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Chapter 1
Introduction

The first chapter describes the background of the dissertation. The research problems and the purpose of the dissertation are discussed, as well as the limitations and the research questions. Finally, the outline of the dissertation is presented.

1.1 Background

The idea of the dissertation came up after a discussion during a seminar in International leadership. The topic was Generation Y (1977-2000), often referred to as Gen Yers, and their traits and attitudes towards work. The topic was how to keep Generation Y employees and get them to take on more responsibility. The seminar provided many suggestions on how to motivate Gen Yers and make them step up to the job and take on more leading roles. Since we share a common interest in the field of leadership and management, we thought that this could be an interesting topic for our dissertation. Different countries have different cultures, and since our Business program has both Chinese and Swedish students, we thought it would be even more interesting to do a cross-cultural study between China and Sweden.

Gen Yers already account for 21% of the workforce (Spiro, 2006), and the demand for Generation Y manpower is steadily increasing both in national and Multinational Business. Today’s workforce consists of different nationalities and spans over several generations, which can cause some problems for management in Multinational Business. There are many ways of categorising people belonging to different age-groups. When describing issues concerning generational shifts and problems related to this, researchers often refer to four generations with an active working life,
“Traditionalists (pre-1946), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1964-1977) and Generation Y (1977-2000)”, all distinguished by their own traits and attitudes. Generation Y are the largest since the Baby Boomers and are also known as the Next Generation, the Echo Boomers or the Millennials (Spiro, 2006).

Generation Y are technologically advanced, ethnically diverse (they often have more than one ethnical background) and highly educated. The qualities and attitudes of Generation Y are different from the qualities and attitudes of their predecessors (Spiro, 2006). To understand not only the attitudes and qualities of Generation Y, but also what motivates them, is essential if you want to successfully recruit and retain them.

1.2 Problem

Generation Y expect instant gratification and do not hesitate to leave their current position if they get a better offer (Armour, 2005). This is a big problem for employers since it is both time-consuming and costly to find and train new people. Therefore, it is crucial that employers understand the attitudes of Generation Y in order to properly motivate them.

The mix of generations and nationalities in international organisations has created many challenges and conflicts. How to motivate members of Generation Y and bridge the generational gap has been the topic of several articles. Researchers have previously offered some solutions to the problem by adjusting or adapting new strategies on how to recruit and retain employees belonging to Generation Y, but during our research we have not found any information or research about how national culture can influence Generation Y, and thereby affect the motivation process. The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate what influence national culture might have on Generation Y and how this influence might affect the motivation process.
There are a lot of different motivation theories but most of them are based on research on previous generations and may therefore not be applicable to Generation Y without modification. Generation Y have some general (global) characteristics, but they still have different cultural backgrounds that affect them. The Global Leadership Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research, for example, has shown that the National Culture Values for China and Sweden differ in several aspects. Therefore, we believe that even if Generation Y share some general characteristics, their National Culture Values must be taken into account before any modification of the motivation theories can be made.

1.3 Purpose

The main purpose of this dissertation is to investigate if National Culture Values have any influence on the motivation process, and thus must be taken into account in order to properly motivate Generation Y employees in China and Sweden.

In order to understand how to properly motivate members of Generation Y in China and Sweden, we need to understand both their similarities and their differences. We need to understand in which aspects and situations we can motivate both Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers according to their general characteristics, and when we need to motivate them according to their respective National Culture Values.

We also have to look at some of the classical motivation theories. Most of these theories have been created for earlier generations that have other priorities and attitudes than Generation Y. Because of this, we feel that the classical motivation theories might not be appropriate and/or effective when it comes to motivating Generation Y, a generation with their own distinct characteristics.
1.4 Limitations

After reviewing some classical motivation theories, we have decided to limit our research to three Content Motivation Theories: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory, Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory and McClelland’s Acquired Needs theory. These three motivation theories are all based on the theory that people have different levels of needs, and that it is essential to understand people’s needs to properly motivate them.

Generation Y have different attributes and traits than previous generations and this also means that they have different needs. The three Content Motivation Theories we have chosen greatly compliments each other; they show the different levels of needs in different ways, which makes them easy to compare. This enables us to both compare the needs of Generation Y to the needs of previous generations, and also allows us to compare how National Culture Values might affect the needs of Generation Y.

Different articles attribute Gen Yers with different characteristics; therefore, to avoid contradictions in our dissertation, we have decided to limit our survey to the most common characteristics of Generation Y. We have also decided to let the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions represent the framework of the National Culture Values, since we feel that the GLOBE research is both comprehensive and up-to-date. Further, we have chosen to limit our survey to two countries, China and Sweden. We have chosen these particular countries for several reasons, partly because of the increased interest in China as a business partner, and partly due to our University’s exchange program with China. The exchange program gives us the opportunity to do our survey on Chinese students in Sweden, and gives us more control over our survey.
1.5 Research Questions

The dissertation will be based on the following questions;

- What are Gen Yers general attitudes towards work?
- Why do Gen Yers need to be motivated differently than other Generations?
- How do National Culture Values affect Generation Y?
- Which factors will influence the Motivation process the most? Generation Y’s general characteristics or the National Culture Values?

1.6 Outline

The outline of this dissertation is as following;

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Methodology

Chapter 3: The Theoretical Framework

Chapter 4: Empirical Method

Chapter 5: Analysis of the survey

Chapter 6: Conclusion
Chapter 2
Methodology

Our choice of methodology is presented. A discussion about data collection follows, including a discussion about the theoretical review and the primary data. Finally the scientific approach is described.

2.1 Research Method

As described in chapter 1, the purpose of this dissertation is to investigate if National Culture Values have any influence on the motivation process regarding Gen Yers. These objectives will be addressed through descriptive and explanatory studies, based on quantitative data.

In order to investigate potential effects of National Culture Values on the motivation process we must first investigate how motivation theories can be applied to Generation Y. To do this we must first understand the characteristics of Generation Y.

Our theoretical framework consists of three different parts. The first part is about the characteristics of Generation Y. The second part is about the Content Motivation Theories and how they can be applied to Generation Y. The last part is about the National Culture Values and how they can influence members of Generation Y.

The first part of our theoretical framework analyses the characteristics and traits of Generation Y. Some characteristics are contradictory in different articles, which is why we have chosen the characteristics of Generation Y that researchers seem to agree on.
The second part of our theoretical framework describes the three Content Motivation Theories and the need to adapt them to fit the characteristics of Generation Y. This part also includes suggestions on how to modify the theories to suit the needs of Generation Y.

The third part of our theoretical framework describes the GLOBE research and how they have measured different countries’ National Culture Values in nine cultural dimensions. In this part we compare the National Culture Values of China and Sweden in each of the nine dimensions. We then create a model, where we place Generation Y in the different dimensions, based on their traits and characteristics and compare the results with the National Culture Values of China and Sweden.

2.2 Research Approach

Our data consists of theoretical reviews and primary data. We will start with a deductive approach, based on our theoretical reviews. We will place Generation Y in the different cultural dimensions and derive our hypotheses from the result. We will then continue to test our hypotheses in a survey. This survey will be conducted with the help of a questionnaire and will provide us with our primary data. Our respondents are Chinese and Swedish students belonging to Generation Y.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

In our theoretical framework we first describe the common characteristics of Generation Y, which are mostly based on articles. We then continue to describe the three Content Motivation Theories; Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory and McClelland’s Theory of Acquired Needs, based both on textbook literature and articles. After that we describe the National Culture Values of our chosen countries China and Sweden, based on the GLOBE research.

2.4 Primary Data

To test our hypotheses we are doing a survey in the form of a questionnaire. Our target population are Swedish and Chinese Gen Yers. Since we do not have the
opportunity to do a large survey, our target population will be represented by two sample groups, one with Chinese students and one with Swedish students. We will distribute our questionnaire in person, to avoid misunderstanding. We will have a Swedish version of the questionnaire for the Swedish students and a Chinese version for the Chinese students. The result of this survey will be our primary data.

2.5 Scientific Approach

Our research will be conducted with an interpretivistic approach since we want “to enter the social world of our research subjects and understand their world from their point of view” (Saunders et al, 2007, p 106).
Chapter 3
The Theoretical Framework

The third chapter describes the theoretical framework of the dissertation. The attitudes and traits of Generation Y are described. The three Content Motivation Theories are discussed and also the National Culture Values of our chosen countries, China and Sweden.

Our research purpose is to investigate if National Culture Values have any effect on Generation Y and must be taken into account if you want to properly motivate members of this generation. Generation Y are often referred to as a global group with general characteristics. In this chapter, we will describe the general characteristics of Generation Y and compare them with National Culture Values in order to see how the National Culture Values might affect members of Generation Y. We will also give a description of the Content Motivation Theories and how they can be applied to members of Generation Y.

3.1 The Attitudes and Traits of Generation Y

3.1.1 Introduction

Researchers usually categorise today’s global workforce into four generations, Traditionalists (pre-1946), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1964-1977) and Generation Y (1977-2000). Generation Y are usually described as a new concept in the workforce, they are predicted to be the most numerous generation since the Baby Boomers and are already in high demand on the global market (Spiro, 2006).

To manage and motivate Generation Y in order to support high performance within an organisation, it is important to understand their characteristics and traits.
3.1.2 The General Characteristics of Generation Y

Most social scientists and researchers try to define Generation Y based on their traits and attitudes. The common definition of Generation Y in this dissertation is people born between 1977 and 2000 (NAS, 2006). They are primarily children of the Baby Boomers and Generation X. Generation Y are influenced by their parents but they have their own characteristics.

Generation Y are highly educated and technologically savvy. They are currently entering the workforce in droves and will shape and transform today’s organisation (Valueoptions, 2007). Generation Y have grown up with a changing generational and cultural landscape. Growing up in this era of technology has provided Gen Yers with concepts like “Live for today” and “Just Do it” (Valueoptions, 2007).

Generation Y often have close relationships with their parents (usually Baby Boomers and Generation X). The parents have provided economical, educational, physical and emotional support. They have also nurtured and protected them which have given members of Generation Y high expectations and a strong need for recognition and reward from others, with minimal effort on their own part. Generation Y often search for supervisors to nurture them, and to give them advice and protection. According to Valueoptions, Generation Y often feel that work is unreal and temporary, which gives them a lesser sense of commitment and loyalty to their employer. Gen Yers like to work in teams, preferably with one or more mentors at hand. The ideal work environment for Gen Yers can be compared to “A village raising a child” (Valueoptions, 2007). Racial, cultural and ethnic diversity are seen as natural to members of Generation Y, since they often have more than one cultural background themselves (Valueoptions, 2007).

We have mentioned some of the general characteristics of Generation Y, and will now continue with some of their values and traits.
Values of Generation Y
For Generation Y, self-expression is more important than self-control. They know how to market and brand themselves and see self-expression as a tool to distinguish themselves from each other. Generation Y plan their economy but save for lifestyle enjoyment and not for wealth. Their respect is not based on seniority or authority; it must be earned (Valueoptions, 2007).

Traits of Generation Y
Generation Y look at the world with a global perspective, which means that they are more open and accept others more easily than other generations. But at the same time they are closed and rely a lot on their family in order to avoid any problems in life (Clausing, 2003). These contradictory traits of Generation Y are possible due to their habit of rapid adaptation and flexibility, but also due to their requirement of change and challenges (Valueoptions, 2007).

Marital/family issues of Generation Y
According to Valueoptions, communication between generations can be difficult, as the parents of Generation Y have experienced. Generation Y want their freedom, but they still expect to live with their parents (for free) and expects their parents to back them up both financially and emotionally.

One big difference between Generation Y and previous generations is that the fathers of Generation Y are much more involved than the fathers of previous generations. The family is very important and 65% of families with children dine together seven days a week (NAS, 2006).
According to NAS, Recruitment Communications, Generation Y are from an early age told by their parents that they can have it all. This sense of entitlement has made them driven and ambitious in everything they do.

Generation Y do not view marriage as an emotional relationship, but rather as an economical one. They do not feel the need to get married in order to prove their love for each other, but are quite content with just living together. Marriage is often considered an economic matter, and post-divorce issues like child support and financial independence are thoroughly discussed (Valueoptions, 2007).

The more we know about Generation Y’s characteristics, values and traits, the easier it is to understand their attitude towards work and how it differs from other generations.

### 3.1.3 Generation Y’s attitudes towards work

As we mentioned before, today’s typical workplace usually has employees from four different generations; Traditionalists (pre-1946), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1964-1977) and Generation Y (1977-2000). Every generation have
their opinions, work-ethics and attitudes about their work environment (Spiro, 2006). The different generations have received different educations in different societies, and therefore have different knowledge and experiences.

*Traditionalists* played the key role in their companies when economic development was strong. They have a lot of experience and knowledge of the company. They value loyalty and discipline. They believe in logic and in law and order, not magic.

