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Chapter 1

Introduction
1.1 The causes and consequences of work values

For most employees a job is a means of subsistence. Although pay is a very important aspect of a job, work serves more functions than only a financial one. It also has important psychosocial meanings, such as being able to contribute to society or having the opportunity to make the most of one’s potential. What people value in their job is a research subject of growing interest (see for instance Elizur 1984, 1994; Ester, Braun and Vinken 2006; Frieze, Olson, Murrell and Selvan 2006; Gallie 2007; Gesthuizen and Verbakel 2011; Gooderman, Nordhaug, Ringdal and Birkeland 2004; Hirschi 2010; Johnson and Elder 2002; Johnson et al. 2007; Kalleberg 1977; Kanchier and Unruh 1989; Roe and Ester 1999; Ros, Schwartz and Surkiss 1999). Studies on the subject differ in their focus. Research on work values can be roughly divided into three clusters (see Sagie, Elizur and Koslowsky 1996; cf. Hitlin and Piliavin 2004). The first cluster concentrates on the grouping of work values. Not all employees consider all job aspects equally important. By grouping job aspects preferred by employees, we gain insights into the individual’s work orientation, i.e. the individual’s perspective on the nature and meaning of work. The second cluster deals with the origins of work values and thus with work values as a dependent variable. Since work has no inherent meaning in itself, what is desirable in a job is socially acquired. Individual characteristics, such as educational attainment, gender and age, influence what people consider important in a job (Bridges 1989; Johnson and Elder 2002; Kalleberg and Losocco 1983; Kohn 1977; Marini et al. 1996). The third cluster of studies deals with work values as an independent variable and correlates work values with work-related behaviour. It thus considers the effects of work values. It is important to integrate insights from the different clusters of work value research to come to a complete picture of the causes and consequences of work values. Only in combining the findings of the several clusters in work value research we are able to contribute substantially to studies on work values and labour market behaviour.

With the insights of the first cluster of studies this thesis seeks to contribute to filling research gaps in the second and third clusters of work value studies. The main research question of the thesis is: how do work values emerge, and what are the consequences of work values for labour market behaviour? To answer this question, the thesis is divided into four sub-questions:
(1) To what extent is the variation in employees’ work values systematically related to labour market characteristics on the national level? Furthermore, do labour market characteristics affect work values of employees in precarious work positions differently from those of workers in more advantageous work positions?

We tackle this question by employing a cross-national comparative research design and multi-level analyses. Using data of the European Value Study (EVS) we investigate how labour market characteristics, such as the (generosity of the) unemployment benefit scheme, employment protection legislation and the degree of wage setting coordination, correlate with specific aspects individual workers consider important in a job.

(2) To what extent do work values influence labour market behaviour? More specifically, how do work values affect the decision of employees to change jobs voluntarily?

Even though it is generally believed that modern societies have seen an increasing emphasis on personal decisions and responsibility in shaping employment trajectories (Heinz 2003), few studies so far have investigated what role work values play for individual job mobility (Nitsche and Mayer 2011). To address this question, we use data from the Dutch Institute for Labour Studies (OSA) and apply event history analysis to assess whether different kinds of work values are related to different types of voluntary job mobility.

(3) To what extent do work values explain forced job endings among male and female workers?

The motivation of this question originates in the common assumption that work values mainly influence job changes that workers initiated themselves. This assumption, however, has not been tested empirically. We use OSA data and apply event history analyses to assess whether work values have no effect on forced job endings. Because forced job endings come with a right to receive unemployment benefits whereas voluntary endings do not, it has been argued that unemployment can serve as an alternative labour market status for people who actually fulfil care-giving duties at home (Grunow
To examine whether this assumption holds for the Dutch case, we separate men's forced termination of the employment contract from that of women.

(4) To what extent do peers affect the decision of workers to change jobs?

