/noticias/empresas-ainda-nao-compreendem-a-geracao-y-diz-estudo>. Last accessed: Sep/2017.

NG, E.S. W.; SCHWEITZER, L.; LYONS, S. T. New generation, great expectations: A field study of the millennial generation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, v. 25, n. 2, p. 281 – 292, 2010.

OLIVEIRA, S.R.; PICCININI, V.C.; BITTENCOURT, B.M. Juventudes, gerações e trabalho: é possível falar em geração Y no Brasil? *Organização & Sociedade*, v.19, n. 62, 2012.

OLIVEIRA, S. Geração Y: o nascimento de uma nova versão de líderes. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Integrate, 2012.

PARRY, E.; URWIN, P. Tapping into talent. The age factor and generational issues. London: CRPD, 2009.

ROBBINS, S. P. ; JUDGE, T. A.; SOBRAL, F. Comportamento Organizacional: teoria e prática no contexto brasileiro. 14. ed. São Paulo: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2010.

ROKEACH, M. The nature of human value theory. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

SCHWARTZ, S. H. Universals in the content and structure of values: theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In: ZANNA, M. (Org.). *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press, p. 1-65, 1992.

TOMIZAKI, K. *Transmitir e herdar: os estudos dos fenômenos educativos em uma perspectiva intergeracional*. Rio de Janeiro: Educação & Sociedade, 2010.

TWENGE, J. M. *Generation me: why today's young americans are more confident, assertive, entitled – and more miserable than ever before*. New York: Atria, 2006.

TWENGE, J. M.; CAMPBELL, S. M.; HOFFMAN, B. J.; LANCE, C. E. Generational Differences in Work Values: Leisure and Extrinsic Values: Increasing, Social and Intrinsic Values Decreasing. *Journal of Management*, v. 36, n. 5, p. 1117 – 1142, 2010.

TULGAN, B. *Not everyone gets a trophy: how to manage generation Y*. São Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.

WONG, M, GARDINER, E., LANG, W; COULON, L. Generational differences in personality and motivation. Do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, v. 23, n. 8, p. 878 – 890, 2008.

Received: 09/08/2017

Approved: 10/06/2017