*Baby Boomers* joined the work force in the mid-1960s and in the end of the 1970s, a period when most European countries enjoyed significant progress. This group is prepared to work hard for their success and strive for titles, high salaries and high corporate responsibility (Spiro, 2006). The Baby Boomers have the largest proportion of workaholics in history; they used to be the cool generation and most of them still think they are (Simón, 2007). The Baby Boomers are confident in their tasks but have a tendency to avoid conflicts (Valueoptions, 2007).

*Generation X* have the best academic training and international experience of all the generations. They are not as individualistic as the Traditionalists and the Baby Boomers. They spend more time on their families than on themselves. The members of Generation X (especially the younger) are technologically advanced, and amongst them you find a lot of work perfectionists. They are very family oriented and are quite quick in setting up households and starting families. Members of Generation X are comfortable with authority but they are not impressed by titles (Valueoptions, 2007).

*Generation Y* have turned a lot of 21st century corporations into battlegrounds, a generational duel between Traditionalists and Baby Boomers on one side, and Generation Y on the other (Simón, 2007). Generation Y’s attitude towards work differs from the older generations in several ways. Here are five of the most important differences.
1. High expectations on their employers

Generation Y want fair and direct managers who are highly engaged in their professional development. They are not afraid to work, but want recognition for it. Fairness is a very important concept for Generation Y. Corporations are only going to be successful if they can manage to harness the energy that Generation Y have, and steer it to accomplish their own goals. They are a demanding generation that expects access to their managers at all times (Valueoptions, 2007).

2. Need for Ongoing Learning

Like most students that graduate from university, Generation Y are eager to join the workforce. The difference is that Generation Y are picky; they do not want any job. They want challenges and a position where they can repeatedly increase their knowledge. They want to have ownership and control of their own work. They seek out creative challenges and view colleagues as vast resources from whom to gain knowledge.

3. Need to Prove Themselves

Generation Y have high expectations on themselves, and they aim to work faster and better than other workers. They believe that what they know is more important than their age. Generation Y have learned from their parents, friends, teachers, and social networks that respect must be earned; “They've grown up questioning their parents, and now they're questioning their employers. They don't know how to shut up, which is great, but that's aggravating to the 50-year-old manager who says, 'Do it and do it now'” (Tulgan, 2007).

4. Desire for immediate responsibility

Generation Y expect instant gratification. They want the opportunity to excel in their work and to make an important impact on every day. This is a result of their self-
confidence and speediness. Generation Y want to start with a top job and expects to climb the corporate ladder to a high position within the first six months (NAS, 2006)

5. **Balance and flexibility in their day-to-day life**

Generation Y need to have balance between their work and their personal lives. They want small goals with tight deadlines that can build up ownership of tasks. They also want free time to themselves in order to make friends, shop and just hang out. This balance will make them work more effectively. Generation Y require a higher amount of feedback than companies usually give, and they also desire greater flexibility and freedom to run with projects once they are assigned to them (Careerbuilder, 2007).

Once you have recruited a member of Generation Y to your organisation, you have to understand that their work style is a bit different from the other generations. Generation Y desire flexibility, especially when it comes to their clothes and their appearance. They are a very expressive generation, and to them, appearance is a statement that tells their environment who they are. They want to work in teams in relaxed environments. They take independent responsibility for their success, and they believe that there is no such thing as pay for performance (Clausing, 2003). It is important for Generation Y to understand how everything fits together in order for them to express themselves through their work. Generation Y can be very passionate about work, and loves challenges and to learn new things. But it is important to remember that they “work to live”, they do not “live to work”. It is very important to Generation Y to have balance between their work and their personal lives.

These differences between the generations show that Generation Y have other priorities and needs than their predecessors, and needs to be motivated differently than other generations.
3.2 Content Motivation Theories

3.2.1 Introduction to Content Motivation Theories

To be able to successfully motivate Generation Y it is important to understand what drives them. If you understand the attitudes and traits of Generation Y, and their wants and needs, it is easier to predict their behaviour and understand how to properly motivate them.

The Content Motivation Theories are based on the concept that people have wants and needs that they consistently strive to meet. Some needs and wants take precedence over others and some are hierarchical, meaning that they usually need to be fulfilled in a certain order. These wants and needs can be analysed to explain and predict people’s behaviour (Lussier & Achua, 2007).

There are three different Content Motivation Theories:

- Hierarchy of Needs theory
- Two-Factor theory
- Acquired Needs theory

3.2.2 Hierarchy of Needs theory

The hierarchy of needs theory was developed by Abraham Maslow (1908-1970) in the 1940s, and is also known as Maslow’s Pyramid of needs (Lussier & Achua, 2007).

Maslow’s theory divides our needs into five different hierarchical layers, often depicted as a pyramid.
Maslow’s Pyramid of Needs.

1. **Physiological Needs**: These needs form the base of the pyramid, the first level. These are the primal needs that we must need to function, such as food, sleep and sex.

2. **Safety Needs**: When our physiological needs have been met we start feeling other needs, like stability, security (a job to go to) and protection (a roof over our head).

3. **Belonging Needs**: when our physiological and safety needs are covered, we start to feel the need to belong, to be loved. These needs are sometimes referred to as the social needs, and include the need for friendships and acceptance.

4. **Esteem Needs**: After meeting the need to belong, we start to focus on our ego. We start feeling the need for status, recognition and self-respect.

5. **Self-Actualisation Needs**: when the needs of the four first levels have been met we look for personal growth, in this stage of the pyramid we try to reach our full potential and “be all that we can be”.
Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs states that needs must be fulfilled in a certain hierarchical order. Members of Generation Y have a strong need to belong but are in some respects far more concerned with issues of Esteem and Self-Actualisation, the higher needs of Maslow’s pyramid, which is not compliant with Maslow’s rigid order of needs.

If we were to arrange Generation Y’s needs hierarchically, we would still have the Physiological and Safety Needs at the bottom, as basic needs. According to our theoretical review about the attitudes and traits of Generation Y, the difference would be found in the middle of the pyramid. There we would find the Esteem, Belonging and Self-Actualisation Needs grouped together. These middle needs are all equally important to Generation Y. The reason for this is the flexibility of Generation Y that we have described earlier in this chapter. They have different needs for different situations. In Figure 3.3 we show the needs of Generation Y in the pyramid model.

*Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs.*

![Figure 3.3](Modified from Figure 3.2, p 17)
3.2.3 Two-Factor Theory

The Two-Factor theory was published by Frederick Herzberg in the 1960s (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Herzberg separates the lower-level needs like job security and relationships (can be compared to the three lower levels of Maslow’s pyramid), from the higher-level needs like recognition and advancement (the top of the pyramid). Herzberg claims that different motivators must be used to meet the different needs.

*Maintenance factors* (extrinsic factors) are used to meet the lower-level needs and *motivators* (intrinsic factors) are used to meet the higher-level needs. Herzberg challenges the traditional one-dimensional view of satisfaction and dissatisfaction and means that they are not always opposites. There is a difference between not being satisfied and being dissatisfied. Herzberg built a two-dimensional model to describe his theory:

*Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Extrinsic motivators</em></td>
<td>Physiological, Safety, and Social needs – Existence and Relatedness needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(pay, benefits, job security, working conditions, company policies, human relations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dissatisfied</td>
<td>(with the Maintenance Factors)</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivator Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intrinsic motivators</em></td>
<td>Esteem and Self-Actualisation needs – Growth needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Work itself, recognition, achievement, increased responsibility, growth, advancement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied (motivated)</td>
<td>(with the Job Motivator Factors)</td>
<td>Not satisfied (not motivated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.4*  
*Source:* Lussier & Achua, 2007, p 80
According to Herzberg, Maintenance factors cannot be used to motivate employees, they are lower (basic) needs that must be met to prevent dissatisfaction. To create motivation and job satisfaction, you must use Motivator factors to meet the higher needs of your employees.

As you can see from the model, Herzberg draws a clear line between Maintenance and Motivator factors, but according to our research, Generation Y have other priorities than their predecessors, and factors like job security means little to the generation known to leave jobs where they do not feel they get enough recognition. Factors like *Esteem and Self-Actualisation* and *Growth Needs* are considered Motivators by Herzberg, but according to the characteristics and traits of Generation Y, described earlier in this chapter, these are factors taken for granted by Generation Y and the absence of them could cause great dissatisfaction. Therefore, they should be considered Maintenance Factors for members of Generation Y.

This leads to an interesting question, if all Herzberg’s Motivator factors are Maintenance Factors for Generation Y. How do you motivate them? If we look at the characteristics of Generation Y, our theoretical review has shown that factors like *recognition, flexibility, ownership of tasks, control over their work environment* and *constant availability to their superiors* are of great importance, and will make the hard working Generation Y go the extra mile. All these factors are part of the *working conditions, company policies and human relations*, which Herzberg ranks as Maintenance factors. In Figure 3.5 we have rearranged Herzberg’s Two-Factor model to fit Generation Y.
3.2.4 Acquired Needs Theory

The acquired needs theory was originally developed by David McClelland in the 1940’s. McClelland’s theory does not include the basic needs, the first two levels of Maslow’s pyramid (Physiological and Safety needs). It only covers the higher-level needs, Belongingness and Self-Actualisation. McClelland proposes that everyone has a need for achievement, power and affiliation (Lussier & Achua, 2007), though it might be to varying degrees. To successfully motivate an employee it is essential to understand which need that dominates him or her. McClelland proposes that there is a strong connection between traits, behaviour and motivation.

- *Employees with a high need for Achievement* are very task oriented and can be motivated by challenging non-routine tasks and increased responsibility.
• *Employees with a high need for Power* likes to be in control of their situation. These people can be motivated by being included in the decision making and by being trusted to plan and perform their own jobs. People with a high need for Power usually work better alone than in teams.

• *Employees with a high need for Affiliation* are very relationship oriented. They can be motivated by praise and recognition and usually prefer to be part of a team. They make great mentors.

McClelland’s theory of needs claims that everyone has a need for Achievement, Power and Affiliation but to different degrees, and how one of these needs always are stronger than the others. If we look at the characteristics of Generation Y we see that according to McClelland’s model, they fit in all three categories and can be said to have an equally high need for *Achievement, Power* and *Affiliation*. They need to achieve, preferably in a team environment, and they need recognition and praise for their work. The Generation Y workforce is very flexible, and employers may find that to properly motivate members of Generation Y, they need to be flexible too. In Figure 3.6 we have made a schematic of McClelland’s model as applied to Generation Y.

*Generation Y’s Acquired Needs Theory.*

![Figure 3.6](image-url)
3.2.5 Summary Content Motivation Theories

The three Content Motivation Theories describe how people strive to fulfil their needs and wants. Since they are based on earlier generations with different needs and priorities than Generation Y, they cannot be applied to members of Generation Y without modifications.

The Hierarchy of Needs theory shows us that the level of needs can be individual and may vary from one group to another. Generation Y are brought up in a different society and with other expectations than their predecessors, this also influences their needs. To properly motivate members of Generation Y with Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, it is recommendable to alter it according to Figure 3.3, p 18.

Generation Y is usually referred to as a generation that requires instant gratification. Some of Herzberg’s Motivator factors, like Growth and Esteem Needs, should be considered Maintenance factors for Generation Y, while some of Herzberg’s Maintenance factors, like working conditions, company policies and human relations could be used as Motivator factors (see Figure 3.5, p 21).

Generation Y have an equally strong need for Power, Achievement and Affiliation (see Figure 3.6, p 22) which calls for some modifications of McClelland’s Acquired Needs Theory in order to apply it on members of Generation Y, which are known to be task oriented, like to work in teams and like to be in control of their own situation.

Flexibility is a key word when it comes to describing Generation Y, and should also be a key word in how to motivate members of this generation. As we have shown before, the Content Motivation Theories can be applied to members of Generation Y, but they need to be modified. When we look at the Content Motivation models and the modifications that need to be done in order to successfully use them, we see that employers already have the means to motivate Generation Y; they just do not use them properly. Employers need to become more flexible and learn to think outside the box.
The three Content Motivation Theories have some common ground. If we combine the models, as shown in Figure 3.7, we see that *Self-Actualisation* can be used as a *Motivator* and is associated with *Achievement and Power*.

### A comparison of Content Motivation Theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIERARCHY OF NEEDS THEORY (MASLOW)</th>
<th>TWO-FACTOR THEORY (HERZBERG)</th>
<th>ACQUIRED NEEDS THEORY (MCCLELLAND)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualisation</td>
<td>Motivators</td>
<td>Achievement and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Motivators</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Achievement and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Maintenance factors will not motivate employees.</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs must be met in a hierarchical order.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.7*  
*Source: Lussier & Achua, 2007, p. 82*

If we apply our suggested modifications to Figure 3.7, it would look like this:

### A comparison of the modified Content Motivation Theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIERARCHY OF NEEDS THEORY (GENERATION Y)</th>
<th>TWO-FACTOR THEORY (GENERATION Y)</th>
<th>ACQUIRED NEEDS THEORY (GENERATION Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualisation</td>
<td>Maintenance (could be used as Motivators)</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Some Maintenance Factors can be used as Motivators.</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs must be met with flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility must be used to meet situational needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.8*  
*Modified from Figure 3.7*

We have shown that the Content Motivation Theories, when applied to Generation Y, have some short-comings. We have also recommended modifications to these theories before trying to use them to motivate employees belonging to Generation Y. Another short-coming is that none of the models take National Culture Values into account.
consideration, which we believe must be done to understand and be able to properly motivate members of Generation Y with different cultural backgrounds.