In acting, individuals compare themselves to reference groups and thus to their peers (Wiener 1982). Some authors suggest that the behavioural rules of peers, i.e. social norms, incorporate the effect of values on individual behaviour (Fishbein 1967; Jaccard and Davidson 1975; Pomazel and Jaccard 1976; Schwartz and Tessler 1972; Wiener 1982). When the line of thought of these authors is correct the effects of work values on individual job changing behaviour would disappear once the behaviour of peers is controlled for; the effect of work values would run through the job changing behaviour of peers (cf. Bardi and Schwartz 2003). We investigate whether individual work values are indeed set aside by the actions of peers. In our analysis, we draw on OSA data and employ event history analysis.

We will put the four sub-questions in the context of research on job mobility and work values and elucidate the relevance of our questions for these fields of study. Before delving into the sub-questions, we start with a brief description of what (work) values are and to what extent they differ from attitudes, interests, traits, norms and needs.

1.2 What are (work) values?

Values have been studied among several disciplines. Within psychology, the study of values has a long history (Hilin and Piliavin 2004; for some studies on values, see Allport 1961; Allport and Vernon 1931; Chatman 1989; Dawis and Lofquist 1984; Judge and Bretz 1992; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson 2005; Meglino and Ravlin 1998; Ravlin and Meglino 1987). Values are studied within sociology as well (see Baier and Rescher 1969; Chase 1965; Inglehart 1977, 1990, 1997; Kohn 1977; Kohn and Schooler 1969; Riesman 1950; for an overview of research on values in sociology see Spates 1983 and for their relevance for social science research see Hechter 1992).
Values have also been examined in philosophy (see for example Gaus 1990) and political science (see for instance Rawls 1971).

Since values are studied across several disciplines, there are also several definitions of values. An influential one is that of Kluckhohn (1951): “A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable, which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action (395).” With his definition Kluckhohn (1951) suggests that values necessarily lead to action. Another common definition of values is from Rokeach (1973). He states that values are “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach 1973: 5). In Rokeach’s view, values do not necessarily lead to action but give meaning to action. What these two definitions of values (and most other definitions) have in common, according to Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), can be summarized in the following five features: “values are (a) concepts or beliefs (b) about desirable end-states or behaviours (c) that transcend specific situations, (d) guide selection or evaluation of behaviour and events and (e) are ordered by relative importance” (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987: 551).

Values are often mixed up with (at least) the following concepts: attitudes, interests, traits, norms and needs (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004; Marini 2000; Meglino and Ravlin 1998).\footnote{It is only a selection of concepts that are mixed up with values. Pleasures, likes, preferences, duties, moral obligations, desires, wants, goals, aversions, attractions, personality types, utilities, motives, motivations and non-existent mental entities are other concepts that are considered as values as well (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004; Marini 2000; Meglino and Ravlin 1998).} As a concept, values differ from attitudes. Values hold a higher place in a person’s hierarchy of beliefs than attitudes (Rokeach 1973). This is because values focus on ideals; they are more abstract, whereas attitudes are people’s beliefs about specific objects or situations. Attitudes can thus be either positive or negative. Values are always positive, because they represent a person’s preference. Values and attitudes also deviate in their level of stability; values are more persistent than attitudes. Less specific than attitudes but more specific than values are interests (Dawis 1991; Roe 1981). Interests refer to a person’s preference or liking for particular types of activities. On the individual level, it is hard to separate interests from values. What tells them apart is that interests are not shared socially within larger groups or communities, whereas values are. Traits differ from values in that traits are fixed aspects of a personality. Traits
are stable characteristics of a person, whereas values are a person’s enduring goals. Like attitudes, but unlike values, traits can be positive or negative (Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz and Knafo 2002). Values serve to justify behaviour as legitimate and thus as standards for judging the individual’s own behaviour and the behaviour of others (Hiltin and Piliavin 2004). Norms are different from values, because norms apply to specific situations, whereas values are trans-situational. Furthermore, values are beliefs about the desirability of behaviour, and norms are beliefs about the acceptability of behaviour (Marini 2000). Norms indicate whether behaviour is regarded as right or wrong or as permissible or impermissible. People who act in accordance with their values, are more in control of their behaviour than people who act in accordance with norms. Norms push people to act in a certain way and thus sanction people who do not act as the norms prescribe. What norms and values have in common, is that both are group-level phenomena that require shared agreement (Hiltin and Piliavin 2004). Values are, however, measured as individual-level constructs. Finally, values differ from needs. Needs are requirements for the continued performance of an activity and the attainment of other valued outcomes (Emerson 1987). Needs thus involve a deficit that imposes a requirement, whereas values entail motivations that are based on beliefs about desirability. Needs might have a biological basis but could be psychological as well. In the latter case, they are often derived from the persistent frustration of important goals (Marini 2000). Values may arise from needs. Values are then cognitive transformations of specific needs and thus serve as socially acceptable ways of articulating needs (Hiltin and Piliavin 2004). However, not all needs are changed into values, and not all values originate from needs (Marini 2000).