3.3 National Culture Values

3.3.1 Introduction

The objective of this dissertation is to investigate what influence National Culture Values might have on the motivation process regarding Generation Y. Early on in this chapter the characteristics of Generation Y are described. In this part we will describe the National Culture Values of our chosen countries, China and Sweden, and will compare them in order to find the main differences. The main differences will be compared to the characteristics of Generation Y. We will then derive our hypotheses from the result of the comparison. We will later test these hypotheses on Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers. In order to understand the cultural differences, it is important to have an overview of the GLOBE National Culture Values.

The GLOBE research project has observed cultures for many years and in many countries. The research has used methods developed during the last 50 years to collect data and information in order to construct the National Culture Values theory. The research has measured many levels of industry organisations, which makes this theory credible (House et al, 2004), and relevant to this dissertation.

3.3.2 The GLOBE National Culture Values

The GLOBE National Culture Values are the GLOBE research result of how business values and practices vary across nations and cultures. For 11 years, the study has involved 17 investigators and 17,300 respondents from 62 cultures, nations and societies, including China and Sweden. The study shows how they have provided and classified each nation according to Cultural Dimensions (House et al, 2004).
The GLOBE research has examined culture in two ways, as practices and as values. In this dissertation we will focus on the practices, “the way things are done in the cultures” which is shown in Table 3.1, these scores are referred to as the “as is” scores. The GLOBE research also contains values, “the way things should be done”, but since these values are beliefs and not facts they are not relevant for this dissertation.

The result of the GLOBE study on China and Sweden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Dimensions</th>
<th>High-Score Clusters</th>
<th>Mid-Score Clusters</th>
<th>Low-Score Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden / China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Collectivism</td>
<td>Sweden / China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Group Collectivism</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Egalitarianism</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House et al, 2004

Table 3.1 shows how the GLOBE research has classified nine cultural dimensions, the nations are then divided into High-, Mid- or Low-Score clusters in each of the nine dimensions, according to the definitions that have been given in Table 3.2
Table 3.2  
**GLOBE Cultural Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Orientation</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group of members for performance improvement and excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertiveness</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational and aggressive in their relationships with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Orientation</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which individuals engage in future-orientated behaviours such as delaying gratification, planning and investing in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humane Orientation</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Collectivism</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which organisational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Group Collectivism</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organisations or families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Egalitarianism</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a collective minimises gender inequality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Distance</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty Avoidance</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which a collective relies on social norms, rituals, and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: House et al, 1994*

Globally, Generation Y have some common characteristics, but they are still affected by the environment and the society in which they grew up. Generation Y are like many other groups a part of society and can, therefore, be influenced by other groups
and cultures in society. We believe that the survey of Generation Y in China and Sweden will show the importance of acknowledging cultural differences.

3.3.3 Cultural Dimensions

This dissertation is based on Robert J. House’s definition of cultural dimensions in order to make comparisons with the GLOBE research.

The Cultural Dimensions are divided into nine elements and the descriptions of these elements are as follows.

3.3.3.1 Performance Orientation

In an article of Robert J. House, Performance Orientation is defined as the reflection of extent to which a community supports and rewards innovation, high standards, excellence, and performance improvement. House also mentions some of the characteristics of societies that have high Performance Orientation, for example; the value of training and development, the value of competitiveness and materialism and how they view formal feedback as necessary for performance improvement. Societies with high Performance Orientation also expect direct and explicit communication with each other (Grovewell, 2007).

According to Table 3.1 (p 26), “how things are done”, China has been placed in the High-Score cluster. The result is unexpected because China has a clear culture of family and social relationships. To do business with Chinese people it is essential to understand “Quanxi rules” in order to build up business relationship and networks. In his book Marketing Across Cultures in Asia, Richard R. Gesteland explains that the Chinese often use indirect expressions to avoid causing offence and loss of face; to show respect for seniority and to help others save face, are major issues when creating business relationships in China. All the factors just mentioned indicate that we should find China in the Low-Score cluster. So why do we find China in the High-Score cluster? One reason can be that the Chinese are competitive and like to win
(Bucknall, 2002), another more likely reason could be that the Chinese are so used to indirect communication and Quanxi rules, that they have managed to turn what some could be considered obstacles into skilfully used tools.

Sweden has been placed in the Mid-Score cluster in Table 3.1 (p 26). This is also a bit unexpected since Sweden is considered a deal-focused business cultures (Gesteland, 2002). Sweden does not have as high a value of societal and family relationships as China. The Swedish people are more independent and require equality; they value factors like competitiveness and materialism.

In Sweden people pay respect to each other regardless of hierarchy or seniority but in China it is the other way around. According to Cross-Cultural Business, by Richard R Gesteland, the Swedes are positive in dealing with strangers. They are more open for feedback and direct, explicit communication in order to improve themselves and their performances.

Generation Y have some characteristics that would put them in the High-Score cluster, they value training and development, view formal feedback as necessary and expect direct, explicit communication and some characteristics that would put them in the Low-Score cluster; value societal relationships, value harmony with the environment and value what one is more than what one does. Since Generation Y’s characteristics fit equally well in the High-Score as in the Low-Score cluster, we would place them in the Mid-Score cluster

3.3.3.2 Assertiveness

Assertiveness measures a group’s assertive, confrontational, and aggressive behaviour based on their relationships with others. A group in a highly assertive society will have high values of competition, success and progress. The members in this group
communicate directly and unambiguously. Nevertheless, this group will have control over their environment and they will expect subordinates to take initiatives, and most of the time they are building their trust based on calculation (Grovewell, 2007).

In Table 3.1 (p 26), China is in the Mid-Score cluster. The issues of Business Behaviour in China support the characteristic of “Expect subordinates to take initiative” by behaviour like respect of hierarchy and seniority. On the other hand, Chinese people do not build up their trust based of calculation because they prefer to have business relationships with familiar persons. The matter of direct communication in these countries should be low because they seem to use more indirect communication in order to avoid causing offence and loss of face. The result shown in Table 3.1 is, therefore, a bit unexpected since it shows that China has a higher score on Assertiveness than Sweden.

The GLOBE research result concerning Sweden (Table 3.1, p 26) has supported the factors of Swedish Business Behaviour. Swedish people act in order to keep warm relationships and good cooperation. They expect subordinates to be loyal and build their trust on basis of predictability. In Swedish society, they nevertheless use an indirect communication to save face and get along with their environment. Swedish managers often phrase their orders like “See what you can do about it!” which means the managers express trust in their co-workers and gives indirect instead of direct orders (Edström & Jönsson, 1998).

The characteristics of Generation Y fit well with the characteristics of high assertiveness societies (communicate directly and unambiguously, try to have control over the environment and value competition, success and progress). We would therefore place Generation Y in the High-Score cluster.

3.3.3.3 Future Orientation
According to Robert J. House, Future Orientation is the degree to which a collective encourage and reward Future-Oriented behaviour such as planning and delaying
satisfaction. Groups with this attribute, Future Orientation, will plan ahead. They will for instance call before visiting and be less spontaneous. Most of them use English in order to advance their career. They also have the benefit of economic prosperity, scientific advancement, democracy, gender equality and social health (House et al, 2004). Members of high Future Orientation societies should have some characteristics such as an inclination to save for the future, because they want to plan and work for a long-term success. Organisations with a high Future Orientation tend to be flexible and adaptive (Grovewell, 2007).

GLOBE’s Future Orientation result shows that Sweden is in the High-Score cluster. This result is also a bit unexpected. Swedish people are provided with a high social security. This gives Swedish people a higher economic and financial confidence. Swedes are more prone to spend now, rather than save for the future, in order to satisfy their needs as soon as possible. Due to this we would expect to find Sweden in the Low-Score cluster and not in the High-Score cluster (Dixon,1999).

China is placed in the Mid-Score cluster. This can be explained by the fact that the Chinese teaches principles such as unselfishness and delayed fulfilment in the societal norms (House et al, 2007). It is well-known that Chinese people are hard workers and have a long-term success perspective. They are therefore good at saving in order to secure their future.

The information we have found about Generation Y’s characteristics concerning Future Orientation is ambiguous; sometimes they are described as long-term planners and sometimes as short-term planners. Generation Y also have characteristics that could place them both in the High-Score and in the Low-Score clusters; on one hand they are flexible and adaptive like societies in the High-Score cluster, and on the other hand they prefer instant gratification like societies in the Low-Score cluster. Because of this ambiguity we have placed Generation Y in the Mid-Score cluster.
3.3.3.4 Humane Orientation

Humane Orientation is the degree to which an organisation or society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, selfless, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others (Grovenwell, 2007). People who live in a Humane Oriented culture have a tendency to use extended, warm greetings. Kindness is an important issue. They show a high empathy and display an honest interest in others. By this reasoning a need for belonging and relationships are major motivation factors for people in this culture. They have a high responsibility for each other in order to promote the well-being of others. Members of this culture are sensitive to racial discrimination and are regarded as unselfish and generous (House et al, 2004).

According to the GLOBE research on Humane Orientation, both China and Sweden are placed in the Mid-Score cluster. This is one of the two dimensions where China and Sweden share a cultural understanding with each other.

Generation Y have a strong need to belong and are very involved in Humane Oriented issues like child labour and discrimination. These are characteristics of societies and groups in the High-Score cluster. Self-interest is very important to them, and must be taken into consideration. This trait is associated with societies in the Low-Score cluster. Generation Y are individualists, but prefer to be so in teams, which is why we would put them in the High-Score cluster.

3.3.3.5 Institutional Collectivism

Robert J. House states that Institutional Collectivism is the degree to which organisational, societal and institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action. The members of Institutional Collectivistic societies are extremely interdependent with the organisation and highly confident of group loyalty, which means that there are no issues of individual goals. All decisions are made by the group. The economic system of these societies tends to
take advantage of group interests more than individual interests. By this reasoning seniority drive rewards through personal needs and group fairness (Grovewell, 2007).

The GLOBE result is once again a bit unexpected, with China and Sweden both in the High-Score cluster. This is the second Cultural Dimension where China and Sweden share cultural values. This result supports the Humane Orientation result, which shows that management in organisations and societies in China and Sweden have a high Institutional Collectivism.

Generation Y usually see themselves as independent of the organisation they work for; they expect rewards or at least recognition on an individual level like the societies in the High-Score cluster, but still encourage group loyalty like societies in the Low-Score clusters. Thus, the characteristics of Generation Y can be found both in the High- and in the Low-Score clusters which is why we have put them in the Mid-Score cluster.

3.3.3.6 In-Group Collectivism

According to House, In-Group Collectivism is the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organisations and families (Grovewell, 2007). This issue is related to low divorce rates and implies the importance of family (House et al, 2004). Cultures with high In-Group Collectivism are usually nature-characters, with a strong sense of duty and responsibility in their social behaviour. They stress relatedness with groups and have a strong distinction between in-groups and out-groups. They do not care so much about love in marriages and their life tempos are usually slower.

In Table 3.1 (p 26), China has been placed in the High-Score cluster. This is an example of Chinese reverence of loyalty and relationships, where people have high responsibility to each other and to the groups to which they belong. Other examples are “the save face” rule and how family relationships and society still are a big part of
Chinese culture. There are for example still a large number of marriage arrangements done in China, where the families decide for their children.

Sweden has been placed in the Low-Score cluster. This is a bit unexpected since Swedish people have a tendency to preserve social stability and uniformity. People in Sweden tend to follow “the Jante law”, of which the first commandment reads “You shall not believe you are special”, according to Encyclopaedia Britannica. This Swedish aversion towards “sticking out” would suggest that Sweden should be in the High-Score cluster, but since Swedish people tend to have less loyalty in their group and defend themselves more in order to fulfil their individual desires and needs, they have been placed in the Low-Score cluster.

Group loyalty and a strong distinction between in-groups and out-groups are characteristics of societies and groups in the High-Score cluster. We would place Generation Y in the High-Score cluster since this social behaviour fits with their characteristics.

3.3.3.7 Gender Egalitarianism

Gender Egalitarianism is the degree to which a collective minimises gender inequality. In cultures where Gender Egalitarianism is high, society supports women’s roles more and shows fewer inequalities between the sexes. This means that women have more power in organisational positions. Organisations within this culture are good at supporting women’s decisions.

The GLOBE result for Sweden does not differ from expectations because the Swedish society is well known for its equality between the sexes. Women are usually highly educated and have powerful and high positions in the Swedish society and within organisations. Chinese Gender Egalitarianism is lower than the Swedish, this is mainly due to the Chinese culture. Men have traditionally been the leaders for a long time in Chinese history and culture.
Amongst the characteristics of the High-Score societies we find *more women in positions of authority, less occupational sex segregation and similar levels of educational attainment for males and females*. Generation Y is a diverse multiethnic Generation. They are highly educated, in fact, the female members are even better educated than the male (NAS, 2006). We would place Generation Y in the High-Score cluster since it is a very egalitarian generation.

### 3.3.3.8 Power Distance

Power Distance is how a community accepts and endorses authority, power differences and status privileges, such as differentiation between rich and poor people and also some issues of national social welfare, for example societal health and human development such as education (House et al, 2004).

The GLOBE result places China in the Mid-Score cluster because in China there is still a big difference between the rich and the poor people in society. The rich people have control and provide the power in the society. The fact that China is a developing country means that resources are not widely available.

Sweden is a country with a highly developed social welfare system which makes the Swedish society more equal. Sweden has one of the best social welfare systems in the world (Sigg & Behrendt, 2002), and information and resources are widely available.

Some of the characteristics signifying a society with low power distance are; *information is widely shared, resources are available to almost all and upward social mobility is common*. We would put Generation Y in the Low-Score cluster since they have similar characteristics.

### 3.3.3.9 Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty Avoidance is the degree to which a society, organisation or group relies on social norms, rules and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future
events. It is related to societies that have a high share of home corporations in national research and development. Scientific progress and government support encourage economic activities such as widely provided telecommunication systems (House et al, 2004).

Sweden has a high degree of Uncertainty Avoidance. This means that in Sweden relationships with others are important. In Sweden people live their lives carefully and avoid taking high risks. They are of a logical mind and follow evidence more than instincts. Sweden’s low position in Power Distance supports the high score in Uncertainty Avoidance. The wide provision of information and resources are taken advantage of when making decisions.

China is placed in the Mid-Score cluster. This can be explained by the “Quanxi rules” that enables the Chinese to take reasonable, carefully calculated risks. The Chinese are also more likely to accept uncertainties in order to avoid conflicts than the Swedish, which would also explain why China got a lower score than Sweden.

A society with low Uncertainty Avoidance is characterised by informality in interactions, rely on informal norms, and show only moderate resistance to change. Generation Y’s characteristics include informality and a strong aptitude towards change, which is why we would place them in the Low-Score cluster.

3.4 Summary on National Culture Values and the General Characteristics of Generation Y

Earlier in this chapter, we have shown that groups and societies in High-Score clusters have distinct characteristics that separate them from groups and societies in the Low-Score clusters. We have also described the common characteristics of Generation Y, and how based on these characteristics, we would place Generation Y in the different cultural dimensions alongside China and Sweden (see Table 3.3).
In Table 3.3 we clearly see how conflicts can arise between National Culture Values and the characteristics and traits of Generation Y. It is important to understand these conflicts in order to see how they can affect the motivation process.

### 3.5 Hypotheses

As shown in Table 3.3, the National Culture Values of our chosen countries are sometimes in conflict with the characteristics of Generation Y. From these conflicts we have derived our main hypothesis: *National Culture Values affect Generation Y and must be taken into account in order to properly motivate them.* To test this hypothesis we have divided it into 11 sub-hypotheses, one for each of the nine cultural dimensions used in the GLOBE research, and two to back up our suggested modifications for the Content Motivation Theories. These 11 sub-hypotheses will be tested on Chinese and Swedish members of Generation Y.
H1  Gen Yers in China are more Performance Oriented than Gen Yers in Sweden
H2  Gen Yers in China are more Assertive than Gen Yers in Sweden.
H3  Swedish Gen Yers are more Future Oriented than Chinese Gen Yers.
H4  Gen Yers in China and Sweden have the same Humane Orientation.
H5  Gen Yers in China and Sweden are equally Institutional Collectivistic.
H6  Chinese Gen Yers are more In-Group Collectivistic than Swedish Gen Yers.
H7  Swedish Gen Yers are more Gender Egalitarian than Chinese Gen Yers.
H8  Gen Yers in China are more comfortable with Power Distance than Gen Yers in Sweden.
H9  Gen Yers in Sweden are more prone to Uncertainty Avoidance than Gen Yers in China.
H10 Opportunities of Self-actualisation are more important to Generation Y than the sense of belonging
H11 Lack of recognition at work will cause dissatisfaction among members of Generation Y

3.6 The GLOBE dimensions and the Content Motivation Theories

Some of the cultural dimensions used to describe different national cultures can be connected to different needs; In-Group Collectivism can for example be compared to the need to belong, while cultures and groups with a high Humane Orientation usually have a strong need for belonging and affiliation.

3.6.1 The Connection between Content Motivation Theories, Generation Y’s Characteristics and National Culture Values.

In order to properly motivate members of Generation Y, it is important to consider not only the Content Motivation Theories, but also the National Culture Values and the general characteristics of Generation Y. To show the connections we have constructed the following model.
Motivation Model for Generation Y.

Figure 3.9
Chapter 4

Empirical Method

The fourth chapter describes the research strategy and the limitation of the dissertation. The questionnaire and the sample group are described. Finally the validity, reliability and generalisability of the dissertation are discussed.

4.1 Research Strategy

This dissertation is built on a deductive approach. We have based our research on a literature review of existing theories concerning Generation Y, Content Motivation Theories and National Culture Values. From this literature review we have derived one main hypothesis and 11 sub-hypotheses. This dissertation is based on a descriptive and explanatory study and to test our hypotheses we have conducted an empirical study in the form of a survey. By using a survey we felt that we had more control over the research process which made it easier for us to do comparisons. We chose to conduct our survey with the help of a questionnaire, which we distributed personally to our respondents.

4.2 The Questionnaire

Our questionnaire started with a cover letter and some general questions to ensure that the respondent was part of our target population (members of Generation Y from China or Sweden). It then continued with 31 questions, 27 about National Culture Values and 4 about motivation. These questions allowed us to investigate and compare how National Culture Values and the characteristics of Generation Y might influence the motivation process.

The questions for the cultural dimensions are based on three situations, *in general, as a student and as an employee*, with one question for each situation. The reason for dividing the questions into different situations is that people can have different
priorities in different situations. By measuring our respondents’ attitudes in different situations we hope to get a more comprehensive result. We are aware that by doing the survey in a student environment, it may affect the situational thinking.

We have translated the questionnaire to both Swedish and Chinese, and have pre-tested our translations on Swedish and Chinese students to ensure that language would not be an issue when answering the questions. The questionnaires were distributed and collected by us personally.

Distributing the questionnaire personally had three advantages; we could explain possible misunderstandings that could occur. It was practical considering the time and financial constraints associated with a candidate dissertation. And since we had personal access to both Chinese and Swedish students (thanks to our University’s exchange program with China), we had more control over our survey.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part contained general questions and was used to make sure that our respondents were part of our target population. The second part had 31 questions. All questions could be answered with Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree or Strongly disagree. All versions of our questionnaire and cover letter can be found in the appendices.

4.3 Limitations

We have studied the National Culture Values and attitudes of Generation Y in two countries, China and Sweden. Because of financial and time constraints, we did not have the means to do a full-scale study on Generation Y in these two countries; hence, we used samples of the population as representatives. When choosing our sample we used Stutely’s rule of thumb that suggests a minimum number of 30 for each category within an overall sample (Saunders, 2007). For our sample we have used 32 Chinese and 32 Swedish students at Kristianstad University in Sweden. By using university students we ensured that our sample populations had approximately the same age and level of education. We also had direct access to both sample groups
which made it easier for us to make sure that the questionnaires were answered correctly, and gave us the opportunity to answer any questions that would arise.

GLOBE’s original questions are far too numerous and extensive, and would be too time-consuming and expensive to try and replicate. We have limited our research to three questions for each of the nine cultural dimensions and four questions about the motivation theories. The three questions we have chosen for each of the nine cultural dimensions, reflects three different situations. The questions are phrased to make our respondents answer them from three different points of view, in general, as a student and as an employee. Having different points of view of the different cultural dimensions makes it easier for us to analyse our data and make valid comparisons between our two sample groups.

4.4 Sample
To test our hypotheses about National Culture Values and motivation concerning Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers, we decided to use two sample groups; one with Chinese students and one with Swedish students. To be able to do a statistical analysis we needed at least 30 in each group. We knew that a lot of Chinese exchange students were studying IT-systems in Hässleholm, in Sweden, so we chose to go to Hässleholm for our Chinese sample group. We introduced ourselves and our topic and personally handed the cover letter and the questionnaire. We knew that some of the students lacked work experience, but we stressed that we still wanted their opinion on the given situations and asked them to try and answer all of the questions. The class we visited in Hässleholm consisted of 24 Chinese students, all of them post-graduate. Since we needed at least 30 for our statistical analysis (Stutely’s advice of a minimum number, (Saunders et al, 2007)) we decided to email our questionnaire to 8 students at Ningbo University in China. All 8 responded, which gave us a Chinese sample group of 32 students.

For our Swedish sample group we visited a class in National Economics. Our method was the same as it was with the Chinese students. We introduced ourselves and our topic and personally distributed our cover letter and questionnaire. We mentioned the
possible lack of work experience and asked them to kindly answer all questions. The National Economics class consisted of about 250 second year students, belonging to 4 different programs. We asked for willing participants and distributed our questionnaire to 60 randomly chosen students.

After we had collected our 60 questionnaires, to ensure that our two sample groups were of the same size, we chose the first 32 students that belonged to Generation Y, had a Swedish nationality and was born in Sweden. The reason we asked for country of birth in our questionnaire, was that there are a lot of Swedish Students with multi-cultural background. Since we are measuring the effect of Swedish National Culture Values, we tried to ensure that the respondents in our Swedish sample group were born in Sweden.

We are aware of that the fact that you are born in Sweden not necessarily means that you grew up there. The fact that our sample group have different gender dispositions may also affect the result, as well as the fact that the Chinese students are all post-graduates. We are also aware that our sample groups may not be representative for our target populations.

4.5 Validity

To ensure the validity of this dissertation we have based our questionnaire on GLOBE’s original questions. We had to modify the questionnaire to fit Generation Y and to be able to make comparisons. We knew that changing the questions would affect the validity of the dissertation, but it was our opinion that our modifications were necessary to get a comparable result from Generation Y.

The GLOBE research covered 62 countries over 11 years. It is not possible for us to make any generalisations about Generation Y in China and Sweden from our comparisons with the GLOBE research, but we do believe that our questions will show the two sample groups’ attitudes in GLOBE’s nine dimensions. GLOBE’s original questions that we have based ours upon can be found in the appendices.
Some of the questions we asked were about Generation Y’s attitude towards work. We knew that some of our respondents did not have any work experience, but asked them (both in the cover letter and orally when we distributed the questionnaire) to still answer these questions since we believed that they still had a clear opinion about what they want from their future employer and co-workers. To avoid unnecessary misunderstandings, we did a pilot test on both Swedish and Chinese students.

When we translated our questionnaire to Swedish, the second answer alternative *neither agree nor disagree*, got translated as *no opinion*. To not affect the validity of our result, we decided to treat all second answer alternatives in our collected data as missing values.

**4.6 Reliability**

Reliability is “the extent to which your data collection techniques or analysis procedures will yield consistent findings” (Saunders, 2007, p 149). One of the factors that can affect the reliability of a questionnaire is the respondents. Since our framework for our respondents have clear boundaries (age and nationality) we believe that a second survey within the same framework would yield the same result. To ensure the reliability of this dissertation further, we have translated the questionnaires and cover letters to our respondents’ first language. This has been done to avoid any misunderstandings caused by misinterpretation. We have also conducted our survey in the same way in both groups. The gender compositions of our two sample groups differ, (the Chinese sample group consists of 23 men and 9 women, and the Swedish of 13 men and 19 women) and since we do not know what effect this has on our result, it may affect the reliability of this dissertation.
4.7 Generalisability

Generalisability is “the extent to which the findings of a research study are applicable to other settings” (Saunders, 2007, p 598). In our survey we have used 32 Chinese and 32 Swedish students, which are close to the minimum (30) for sample populations. These small samples make it hard to generalise our result to the whole Generation Y population of China and Sweden.

Our purpose is not to explain all the connections between National Culture Values, Content Motivation Theories and the characteristics of Generation Y; it is simply to show that a connection exists.

The result of our research shows that there is a connection that must be taken into account if you want to properly motivate Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers. We believe that this result is not only applicable to Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers, but that it can be generalised to Gen Yers with other nationalities and with other National Culture Values as well.