All values people adhere to, are part of their value system (Brown 2002). This system includes general life values but also values on a specific domain, such as family or work. Due to the importance of the work role in modern society, work values take a fundamental position in the system of values (Roe and Ester 1999). In modern societies, work values are considered as “salient, basic and influential” (Roe and Ester 1999: 5). Work values are the values that individuals believe should be satisfied as a result of their participation in the work role (Brown 2002).
1.3 The origins of work values

*Are employee work values systematically related to labour market characteristics?*

Good pay, job security, interesting work tasks or work activities that contribute to society are some aspects of a job that workers could consider important. Not all employees value these job characteristics to the same extent. To gain insight in workers’ perspectives on the nature and meaning of work – the topic of the first cluster of work value research – we need to group workers’ preferred job characteristics. A common classification is to divide work into an extrinsic component and intrinsic element (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman 1959). Employees who emphasize the importance of working conditions, such as income and job security, high-prestige jobs and power positions, have an extrinsic work orientation. Employees who stress the importance of the nature of their work tasks, have an intrinsic work orientation.

Work has no inherent meaning. What is desirable in a job is socially acquired. The socialization process thus plays an important role in people’s preferred job aspects. Research belonging to the second cluster of work value research shows that work values emerge along the dimensions of gender and education. Women value intrinsic job aspects slightly more than men do, whereas men and women hardly differ in their preference for extrinsic job aspects (Marini et al. 1996; Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb and Corrigall 2000; Hagström and Kjellberg 2007). Studies on the origins of work values also demonstrate that more highly-educated workers assess jobs more by their intrinsic characteristics, whereas workers with a lower educational level evaluate jobs more on their extrinsic features (Kohn 1977; Johnson and Elder 2002). Besides these effects of education on work values, it is likely that education indirectly affects employees’ preferred job aspects. Initial education prepares students for their future life as workers. Students’ work values reflect their expectations of labour market requirements (Dæhlen’s (2005) interpretation of Freidson (2001)). It is therefore likely that labour market characteristics (through initial education) affect the work values of (future) employees. Research on the relationship between labour market characteristics and work values of employees, however, is limited. Only a few studies investigated whether labour market attributes affect job aspects workers prefer (Gallie 2007; Gesthuizen and Verbakel 2011). In employing OLS regressions with country dummies, Gallie (2007) examines
the impact of country characteristics through the change in country regression coefficients by adding subsequent specific subsets of variables ((1) characteristics of the workforce and the nature of the economic structure, (2) characteristics of the welfare state, and (3) variables representing the quality of work). Gallie (2007) concludes that differences in the composition of the workforce (in particular in educational levels) explain the larger part of variation between countries. He, too, finds support for the view that countries investing in the improvement of job quality influence employees’ job preferences. These countries have a workforce with a stronger intrinsic work orientation. By applying OLS regressions, however, it is hard to tell whether individual characteristics have a systematically differential impact on work motivations, depending on the institutional setting within which people work. It thus remains unclear whether, for example, the generosity of the unemployment benefits scheme or the level of employment protection affects employee work values. Due to the hierarchical data structure, multi-level modelling is a better-suited research technique than OLS regressions to test the effects of country-specific characteristics on individual work values. Using multi-level models, Gesthuizen and Verbakel (2011) assess the relationship between country characteristics and employee work values. They find that human capital investments lower the importance workers attach to extrinsic job aspects. Furthermore, the quality of the labour market also has a negative effect on workers’ extrinsic job preferences. Finally, Gesthuizen and Verbakel’s (2011) analyses for an indicator of the protection of workers against economic deprivation show that the better workers are protected from economic deprivation, the more important intrinsic job aspects become.