4.8 Operationalisation

Operationalisation is “the translation of concepts into tangible indicators of their existence” (Saunders, 2007, p 605).

To be able to measure our sample groups’ attitudes, and test our hypotheses, we had to operationalise the different factors we wanted to measure. Hypotheses 1-9 cover the GLOBE research’s nine dimensions, and hypotheses 10 and 11 are about our modified motivation theories.

To be able to measure our two sample groups’ attitudes concerning these nine dimensions, we had to look at the GLOBE research’s definition of these dimensions (see Table 3.2, p 27).
After reviewing examples of GLOBE research’s questions (see appendix 3), we decided that they were too impractical and hard to understand; one of the problems was that the GLOBE research’s questions were based on many sub-questions, which could not be applied to our research because of time and financial limitations. Therefore, we had to adapt the questions to make them more applicable to our survey.

To adapt the questionnaire of Hypotheses 1 to 9, which involved the cultural dimensions of the National Culture Values, we decided to base them on the specific characteristics of each dimension according to Robert J. House. House described the nine culture dimensions by categorising behaviours found in different societies.

House divided the specific characteristics found in these societies into two categories, high and low. This gave us an idea of how to adapt our questionnaire on National Culture Values to fit the Chinese and Swedish Generation Y. Our questions are based on the high characteristics of each of the nine cultural dimensions in the GLOBE research.

Robert J. House gives the following high characteristics for the nine cultural dimensions (as described in House et al, 2004):

*Performance Orientation, questions 1-3*
- Value training and development
- Reward performance.

Our questions in this dimension concerns personal growth and performance.

*Assertiveness, questions 4-6*
- Value competition.
- Try to have control over the environment.

Our questions in this dimension concerns competitiveness and the need to control the environment.
Future Orientation, questions 7-9

- Long strategic orientation for long-term success both for the individual and the organisation.

Our questions in this dimension concerns long-term goals and planning ahead.

Humane Orientation, questions 10-12

- Other people are important, such as family, friends and community.
- The need for belonging and need for affiliation motivate people.

Our questions in this dimension concerns family, friends, society and affiliation.

Institutional Collectivism question 13-15

- Members assume that they are highly interdependent with the organisation and believe it is important to make personal sacrifices to fulfil their organisational obligations.
- Employees tend to develop long-term relationship with employers from recruitment to retirement.

Our questions in this dimension concerns loyalty.

In-Group Collectivism, questions 16-18

- Members assume that they are independent of the organisation and believe it is important to bring their unique skills and abilities to the organisation.
- Employees develop short-term relationships, and change companies at their own discretion.

Our questions in this dimension concerns individual accomplishments and loyalty.

Gender Egalitarianism question 19-21

- Women have more positions of authority, more status in society, and a greater role in community decision making.
- The female literacy rates are higher.
- Similar levels of education between females and males.
Our questions in this dimension concerns equality between the sexes and female literacy rates.

*Power Distance, question 22-24*
- Power is seen as providing social order, relational harmony, and role stability
- Information is localised.
- Only a few people have access to resources, skills, and capabilities, contributing to low human development and life expectancies.

Our questions in this dimension concerns social order, and access to resources.

*Uncertainty Avoidance, question 25-27*
- Relies on formalised policies and procedures, the establishing and following of rules. Verifies communications in writing.
- Shows a stronger desire to establish rules that allows predictability of behaviour.
- Shows less tolerance for breaking rules.

Our questions in this dimension concerns rules and regulations.

Our last two hypotheses are derived from our modified motivation models.

*Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Need, question 28 and 29*
Our questions concern self-actualisation and belonging.

*Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory, question 30 and 31*
Our questions concern recognition, praise and respect.

By constructing our questions according to the *high* characteristics of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, our result is more credible. It also helps us ensure that we measure what we intend to measure, and enables us to better compare the National Culture Values and the general characteristics of Generation Y.
Chapter 5

Analysis of the Survey

The fifth chapter describes the result of the survey and the statistical analysis of the collected data.

5.1 Introduction

Our questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part one consisted of general questions like age-group, nationality and country of birth. This part was used to ensure that our respondents belonged to our target population, and will not be analysed further in this dissertation. Part two consists of 31 questions pertaining to our 11 smaller hypotheses (see Appendix 4, schematics of questions and hypotheses).

The questions in the GLOBE research, about National Culture Values, can be answered on a scale from 1-7. These kind of scales usually have strong opposites on each end; where 1 means Strongly agree, 7 means Strongly disagree and 2-6 are the range in between. With a wide answering scale like this, it is easier to measure the strength of potential differences and statistically analyse the result. The problem with using a wide scale is that people usually answer somewhere in the middle. The purpose of our survey was not to investigate potential differences, but to confirm the differences we have already established in our theoretical review. Because of this, we chose to have only three answer alternatives, Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree and Strongly disagree. By only having three alternatives, our respondents had to either Strongly agree, Strongly disagree, or Neither nor. If we had used a scale of 1-7 like the GLOBE research did, we would have had three different levels of agreement and three different levels of disagreement. To be able to draw strong conclusions from our results, we found it more suitable, according to the purpose of this dissertation, to use strong answer alternatives.
Like we wrote in chapter 4, we have treated all *Neither agree nor disagree* answers as missing values, and only used the *Strongly agree* and *Strongly disagree* in our statistical analysis. These are the two answers that we wanted to measure, but since they are such strong opposites, we wanted to give our respondents a third alternative in between.

To compare the result between our two sample groups, and test our hypotheses, we used SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) (SPSS, 2007). In all instances where the expected count values were 5 or higher, we used Pearson’s Chi-square test. The Chi-square test can be used to investigate differences between two factors, and show if there is any statistically proved (significant) difference between them. If the expected count value was under 5, we used Fisher’s exact test (2-sided). The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the possible influence of National Culture Values on Chinese and Swedish members of Generation Y. Our statistical analysis will show that there are significant differences in the answers given by our two sample groups, which support our main hypothesis *National Culture Values affect Generation Y and must be taken into account in order to properly motivate them*.

After processing our collected data in SPSS, we compared the answers from our two sample groups. To see if there were any significant differences between the answers, we used Pearson’s Chi-square test. The first thing we looked at was the p-values; the p-value (probability-value) present from 0-1, and measures if the difference between two factors is significant or if it can have occurred at random. If the p-value is under 0.05 (5%), the result was significant (graphpad, 2007), as long as the expected count value was 5 or higher in all cells. If the expected count value was under 5, we used Fisher’s exact test (2-sided). If the Fisher value was under 0.05 (5%), the result was significant.
5.2 Analysis of the collected data

The analysis of our collected data is based on our 11 sub-hypotheses, the first nine hypotheses are based on our model of National Culture Values and Generation Y, and the last two are based on our modified Content Motivation Theories (see appendix 4). In this chapter, the hypotheses are followed by the questions used to test them, a table showing how the two sample groups answered, and a statistical analysis of the results. China has been abbreviated to CH and Sweden to SW. The n-value given in the tables are the total number of answers given by that sample group and the p-values are from Pearson’s Chi-square test.

In chapter 3, we discussed that Generation Y have some general characteristics. We also discussed how National Culture Values might be in conflict with the characteristics of Generation Y. In chapter 5.3 we will analyse the result of our survey and compare the result with our model of National Culture Values and Generation Y, Table 3.3 (p 37). The three questions in each of the nine first hypotheses are based on three different situations (in general, as a student and as an employee). These situations will be referred to as the general, the student and the employee situation in our analysis. The analysis will show how in some situations and cultural dimensions, National Culture Values can be stronger than the general characteristics of Generation Y and vice versa.

5.3 Analysis of National Cultural Values and Generation Y

5.3.1 Performance Orientation

Performance Orientation.
As shown in Figure 5.1, question 1, 2 and 3 are related to Performance Orientation, the first of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on personal growth.

**H1**  
*Gen Yers in China are more Performance Oriented than Gen Yers in Sweden.*

Q1  
In general, it is important to have a personal growth which could lead to a high performance.

Q2  
As a student, I strive to do my best for my results and grades.

Q3  
As an employee, it is / will be very important for me to have a constantly rising salary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>P=0.201</td>
<td>CH n=20</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n=31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>P=0.476</td>
<td>CH n=23</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n=26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>P=0.275</td>
<td>CH n=24</td>
<td>23 (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n=28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Hypothesis 1**

According to our theoretical review, we should see a significant difference in Performance Orientation between our Chinese and Swedish sample group. As shown by the p-values in Table 5.1 there are no significant difference between our two sample groups, in any of the given situations. In both of our sample groups, a majority of the participants agreed on all three questions. This shows that Performance Orientation is an important issue for both our sample groups, in different aspects of their lives.
Since we could show no significant difference in any of the given situations, we can say that National Culture Values have no significant effect on our sample groups. This suggests that in performance oriented issues, the general characteristics of Generation Y, might be stronger than the National Culture Values.

GLOBE’s high characteristics that we based our Performance Orientation questions on, includes value training and development and reward performance. In Table 3.3 (p 37), we placed Generation Y in the High-Score cluster because according to their general characteristics they have a need for ongoing learning and a need to prove themselves. If we look at the result of our survey again, we see that our result supports the general characteristics of Generation Y. Therefore, we suggest that in issues related to Performance Orientation, Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics.

5.3.2 Assertiveness

As shown in Figure 5.2, question 4, 5 and 6 are related to Assertiveness, the second of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions and are based on self-confidence.

\[ H2 \quad Gen \text{ Yers in China are more Assertive (self-confident) than Gen Yers in Sweden.} \]

\[ Q4 \quad \text{In general, being competitive helps a person to achieve better results.} \]

\[ Q5 \quad \text{As a student, I am competitive when it comes to my studies / education.} \]
Q6 As an employee, I have / I would like to have control over my work environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>CH n= 21 SW n= 26</td>
<td>19 (90%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>25 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>CH n= 17 SW n= 27</td>
<td>16 (94%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>15 (56%)</td>
<td>12 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>CH n= 20 SW n= 23</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>22 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

**Analysis of Hypothesis 2**

According to our theoretical review we should see a significant difference in Assertiveness between our two sample groups. If we look at the p-values in Table 5.2, we see that in question 5 the p-value is under 0.05. Since the expected count is 5 or higher in all cells, the Chi-square test is valid, which means that as a student, there is a significant difference in the result.

GLOBE’s high characteristics that we based our Assertiveness questions on include value competition and try to have control over the environment. In Table 3.3 (p 37), we placed Generation Y in the High-Score cluster because they according to their general characteristics value competition and try to have control over the environment. If we look at the result of our survey again, in the general and employee situation, our result supports the general characteristics of Generation Y. Therefore, we suggest that in issues related to Assertiveness, in the student situation, Generation Y should be motivated according to their National Culture Values, while in the general and employee situations, Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics.
5.3.3 Future Orientation

As shown in Figure 5.3, question 7, 8 and 9 are related to Future Orientation, the third of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on planning for the future.

**H3** *Swedish Gen Yers are more Future Oriented than Chinese Gen Yers.*

Q7 In general, I put more emphasis on solving current problems than future problems.

Q8 As a student, it is important for me to set up goals and plan my studies.

Q9 As an employee, I have / will have to plan ahead in order to be successful in the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Future Orientation</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s Chi-square</td>
<td>CH n= 23</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 CH n= 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>19 (73%)</td>
<td>7 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW n= 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9 CH n= 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>22 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW n= 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Hypothesis 3**

According to our theoretical review, we should see a significant difference in Future Orientation between our two sample groups. As shown by the p-values in Table 5.3,
there is no significant difference between the two groups in any of the given situations.

The result shows no significant difference, but since most of the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers in our sample groups agree on all three questions, Future Orientation is important for both of the groups in all the given situations. Since we see no significant difference in any of our given situations, we can conclude that National Culture Values have no significant effect on our two sample groups when it comes to Future Orientation in our given situations.

GLOBE’s high characteristics that we based our Future Orientation questions on, includes long-term goals and planning ahead. When it comes to Future Orientation, our research on Generation Y is ambiguous; some researchers describe them as long-term planners and some as short-term planners. What researchers do agree on is that Generation Y are flexible and adaptable, characteristics typical for societies in the High-Score cluster. Our results in Table 5.3, shows that in the general situation, Generation Y are short-term planners, while in the student and employee situations they are long-term planners. This result supports the general characteristics of Generation Y. Therefore, we suggest that in issues related to Future Orientation, Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics.

If we look at Table 3.3, p18, Generation Y is placed in the Mid-Score cluster next to China. Earlier in this dissertation, we have described Generation Y as flexible and adaptable. These characteristics can be found in High-Score clusters societies like China. If the general characteristics of Generation Y have affected our Swedish sample group, this would explain the result. When it comes to Future Oriented issues, we suggest that Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics and not according to their National Culture Values.
5.3.4 Humane Orientation

As shown in Figure 5.4, question 10, 11 and 12 are related to Humane Orientation, the fourth of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on self-interest.

**H4**  
*Gen Yers in China and Sweden have the same Humane Orientation.*

**Q10**  
My family and friends are more important than my self-interest.

**Q11**  
It is important to me that teachers and friends listen to my ideas.

**Q12**  
It is / will be important to me that my colleagues and bosses listen to my ideas.

**Table 5.4  Humane Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH n= 27</td>
<td>P=0.017*</td>
<td>22 (82%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW n= 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH n= 25</td>
<td>P=0.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW n= 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH n= 25</td>
<td>P=0.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW n= 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant

**Analysis of Hypothesis 4**

According to our theoretical review there should be no significant difference in Humane Orientation between our two sample groups. The p-value of question 10 in Table 5.4, is under 0.05. Since the expected count values in all cells are higher than 5,
the test is valid. This means that in general situations; there is a significant difference between the two groups.

In Table 3.3 (p 37), National Culture Values and Generation Y, our two sample groups are both in the Mid-Score cluster. This means that our two groups share the same National Culture Values. According to Table 5.4, there is a significant difference between our two sample groups in question 10, in the general situation. According to the general characteristics of Generation Y, self-interest is very important to them. If we look at the result for question 10, we see that self-interest is much more important to the Swedish sample group than for the Chinese. This suggests that in this case, in China, the Chinese National Culture Values are stronger than the general characteristics of Generation Y, while in Sweden, the general characteristics of Generation Y are stronger than the Swedish National Culture Values. In Humane Oriented issues, in general situations, Chinese Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values, while the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.

In the student and employee situations, the results support our hypothesis that Chinese Gen Yers and Swedish Gen Yers have the same Humane Orientation. Since Generation Y also have the same Humane Orientation they can in student and employee situations, be motivated either according to their National Culture Values or according to their general characteristics.

5.3.5 Institutional Collectivism

Institutional Collectivism.
As shown in Figure 5.5, question 13, 14 and 15 are related to the fifth of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on organisational loyalty.

**H5** *Gen Yers in China and Sweden are equally Institutional Collectivistic.*

Q13 It is important to me to be loyal to the norm of the society I live in.
Q14 It is important to me to be loyal to my work team at school.
Q15 As an employee, it is important to be loyal to my project group within the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5</th>
<th>Institutional Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Pearson’s Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13</td>
<td>CH n= 25  SW n= 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14</td>
<td>CH n= 26  SW n= 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15</td>
<td>CH n= 28  SW n= 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Hypothesis 5**

According to our theoretical review, there should be no significant difference between our two sample groups. As shown by the p-values in Table 5.5, there are no significant differences between the two groups, in any of the given situations. This means that in all given situations, the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers in our sample groups, are equally Institutional Collectivistic. This supports our hypothesis for our two sample groups.

As our analysis shows, there is no significance difference between our sample groups in any of the given situations. Institutional Collectivistic societies are highly confident of group loyalty, with no issues of individual goals. Since Generation Y expect
rewards or at least recognition on an individual level, Gen Yers in China and Sweden should, in issues related to Institutional Collectivism, be motivated according to their National Culture Values.

5.3.6 In-Group Collectivism

As shown in Figure 5.6, question 16, 17 and 18 are related to the sixth of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on group loyalty.

**H6** Chinese Gen Yers are more In-Group Collectivistic than Swedish Gen Yers.

Q16 In general, my individual accomplishments are more important than the collective accomplishments of my group.

Q17 As a student, my individual accomplishments are more important than my group members’ achievements.

Q18 As an employee, I have to / will be loyal to my organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6</th>
<th>In-Group Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Pearson’s Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td>CH n= 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td>CH n= 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18</td>
<td>CH n= 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Hypothesis 6

According to our theoretical review, there should be a significant difference between the two groups. As seen by the p-value of question 18 in Table 5.6, there is a significant difference between the groups in the employee situation. Two of the expected count values are under 5, which mean that the Chi-square test is not valid. Fisher's Exact Test shows that there is no significance difference between the two groups.

In Table 3.3 (p 37) Sweden is placed in the Low-Score cluster and China is placed in the High-Score cluster. This shows that the National Culture Values of China and Sweden are very far apart. Since we do not see any significant difference between our sample groups in any of the given situations, in issues related to In-Group Collectivism, *Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics.*

5.3.7 Gender Egalitarianism

*Gender Egalitarianism.*

As shown in Figure 5.7, question 19, 20 and 21 are related to the seventh of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on equality between the sexes.

*H7*  *Swedish Gen Yers are more Gender Egalitarian than Chinese Gen Yers.*
Q19  It is important to have equality between men and women.

Q20  I think that boys are encouraged more to attain a higher education than girls.

Q21  As an employee, it makes a difference for me if a male or female is my boss.

Table 5.7  Gender Egalitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19</td>
<td>CH n= 26  SW n= 26</td>
<td>24 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20</td>
<td>CH n= 15  SW n= 22</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>20 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.003*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21</td>
<td>CH n= 17  SW n= 21</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.004*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant

Analysis of Hypothesis 7

According to our theoretical review, there should be a significant difference in Gender Egalitarianism between the two sample groups. As shown by the p-values in questions 20 and 21, there is a significant difference between our two sample groups in the student and employee situation. The expected count values only support question 21, so for question 20 we had to use Fisher's Exact Test. The Fisher value for question 20 was 0.006, which means that the result of both question 20 and question 21 are significant.

GLOBE’s high characteristics that we based our Gender Egalitarianism questions on, includes equality between the sexes and female literacy rates. As seen in Table 5.7, question 19 and 21 relates to gender equality, and question 20 relates to female education. Questions 20 and 21, both show significant differences between our two sample groups, which supports our hypothesis that Swedish Gen Yers are more Gender Egalitarian than Chinese Gen Yers. In question 19, we see no significant
difference between our two groups. This supports the general characteristics of Generation Y, which are known as a very egalitarian generation. According to our results, in general situations concerning Gender Egalitarianism, Generation Y should be motivated according to their general characteristics, and in student and employee situations, they should be motivated according to their National Culture Values.

5.3.8 Power Distance

As shown in Figure 5.8, question 22, 23 and 24 are related to the eighth of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on perception of authorities.

\( H^8 \quad \text{Gen Yers in China are more comfortable with Power Distance than Gen Yers in Sweden.} \)

Q22 In general, it is important that followers obey the leader.

Q23 As a student, it is important to concentrate and reach the top of my abilities.

Q24 As an employee, it is/ will be important to me to have direct access to sources and information at work and not have to go through managers to get it.
### Table 5.8

**Power Distance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 22</strong></td>
<td>P=0.042</td>
<td>CH n= 16</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>21 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 23</strong></td>
<td>P=0.020*</td>
<td>CH n= 24</td>
<td>23(96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 24</strong></td>
<td>P=0.592</td>
<td>CH n= 21</td>
<td>19 (91%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

### Analysis of Hypothesis 8

According to our theoretical review, there should be a significant difference between the two groups. As shown by the p-values in question 22 and 23 (Table 5.8), there is a significant difference between the two groups. In both question 22 and 23, the expected count shows values under 5, so we had to use Fisher’s exact test. The Fisher value for question 22 is over 0.05 which means that it is not significant, the Fisher value for question 23 is 0.048, which means that in the student situation, there is a significance difference between the two groups.

As shown in Table 5.8, the result supports our theory that our Chinese sample group are more comfortable with issues related to Power Distance in our given situations. Statistics show that in the student situation, there is a significant difference between our two sample groups. This supports our theory that the Chinese Gen Yers are more comfortable with Power Distance than the Swedish Gen Yers. Therefore, in student situations, they should be motivated according to their National Culture Values, and in general and employee situations, they should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.
5.3.9 Uncertainty Avoidance

As shown in Figure 5.9, question 25, 26 and 27 are related to the ninth of the GLOBE research’s nine cultural dimensions, and are based on rules and regulations.

H9 Gen Yers in Sweden are more prone to Uncertainty Avoidance than Gen Yers in China.

Q25 It is important to have clear rules and regulations in general.
Q26 As a student, I prefer to have clear rules and regulations at school.
Q27 As an employee, I prefer to have clear rules and regulations within an organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 25</td>
<td>CH n= 29 SW n= 25</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 26</td>
<td>CH n= 21 SW n= 29</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>24 (83%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 27</td>
<td>CH n= 23 SW n= 25</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>21 (84%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant
Analysis of Hypothesis 9

According to our theoretical review, there should be a significant difference between the two groups. As shown by the p-value of question 25 in Table 5.9, there is a significant difference between the two groups in general. The expected count shows values under 5, so we have to use Fisher's Exact Test. The Fisher value is 0.001, which means that there is a significant difference between our two groups in general. We can conclude that our Chinese sample group, in general, are more prone to Uncertainty Avoidance than our Swedish sample group. Our hypothesis was that the Swedish sample group should be more prone to Uncertainty Avoidance than the Chinese sample group, and not the other way around.

According to Table 3.3 (p 37), Sweden is placed in the High-Score cluster and China in the Mid-Score cluster. In Table 5.9, according to the National Culture Values, we would expect our Swedish sample group to have a higher agree percentage than our Chinese sample group. The statistics, however, show that the Chinese sample group has a significant higher agree percentage than the Swedish sample group.

GLOBE’s high characteristics that we based our Uncertainty Avoidance questions upon, include rules and regulations and formalised policies and procedures. When it comes to Uncertainty Avoidance, China has a long tradition of Quanxi rules which means that they avoid doing business with total strangers (Gesteland, 2002). This enables them to take reasonable, carefully calculated risks. These Quanxi rules are a very strong part of Chinese national culture, which explains why in general situations, when it comes to Uncertainty Avoidance, the Chinese National Culture Values are stronger than the general characteristics of Generation Y. Sweden does not have any strong cultural influences when it comes to Uncertainty Avoidance. This could explain why in Sweden, in issues of Uncertainty Avoidance, the general characteristics of Generation Y are stronger than the Swedish National Culture Values. In the student and employee situations we do not see any difference between our two sample groups which supports the general characteristics of Generation Y.
In general situations, Chinese Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values, while Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y. In student and employee situations, both Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.

5.3.10 Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Need

As shown in Figure 5.10, question 28 and 29 are related to Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Need, and are based on self-actualisation and belonging.

\( H10 \quad \text{Opportunities of Self-actualisation is more important to Generation Y than the sense of belonging.} \)

Q28  It is important to me to improve my personal growth by training and education.

Q29  I am influenced by social acceptance and friendships.
### Table 5.10  
*Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Need*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH n= 24</td>
<td>SW n= 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 28</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=-</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 29</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.753</td>
<td>25 (93%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Hypothesis 10**

According to our theoretical review, there should be no differences between our two sample groups. We can not statistically compare the difference between the two groups in question 28, since all our respondents agreed. Question 29 shows no significant difference between the two groups. As seen in Table 5.10, the majority of our two sample groups agree on both questions.

The questions about Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs, are about Self-actualisation and Belonging. The result in Table 5.10 shows no difference between Self-actualisation and the sense of Belonging. This result supports our theory that Self-actualisation and the sense of Belonging is equally strong in Generation Y (see Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs, Figure 3.3, p 18).

All our respondents agreed on question 28, and the majority of both groups agreed on question 29. We can only show statistical support for the result on question 29, but we feel that these statistics together with the unanimous agreement in question 28 is sufficient to show that Self-actualisation and Belonging needs are equally strong in our two sample groups, which supports our theory that Generation Y should be motivated according to Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Figure 3.3, p 18).
5.3.11 Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory

As shown in Figure 5.11, question 30 and 31 are related to Generation Y’s Two-Factor theory, and are based on recognition and respect.

H11 Lack of recognition at work will cause dissatisfaction among members of Generation Y.

Q30 Recognition and praise at work are/ will be important to me
Q31 I want / would like to be respected by my co-workers

Table 5.11 Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Pearson’s Chi-square</th>
<th>Chinese Agree</th>
<th>Chinese Disagree</th>
<th>Swedish Agree</th>
<th>Swedish Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 30</td>
<td>P=0.136 CH n= 28</td>
<td>26 (93%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 31</td>
<td>P=0.298 CH n= 30</td>
<td>29 (97%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW n= 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Hypotheses 11

According to our theoretical review, there should be no significant difference between our two sample groups. The p-values in Table 5.11 show no significant difference which supports our hypothesis.

The questions concerning Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory, are about recognition, praise and respect. As seen in Table 5.11, recognition, praise and respect are very
important to both our sample groups. In our Swedish group, all respondents agreed on both questions, and in the Chinese group, 93% agreed on the first question and 97% on the second. This results supports our claim that recognition and praise are important issues to Generation Y and should be considered Maintenance Factors (needs that must be met to prevent dissatisfaction), see Figure 3.5, p 21. this supports our theory that both groups should be motivated according to Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory.