Both Gallie (2007) and Gesthuizen and Verbakel (2011) apply Ingleharts’ (1990) interpretation of Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy in needs to workers’ preferred job aspects. People’s preferences reflect their socio-economic position, i.e. they will attach importance to what is scarce. Applying Inglehart’s (1990) ideas to jobs, means that workers in unsafe or insecure labour situations consider extrinsic work values more important than intrinsic work values. The preferred extrinsic job aspects are insufficiently satisfied in these unsafe and insecure labour situations. However, employees in safe or secure labour situations have fulfilled their basic needs and could therefore (also) focus on the realization of higher needs, i.e. the intrinsic aspects of a job. In their studies, Gallie (2007) and Gesthuizen and Verbakel (2011) assume that labour market arrangements safeguard basic human needs and therefore
help workers to relax their focus on extrinsic work values and to strengthen their attention to intrinsic work values. Both studies thus expect that labour market characteristics have a comparable effect on all workers, regardless of their socio-economic positions. We believe that the indicators of economic deprivation on the national level interact with the indicators of economic deprivation on the individual level. We thus expect that work values of employees in more precarious work positions are differently affected by labour market characteristics than the preferred job aspects of workers in more favourable job positions. Employees in poor-quality jobs probably benefit most from the labour market arrangements. In Chapter 2 of this thesis, we will therefore examine the effects of labour market characteristics on work values of employees in precarious and more favourable job positions, using multi-level modelling. We assess the relationships between extrinsic and intrinsic work values of employees and the following labour market characteristics: (1) the generosity of the unemployment benefit scheme, (2) employment protection legislation, (3) the wage setting coordination, (4) the distribution of incomes, and (5) the growth in unemployment rate.

1.4 The impact of work values on labour market behaviour

Are work values related to the decision of workers to change jobs voluntarily? Theoretically, there is little debate on the influence of values on individual behaviour. Values affect behaviour directly, because they encourage individuals to act in accordance with their values (Meglino and Ravlin 1998). Values are thus one of the forces that affect behaviour (Rokeach 1973). Still, the impact of work values on work-related behaviour received much less attention in empirical research than effects of the socio-structural setting. One of the work-related activities for which the influence of work values is surveyed, is organizational commitment. On the basis of cross-sectional data for East-Asia, Putti, Aryee and Liang (1989) demonstrate that individuals who attach importance to intrinsic work values in particular, are more loyal to the firm than individuals who stress the importance of extrinsic job aspects. Another work activity that has been associated with work values is job performance. England and Lee (1974) find that more successful managers value ‘achievement’. Replicating England and Lee’s (1974) study for male and female managers with longitudinal data, Frieze, Olson,
Murrell and Selvan (2006) discover that work values are the key variables in explaining pay for both male and female managers. A more extrinsic work orientation affects earnings positively. Frieze et al. (2006) also find that work values are correlated with the number of hours worked, promotions and job changes. The few studies that have looked into the relationship between work values and work-related activities empirically so far, demonstrate that the theoretical notion that values influence behaviour is supported. With this thesis, we especially aim at adding to the studies on the relationship between work values and work-related behaviour, and thus at contributing to filling a gap in the third cluster of work value research. In Chapter 3, we will therefore examine first of all how work values influence the voluntary decision of employees to change jobs.