5.4 Summary of the Analysis

After analysing the results of our survey, we have come to the following conclusions:

*Performance Orientation:* Both the Chinese and the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y in all given situations.

*Assertiveness:* In *student* situations, both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values. In general and employee situations, both groups should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.

*Future Orientation:* Both the Chinese and the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y in all given situations.

*Humane Orientation:* In *general* situations, Chinese Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values, while the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y. In *student* and *employee* situations, the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers can be motivated either according to their National Culture Values or according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.
Institutional Collectivism: Both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values in all given situations.

In-Group Collectivism: Both the Chinese and the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y in all given situations.

Gender Egalitarianism: In general situations, both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y. In student and employee situations, both groups should be motivated according to their National Culture Values.

Power Distance: Both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y in general and employee situations and according to their National Culture Values in student situations.

Uncertainty Avoidance: In general situations, Chinese Gen Yers should be motivated according to their National Culture Values while the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y. In student and employee situations, both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to the general characteristics of Generation Y.

Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs theory: Both the Chinese and the Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory.

Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory: Both the Chinese and Swedish Gen Yers should be motivated according to Generation Y’s Two-Factor Theory.

The analysis shows that the general characteristics of Generation Y are very strong, and that they in some cases can be stronger than the National Culture Values in China and Sweden. It also shows that in countries like China, with strong cultural traditions, the National Culture Values are sometimes stronger than the general characteristics of
Generation Y. Since we have tested most of our sub-hypotheses in different situations, it makes it hard for us to generalise the result for each hypothesis in order to accept or reject them.

After analysing the result of our survey, we can conclude that to properly motivate members of Generation Y with different cultural backgrounds, you have to consider both the National Culture Values and the general characteristics of Generation Y, which supports our main hypothesis: *National Culture Values affect Generation Y and must be taken into account in order to properly motivate them.*
Chapter 6

Conclusion

The sixth chapter gives a summary of the dissertation and our research. The research questions are answered and the applicability of the modified motivation models is discussed. The methodology is criticised, and finally, some suggestions for future research and practical implications are given.

6.1 Summary of Dissertation

Generation Y have become the newest group of the global workforce in Multinational Business. They are often referred to as a global group with global characteristics which lead them to be recruited and retained in the same way. The purpose of this dissertation was to show that although Generation Y have their own general (global) characteristics, they are still affected by their national culture. The GLOBE research has measured national culture in 62 countries and attributed them National Culture Values that can be measured in nine different cultural dimensions. According to our literature review, these National Culture Values must be taken into account when Multinational firms want to properly motivate Generation Y with different cultural backgrounds.

This dissertation is based on the impact of National Culture Values on Generation Y in China and Sweden, and how these values may be in conflict with Generation Y’s general characteristics. We have shown how in some situations, the National Culture Values are stronger than the general characteristics of Generation Y, and vice versa. The main hypothesis of this dissertation is: National Culture Values affect Generation Y and must be taken into account in order to properly motivate them.
Our theoretical framework consists of three parts, where the first part describes how researchers categorise Generation Y and the general attributes they contribute them. It also describes how the attitudes and characteristics of Generation Y differ from those of previous generations.

The second part describes some classical motivation theories and how they can be used to motivate Generation Y. The three Content Motivation Theories focus on people’s needs and how these needs must be identified and met if you want to motivate people properly. Generation Y have a very strong need for recognition, self-actualisation and a strong need to belong, which made it suitable to use the Content Motivation Theories. Since the Content Motivation Theories were constructed for generations with different characteristics than Generation Y, they had to be modified to fit Generation Y (see Figure 3.8, p 24, for a comparison of the modified theories).

The third part of our theoretical framework describes the GLOBE research and the National Culture Values for China and Sweden. In the end of the chapter we created National Culture Values for Generation Y based on their general characteristics, and compared the National Culture Values of China, Sweden and Generation Y (see Table 3.3, p 37). In this comparison, we noticed that the general characteristics of Generation Y sometimes were in conflict with the National Culture Values of China and Sweden.

When the National Culture Values of our chosen countries conflicted with the characteristics of Generation Y, we wanted to see which took precedence. From the main hypothesis we constructed 11 sub-hypotheses. The first 9 hypotheses concerned National Culture Values and the last 2 concerned our modified Content Motivation Theories. These 11 sub-hypotheses were tested in a survey as illustrated in chapter 4. In chapter 5 we presented and analysed the result of our survey. We applied our result for the first 9 hypotheses to the comparison we made earlier between the National Culture Values of China, Sweden and Generation Y (Table 3.3, p 37). We viewed the results for each dimension and analysed which was strongest in the given situations,
the National Culture Values or the general characteristics of Generation Y. The analysis of the last two hypotheses supported our modified motivation theories for Generation Y.

6.2 Research Questions

In the beginning of this dissertation, we constructed four research questions. These research questions have been answered throughout the dissertation, and are presented below.

6.2.1 What are Gen Yers’ General Attitudes towards Work?

In our theoretical review about Generation Y’s general characteristics and in the analysis of our survey in chapter 5, we have shown that Gen Yers have the following general attitudes towards work.

Generation Y are not afraid to work but they want to have recognition for it. This is supported by the result of our survey, which shows that Generation Y have high expectations on their employers, and they want to be fairly treated by their employers, regardless of gender. Generation Y need to prove themselves. Thanks to these high expectations on themselves, they often deliver high performance in their attempts to improve themselves even more. The result of the survey shows that the general characteristics of Generation Y are strong in all given situations. Generation Y believe in personal growth by learning and training. Self-confidence is the most recognised of Generation Y’s traits regardless of background, when it comes to work. Gen Yers prefer to work in teams is in order to build up relationships and harmony with the environment to balance their lives.
6.2.2 Why do Gen Yers Need to be Motivated Differently than Other Generations?

As we have stated in our theoretical review, the classical Content Motivation Theories were constructed for generations with different characteristics than Generation Y. The main difference between Generation Y and previous generations are described in chapter 3. Generation Y’s need for Recognition, Belonging, Self-actualisation and Personal growth, in combination with their habit of rapid adaptation and flexibility, makes it necessary to motivate Generation Y according to each situation. The hierarchical order of Maslow’s Pyramid of Needs can therefore not be applied to Generation Y without modifications. The result of our analysis in chapter 5 shows that Generation Y’s characteristics support the Generation Y’s Hierarchy of Needs and Two-Factor Theory.

6.2.3 How do National Culture Values affect Generation Y?

In our analysis in chapter 5 we have shown that the general characteristics of Generation Y are very strong, we have also shown that the National Culture Values of a country can be in conflict with the characteristics of Generation Y. In countries with strong cultural traditions, like China, National Culture Values can take precedence over the general characteristics of Generation Y in certain situations (see chapter 5.3.7 analysis of H7, p 64).

6.2.4 Which Factors will Influence the Motivation process the most? Generation Y’s general characteristics or the National Culture Values?

As shown in our analysis in chapter 5, both National Culture Values and Generation Y’s characteristics can have an effect on the motivation process, depending on the situation. When comparing the answers between the Chinese and the Swedish Gen Yers in our sample groups, we see that in most of our given situations, the general characteristics of Generation Y are stronger than the National Culture Values of our
two countries. However, in some situations concerning Uncertainty Avoidance, Gender Egalitarianism and Institutional Collectivism, the National Culture Values are stronger.

### 6.3 Applicability of the Motivation Models

In chapter 3 we describe how the classical Content Motivation Theories must be adapted according to our research on Generation Y’s general characteristics (see chapter 3.2). The result of the two last hypotheses in our survey, support this research. The modified theories are always applicable to Generation Y, but in some situations, and cultural dimensions, National Culture Values must also be taken into account. In chapter 3.6, we constructed a model describing the connection between Generation Y, their general characteristics, the National Culture Values and the modified motivation theories (see Figure 3.9, p 39). After the analysis we have modified it as shown in Figure 6.1.

![Modified Motivation model for Generation Y.](image)
As we can see in Figure 6.1, Generation Y can be motivated either according to their general characteristics, or according to their National Culture Values. When Generation Y are motivated according to their general characteristics, our modified motivation theories can be used.

### 6.4 Methodological Criticism

Our research was conducted by a survey. The questions in our survey helped us to evaluate Generation Y’s attitude in different cultural dimensions. We build 11 sub-hypotheses that we tested in three different situations. We wanted to find out what seemed to influence Generation Y the most in these situations, their general characteristics or the National Culture Values. During our analysis we have found these concerns worth mentioning.

- Our sample groups might not be representative for Generation Y in our chosen countries.
- The gender composition of our two groups differs, which might affect the result.
- Our survey was done in the student situation; this might have influenced the results in the given situations.
- When translating words from one language to another, they can change connotation; the word/words can be positive in one language and negative in another.
- The questionnaire was not enough to give conclusive results on all our hypotheses; more questions should be added to each hypothesis.

### 6.5 Future Research

Since our survey result was achieved with small sample groups and limited time frame, it is hard to generalise the results. In this dissertation we only compared two countries, China and Sweden, in different situations. Due to this, it was sometimes hard to determine if the lack of significant differences in our result was due to shared
cultural values or shared general characteristics. This made it difficult for us to properly analyse how our sample groups should be motivated in the different situations. It would be interesting to redo the survey with more than two countries.

In order to increase the validity and reliability, the research should be done with larger sample groups. The sample groups should be carefully constructed to be representative for the target populations. The questions should be more detailed and cover more areas of each dimension.

It would also be interesting to do research on Generation Y in other countries. Since Generation Y do not mind moving across borders, it would be interesting to look at the effect of National Culture Values on Generation Y in Europe, perhaps to see how big the differences is between the north and the south.

Much of the research concerning Generation Y’s characteristics is contradictory, in many cases due to the flexibility and ambiguity of Generation Y. Further exploration on these issues would therefore be interesting to gain a more thorough understanding of the characteristics of Generation Y.

All respondents in the GLOBE research belonged to middle management. Since the data that the research is built on was collected between 1994 and 1997 (House et al, 2004) the number of middle management leaders questioned by GLOBE would have been minimal or non-existing. Therefore, it would be interesting to do a small-scale version of the GLOBE study on middle management belonging to Generation Y.

### 6.6 Practical Implications

Our research has shown that Generation Y have a different attitude towards work than previous generations, it has also shown that the general characteristics of Generation Y are very strong. We hope that our findings will offer valuable suggestions for further research, and that this dissertation can help managers, dealing with Generation
Y, gain a better understanding of Generation Y and how to motivate them. We also hope that we have managed to convey the importance of taking National Culture Values in consideration before motivating members of Generation Y.
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Appendix 1a – English Cover Letter

Dear students

We are currently writing our candidate dissertation here at Kristianstad University. Our topic is Generation Y (born 1977-2000) and the influence of National Culture Values. We are doing this survey with two groups, one consisting of Swedish students and one of Chinese students.

We would greatly appreciate if you could help us by filling out this questionnaire.

On the first page you will find some general questions, answering them will help us make sure that you belong to our target population.

The following 31 questions are about your attitude towards certain issues; in general, as a student and as an employee.

We are aware that many of you might not have any previous work experience, but we believe that you still have opinions on what you expect from your future employers and co-workers and we therefore ask you to answer all the questions to the best of your ability.

Thank you for your participation
Maria Pettersson
Aroonwan Kårefalk
Yeqing Zhu
Kära studenter


Denna undersökning görs på två grupper, en med svenska och en med kinesiska studenter.

Vi skulle vara väldigt tacksamma om ni ville hjälpa oss med denna undersökning genom att fylla i vårt frågeformulär.

På första sidan har vi några generella frågor, genom att svara på dem hjälper du oss se till att du tillhör vår målgrupp.

De följande 31 frågorna gäller din attityd i vissa frågor; generellt, som student och som anställd.

Vi är medvetna om att många av er inte har någon arbetslivserfarenhet, men vi tror att ni ändå har åsikter om vad ni förväntar er av framtida arbetsgivare och medarbetare och ber er därför besvara alla frågorna efter bästa förmåga.

Tack för er medverkan
Maria Pettersson
Aroonwan Kårefalk
Yeqing Zhu
Appendix 1c – Chinese Cover Letter

亲爱的同学们:

我们正在进行我们的KRISTIANSTAD大学毕业论文设计，论文是关于新一代
GENERATION Y（出生1977 -2000）和文化对他们一代的影响，我们分2组进行调查，
一组是瑞典商科学生，一组是中国学生。

我们非常感谢你能帮助我们完成问卷调查。

在问卷第一页是关于一般问题，这些问题可以帮助我们确定你是否是我们的目标人群。

接下来的31个问题，想了解你对某些事物的看法：通常看法，作为学生和员工又有何种看法。

我们意识到部分学生可能并没有工作经验，但是我们同样希望能得到你对以后从事工作
或者合作企业的意见和看法，请尽可能的如实回答以下的问题。

非常感谢你的意见和想法

Maria Pettersson
Aroonwan Kårefalk
Yeqing Zhu
Appendix 2a – English Questionnaire

Questionnaire

General:

- Gender?  □ Male  □ Female
- Nationality?  □ Chinese  □ Swedish  □ Other
- Country of birth? ............................................................
- Previous work experience?  □ Yes  □ No
1. In general, it is important to have a personal growth which could lead to a high performance.

   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

2. As a student, I strive to do my best for my results and grades.

   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

3. As an employee, it is / will be very important for me to have a constantly rising salary.

   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

4. In general, being competitive helps a person to achieve better results.

   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

5. As a student, I am competitive when it comes to my studies / education.

   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
6. As an employee, I have / I would like to have control over my work environment.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

7. In general, I put more emphasis on solving current problems than future problems.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

8. As a student, it is important for me to set up goals and plan my studies.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

9. As an employee, I have / will have to plan ahead in order to be successful in an organisation.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

10. My family and friends are more important than my self-interest.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree
11. It is important to me that teachers and friends listen to my ideas.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

12. It is / will be important to me that my colleagues and bosses listen to my ideas.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

13. It is important to me to be loyal to the norm of the society I live in.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

14. It is important to me to be loyal to my work team at school.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

15. As an employee, It is important to be loyal to my project group within the organisation.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree
16. In general, my individual accomplishments are more important than the collective accomplishments of my group.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

17. As a student, my individual accomplishments are more important than my group members’ achievements.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

18. As an employee, I have to / will be loyal to my organisation.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

19. It is important to have equality between men and women.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

20. I think that boys are encouraged more than girls to attain a higher education.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree
21. As an employee, it makes a difference for me if a male or female is my boss.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

22. In general, it is important that followers obey the leader.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

23. As a student, it is important to concentrate and reach the top of my abilities.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

24. As an employee, it is/will be important to me to have direct access to resources and information at work and not have to go through managers to get it.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

25. It is important to have clear rules and regulation in general.

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree
26. As a student, I prefer to have clear rules and regulation at school.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

27. As an employee, I prefer to have clear rules and regulation within an organisation.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

28. It is important to me to improve personal growth by training and education.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

29. I am influenced by social acceptance and friendships.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

30. The recognition and praise at work are/ will be important to me.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
31. I want / would like to be respected by my co-workers

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Neither disagree nor agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
Appendix 2b – Swedish Questionnaire

Frågeformulär

Generellt:

- Kön?  □ Man    □ Kvinna
- Nationalitet?  □ Kinesisk □ Svensk □ Annan
- Födelseland? .................................................................
- Erfarenhet från arbetslivet?  □ Ja □ Nej
1. Generellt, det är viktigt med personlig utveckling för att kunna nå bra resultat.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

2. Som student försöker jag göra mitt bästa för att nå bra resultat och betyg.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

3. Som anställd är det väldigt viktigt för mig att ha en stadigt stigande lön.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls


- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

5. Som student är jag tävlingsinriktad när det gäller mina studier/ min utbildning.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

6. Som anställd vill jag ha kontroll över min arbetsmiljö.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

8. Som student är det viktigt för mig att sätta upp mål och planera mina studier.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

10. Min familj och mina vänner är viktigare än mitt egenintresse.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

11. Det är viktigt för mig att lärare och vänner lyssnar på mina idéer.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls
12. Det är/kommer att vara viktigt för mig att mina arbetskamrater och min chef lyssnar på mina idéer.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

14. Det är viktigt för mig att vara lojal mot mina klasskamrater i skolan.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

15. Som anställd är det viktigt för mig att vara lojal mot min arbetsgrupp inom företaget/organisation.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

16. Generellt, mina individuella bedrifter är viktigare än min grupps gemensamma bedrifter.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls
17. Som student är mina individuella bedrifter viktigare än min grupps bedrifter.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

21. För mig som anställd spelar det roll om min chef är man eller kvinna.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls
22. Generellt, det är viktigt att följa/lyda den som leder.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

23. Som student är det viktigt att jag koncentrerar mig och utnyttjar mina förmågor till max.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

24. Som anställd är det viktigt för mig att ha direkt åtkomst till källor och information och inte behöver gå via en överordnad.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

25. Generellt är det viktigt med klara regler och direktiv.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls

26. Som student vill jag ha klara regler och direktiv i skolan.

- Instämmer helt
- Ingen åsikt
- Instämmer inte alls
27. Som anställd föredrar jag att ha klara regler och direktiv inom organisation.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls


☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

29. Jag är påverkad av social acceptans och mina vänner.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

30. Erkännande och beröm på arbetet är viktigt för mig.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls

31. Jag vill bli respekterad av mina medarbetare.

☐ Instämmer helt
☐ Ingen åsikt
☐ Instämmer inte alls
Appendix 2c – Chinese Questionnaire

**Questionnaire**

**General:**

- **Year of birth?**  
  - □ Before 1977  
  - □ 1977-2000

- **Gender?**  
  - Male □  
  - Female □

- **Nationality?**  
  - □ Chinese  
  - □ Swedish  
  - □ Other

- **Country of birth?**

- **Previous work experience?**  
  - □ Yes  
  - □ No
1. In general, it is important to have a personal growth which could lead to a high performance.

   *的来，使得更好成的个人成是必要的

   □ Strongly Disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

2. As a student, I strive to do my best for my results and grades.

   作学生，我用最大的努力完成我的学

   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

3. As an employee, it is / will be very important for me to have a constantly rising salary.

   作工，有一个能不断上升的薪水是很重要的？

   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

4. In general, being competitive helps a person to achieve better results.

   一般来，成一个有竞争力的人能的更好的成就：

   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

5. As a student, I am competitive when it comes to my studies / education.

   作学生，我在学上是有竞争力的：

   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree
6. As an employee, I have / I would like to have control over my work environment.

   作工，我比意能掌握的我工作境
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

7. In general, I put more emphasis on solving current problems than future problems.

   一般来，比起以后的我更解决当即。
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

8. As a student, it is important for me to set up goals and plan my studies.

   作学生，我的学制定一个目和划是很重要的：
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

9. As an employee, I have / will have to plan ahead in order to be successful in an organisation.

   作工，为了成功我必先制定一个划。
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Neither disagree nor agree
   □ Strongly agree

10. My family and friends are more important than my self-interest.

    我的家庭和朋友比我的个人利益更重要：
    □ Strongly disagree
    □ Neither disagree nor agree
    □ Strongly agree
11. It is important to me that teachers and friends listen to my ideas.

Strongly disagree  
Neither disagree nor agree  
Strongly agree

12. It is / will be important to me that my colleagues and bosses listen to my ideas.

Strongly disagree  
Neither disagree nor agree  
Strongly agree

13. It is important to me to be loyal to the norm of the society I live in.

Strongly disagree  
Neither disagree nor agree  
Strongly agree

14. It is important to me to be loyal to my work team at school.

Strongly disagree  
Neither disagree nor agree  
Strongly agree

15. As an employee, It is important to be loyal to my project group within the organisation.

Strongly disagree  
Neither disagree nor agree  
Strongly agree
16. In general, my individual accomplishments are more important than the collective accomplishments of my group.

一般来


\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly disagree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Neither disagree nor agree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly agree} \]

17. As a student, my individual accomplishments are more important than my group members’ achievements.

作学生，我个人的造比我集体的造更重要。


\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly disagree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Neither disagree nor agree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly agree} \]

18. As an employee, I have to / will be loyal to my organisation.

作工，我个人的造比我集体的造更重要。


\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly disagree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Neither disagree nor agree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly agree} \]

19. It is important to have equality between men and women.

男女平等很重要。


\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly disagree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Neither disagree nor agree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly agree} \]

20. I think that boys are encouraged more than girls to attain a higher education.

我在接受高等教育上，男孩比女孩受到更多的鼓励。


\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly disagree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Neither disagree nor agree} \]
\[ \checkmark \quad \text{Strongly agree} \]
21. As an employee, it makes a difference for me if a male or female is my boss.

作工，男性和女性来是不同的

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

22. In general, it is important that followers obey the leader.

作学生，服从命令很重要

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

23. As a student, it is important to concentrate and reach the top of my abilities.

作学生，集中并得我的能力很重要

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

24. As an employee, it is/will be important to me to have direct access to resources and information at work and not have to go through managers to get it.

作工，在工作中直接得源和信息比通管理者得更重要。

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree

25. It is important to have clear rules and regulation in general.

一般来清楚章制度很重要。

- Strongly disagree
- Neither disagree nor agree
- Strongly agree
26. As a student, I prefer to have clear rules and regulation at school.

作学生，我更意了解学校的章制度：

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

27. As an employee, I prefer to have clear rules and regulation within an organisation.

作工，我更意弄清楚的章制度：

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

28. It is important to me to improve personal growth by training and education.

我来通和教育来改个人的成很重要：

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☑ Strongly agree

29. I am influenced by social acceptance and friendships.

我容易受到社会可和友情的影响

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree

30. The recognition and praise at work are/ will be important to me.

工作中的同和表我很重要：

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☑ Strongly agree
31. I want / would like to be respected from my co-workers.

我意得我的合作伙伴的尊敬？

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neither disagree nor agree
☐ Strongly agree
Appendix 3 – Examples of Questions from the GLOBE research

Examples of questions from the GLOBE research

**Performance Orientation**

1. In society, student are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In organisation, employees are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assertiveness**

1. In society, people are generally: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Nonassertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In society, people are generally: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tough</th>
<th>Tender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In organization, people are generally: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Nonassertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In organization, people are generally: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tough</th>
<th>Tender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Orientation**

1. In society, the accepted norm is to: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for the future</th>
<th>Accept the status quo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In society, people place more emphasis on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solving current problems</th>
<th>Planning for the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The way to be successful in the organisation is to: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan ahead</th>
<th>Take events as they occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In organisation, the accepted norm is to: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for the future</th>
<th>Accept the status quo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Humane Orientation**

1. In society, people are generally: (reverse scored)

   *Very concerned about others*  *Not at all concerned about others*
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. In society, people are generally: (reverse scored)

   *Very sensitive toward others*  *Not at all sensitive toward others*
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. In organisation, people are generally: (reverse scored)

   *Very concerned about others*  *Not at all concerned about others*
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. In organisation, people are generally: (reverse scored)

   *Very sensitive toward others*  *Not at all sensitive toward others*
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Institutional Collectivism**

1. In society, leaders encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer: (reverse scored)

   *Strongly agree*  *Neither agree nor disagree*  *Strongly disagree*
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
2. The economic system in the society is designed to maximize:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual interests</th>
<th>Collective interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In organisation, managers encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The pay and bonus system in an organisation should design to maximize:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual interests</th>
<th>Collective interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In-Group Collectivism**

1. In society, children take pride in the individual accomplishments of their parents: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In society, parents take pride in the individual accomplishments of their children: (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. In organisation, group members take pride in individual accomplishments of their group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In organisation, group managers take pride in the individual accomplishments of group members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender Egalitarianism**

1. In society, boys are encouraged more than girls to attain a higher education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In society, who is more likely to serve in a position of high office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In organisation, men are encouraged to participate in professional development activities more than women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Power Distance**

1. In society, followers are expected to: (reverse scored)

   *Obey their leader*  
   *without question*  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   *Question their leaders*  
   *when in disagreement*  
   8

2. In society, power is: (reverse scored)

   *Concentrated*  
   *at the top*  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   *Shared throughout*  
   *the society*  
   8

3. In organisation, subordinates are expected to:

   *Obey the boss*  
   *without question*  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   *Question the boss*  
   *when in disagreement*  
   8

4. In organisation, a person’s influence is based primarily on:

   *One’s ability and contribution to the organisation*  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
   *The authority of one’s position*  
   8
Uncertainty Avoidance

1. In society, orderliness and consistency are stressed, even at the expense of experimentation and innovation. (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In society, societal requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so citizens know what they are expected to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In organisation, orderliness and consistency are stressed, even at the expense of experimentation and innovation. (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In organisation, job requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so employees know what they are expected to do. (reverse scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 – Schematics of our questionnaire

Part 1

General Questions

- Year of Birth
- Nationality

Generation Y Characteristics

Part 2

H:1 (Question 1 - 3)
Performance Orientation

H:2 (Question 4 - 6)
Assertiveness

H:3 (Question 7-9)
Future Orientation

H:4 (Question 10-12)
Humane Orientation

H:5 (Question 13-15)
Institutional Collectivism

H:6 (Question 16-18)
In-Group Collectivism

H:7 (Question 19-21)
Gender Egalitarianism

H:8 (Question 22-24)
Power Distance

H:9 (Question 25-27)
Uncertainty Avoidance

H:10 (Question 28-29)
Hierarchy of Need

H:11 (Question 30-31)
Two-Factor Theory

National Culture Value

Content Motivation Theories