In contemporary labour markets, workers with stable careers sustained throughout their working lives are becoming increasingly rare. The higher volatility of employment careers is mostly seen as the result of increased levels of involuntary mobility. For German workers, however, Mayer, Grunow and Nitsche (2010) show that the volatility could also be the result of increased voluntary job changes. Consequently, it is thus important to understand why people change or have to change jobs in volatile labour markets. Examining the significance of work values for job mobility helps to understand what makes people job-mobile.

Workers who take up a job, do not know a priori whether the characteristics of a job and their expectations match. Only after taking up the job, do they learn what the job is all about (Johnson 1978; Jovanovic 1979). When workers’ expectations are met, it is likely that they are satisfied with their job, which in turn makes them less prone to a job change (Freeman 1978). Whether employees are satisfied with their job is influenced by the perceived job rewards and work values (Kalleberg 1977). Kanchier and Unruh’s (1989) study, one of the few that explicitly includes work values in studying job mobility, demonstrates that work values matter for managers’ decisions to change jobs. Their study, however, is limited to one specific occupational group and is based on cross-sectional data from the 1980s. In a recent theoretical study on the determinants of job mobility, the importance of work values for the decision of employees to change jobs is emphasized (Ng, Sorensen, Eby and Feldman 2007). The authors expect that work values will even be more important in workers’ future job changes, because work values especially guide behaviour in ‘weak situations’ (e.g. in situations
without incentives or limitations) and because current (and future) careers are increasingly self-directed. Work values will therefore affect future labour market behaviour more prominently (Ng et al. 2007).

Hence, the aim in Chapter 3 of this thesis is to explore the impact of work values on voluntary job mobility. More specifically, the focus is on finding out whether the importance employees attach to the various job characteristics influences the kind of job change they make. We distinguish between two types of job changes. The first type involves changes that aim to improve the extrinsic aspects of a job. The second type of job mobility is intended to enhance the intrinsic characteristics of a job. We expect that extrinsic work values are likely to have a positive effect on the job changes that intend to improve the extrinsic job aspects. As extrinsic and intrinsic work values are not necessarily opposite ends of a continuum, intrinsic work values could have a negative effect on the extrinsically motivated job mobility, but they could also have no effect at all. For the intrinsic work values we assume that they increase the probability that workers make an intrinsically motivated job change. Extrinsic work values, on the other hand, could either have a negative effect or no effect at all on intrinsically motivated job mobility.

Can work values explain forced job endings among male and female workers?

As a result of global competitive pressures, downsizing – the option to end the employment relationship of workers involuntarily – has become a norm in many firms and countries over the past decades (Datta, Gutherie, Basuil and Pandey 2010). Researchers who study involuntary job endings, stress the conceptual differences between forced and voluntary job endings and expect voluntary and involuntary turnover to have different determinants and effects (Batt and Colvin 2011; Barrick, Mount and Strauss 1994; Donaghue and Castle 2006; Iverson and Pullman 2000; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins and Gupta 1998). The results of studies, however, are mixed. In Chapter 3, we examine whether work values affect voluntary job mobility. We expect that work values mainly influence job changes that workers initiate themselves. To examine whether our assumption is correct, we investigate in Chapter 4 whether the forced job changes of employees are indeed unaffected by what workers consider important in a job.

Labour market careers of workers are strongly affected by gender. The differences in careers are a result of differences in preferences between male
and female workers. Women tend to choose jobs and working hours that do not interfere with family obligations (Drobnič, Blossfeld and Rohwer 1999; Hakim 1997). Women therefore leave the labour market more often than men, and women also work fewer hours per week than male workers. Forced job endings come with a right to receive unemployment benefits. It has been argued that unemployment can serve as an alternative labour market status for people who actually fulfil care-giving duties at home (Grunow 2006; Leth-Sørensen and Rohwer 1997; Nielsen, Simonsen and Verner 2003). However, there is hardly any research on whether there are any gender differences in involuntary job mobility (see Wilkins and Wood 2011). To examine whether there are differences in lay-offs between Dutch men and women, we separate men’s forced termination of the employment contract from that of women. In Chapter 4, we focus on whether work values affect the ending of employment relationships among female and male workers, thus filling a gap in research. The general claim in Chapter 4 is that workers with strong preferences for specific job characteristics are less likely to experience a forced discontinuation of their employment relationship than workers with less strong preferences for specific job characteristics. After all, workers with a strong preference for a specific job aspect will probably have moved voluntarily already.

Do peers affect the decision of workers to change jobs voluntarily?

At the turn of the 20th century, Veblen (1899) revealed that human interactions are important for individual behaviour. The actions of ‘others’ with whom people compare themselves, function as behavioural rules or as ‘social norms’. Peer actions give people guidance on the appropriateness of behaviour in a given situation (Bicchieri 2006; Coleman 1990; Ellickson 2001; Elster 1989; Horne 2001; Voss 2001). The behaviour of peers is, similar to individual behaviour, affected by values. The values on which peer actions are based, operate as ‘social values’ for the individual. Hence, what the individual’s social group considers important in a job – social work values – influences peer behaviour, which in turn affects the individual’s behaviour.

Some authors suggest that the influence of peers that runs through social norms, or ‘subjective norms’ as they call it, is determined not only by the individual’s beliefs of how others expect him to act, but also by the individual’s personal normative beliefs (Fishbein 1967; Jaccard and Davidson 1975; Pomazel and Jaccard 1976; Schwartz and Tessler 1972; Wiener 1982). These latter beliefs are personal moral standards with respect to a given
behaviour (Wiener 1982) and are thus comparable to an individual’s values, because values are “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach 1973: 5).

Peer influence on individual behaviour, running through social values, could thus already be incorporated in the individual’s values. However, this is not necessarily the case. Bardi and Schwartz (2003) state that people conform to norms even when the norms are opposed to their own values.

The effect of the social group on individual behaviour has been tested empirically for a number of topics. Researchers show, for instance, that peers influence whether individuals buy (publicly or privately consumed) products (of particular brands) (Bearden and Etzel 1982; Childers and Rao 1992), whether individuals participate in the stock market (Kaustia and Knüpfer 2011) or whether adolescents drink alcohol (Clark and Lohéac 2007) or smoke (Huisman and Bruggeman, forthcoming) and how happy individuals are with their income (Ferrer-i-Carbonell 2003: 57–75). For labour market behaviour researchers find that although workers care about their own wage payments, they are also concerned about their colleagues’ wages (Akerlof 1982). For female workers peers even influence if women work (Romme 1990; Woittiez and Kapteyn 1998) and, if so, the number of hours they would like to work (Woittiez and Kapteyn 1998). In studies on voluntary job mobility, however, the fact that peers might affect workers’ decisions to change jobs is mainly neglected. One of the few researchers who have looked into the relationship between job choice and social influence is Higgins (2001a and 2001b). For young, recently graduated MBA students, she investigates whether social influence has an impact on their decision to change careers (Higgins, 2001b). Her analyses show that peers have a significant effect on the choice of employer. In her study, though, Higgins (2001b) relies on cross-sectional data and focuses on one specific group of employees.

In Chapter 5, we examine how social norms, measured indirectly through the job changing behaviour of peers, affect the decision of workers to change jobs. To assess whether the peers’ job changing behaviour substitutes or opposes individual work values, we control for job aspects preferred by employees in our analyses. We assume that the influence of the social group on job mobility comes to light especially when the decision of workers to change jobs deviates from the job changing behaviour of the social group. It is therefore likely that
employees who have held fewer jobs than their social group, are more likely to change jobs than workers who have held a comparable number of jobs as their peers have. Furthermore, we expect that workers who are more job-mobile than their social group are less likely to change jobs than workers who have made a similar number of job changes as their social group has.

1.5 Visual overview of the study

In Figure 1, we present what our study aims to explore. With this study we contribute to filling gaps in work value research. In this section, we briefly summarize what the different chapters in this study aim to examine and how the individual chapters are related. In Chapter 2, we start with investigating how work values emerge, and we pay special attention to the impact of labour market characteristics on individual work values. Insights in the origins of work values make it easier to understand how work values might affect behaviour. In the following chapters we therefore look at the impact of work values on workers’ voluntary and forced endings. In Chapter 3, we assess the relationship between job aspects workers prefer and their likelihood to change jobs voluntarily. We expect that work values mainly function as a motivator for individual decision-making. In Chapter 4, we therefore examine whether work values also affect forced job endings among employees. We assume they do not influence the forced transitions on the labour market. Finally, we assess the relationship between social norms on job mobility and individual job mobility. The impact of work values might disappear when we take social norms (the job changing behaviour of peers) into account, as social norms could possibly have incorporated individual work values among employees. In Chapter 5, therefore, we assess whether social norms substitute or oppose the influence of individual work values on individual job mobility.
1.6 Research approach

The contribution of this thesis is not only in exploring mainly uncharted territory in work value research and job mobility studies but also in the research approach.

In some studies on the relationship between labour market characteristics and work values OLS regressions are used, whereas, multi-level modelling is a better research technique to test whether job preferences of workers are systematically related to labour market characteristics, due to the hierarchical structure of the data. In this thesis, we will use multi-level models to explore the relationship between the labour market and work values.

In studies conducted so far on the influence of work values on work-related behaviour, mainly cross-sectional data are used. In the studies in which such data are used, the researchers have to rely on the assumption that job values affect job mobility later on. Ideally, data with a longitudinal design should be used in research where the impact of values on behavioural outcomes is tested. Such a test is offered in our study. To make optimum use
of the longitudinal character of our data, we employ event history analysis. In such analysis, also called a ‘hazard model’, the ‘risk’ of experiencing an event at a certain point in time is predicted with a set of covariates.

Throughout this thesis, we use two data sources: the European Value Study (EVS), in Chapter 2, and data from the Dutch Institute for Labour Studies (OSA), in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. In the remainder of this section, we will give a brief description of these data sets.

**European Value Study (EVS)**
The EVS is a large-scale, repeated cross-national survey on basic human values. It is used to investigate the ideas, beliefs, preferences, attitudes, values and opinions on life, family, work, religion, politics and society of European citizens. In the first stage of the EVS, in 1981, one thousand citizens were interviewed in 13 participating European countries by means of standardized questionnaires. Every nine years, the survey is repeated in an increasing number of countries. The fourth wave in 2008 covered 47 European countries and regions. In total, about 70,000 people in Europe were interviewed (http://www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu/evs/about-evs/). In this thesis, we use the 1999 data. In 1999, representative national samples for 32 European countries and regions were interviewed. In all countries, the surveys were executed through face-to-face interviews. The interviewees were adult citizens aged 18 years and older. No upper age limit was imposed (Halman 2001). The EVS data are used in numerous studies. In his influential studies on values and post modernization Inglehart (1977, 1990, 1999) used EVS data. Other studies that need to be mentioned are Lück’s studies (2009, 2010) on changing gender roles and on combining family life, career and job mobility. Some other important studies that are related to our research topic are Ester, Braun and Vinken (2006); De Witte, Halman and Gelissen (2004); and Gesthuizen and Verbakel (2011).

**Data of the Dutch Institute of Labour Studies (OSA)**
The data set of the Labour Supply Panel of the Dutch Institute for Labour Studies (OSA) has led to valuable insights on job mobility (see for example Gesthuizen 2009; Gesthuizen and Dagevos 2007) and the Dutch labour market in general (see for instance Hartog and Ophem 1994; Gesthuizen and Wolbers 2010; De Grip, Heijke and Willems 1998; Mooi-Reçi 2008; Wolbers 2011). The OSA collects data for households of which the main breadwinner is between 16 and 64 years old. All other members of the household are
questioned as well, as long as they are in the age category of 16- to 64-year-olds, and as long as they are not in full-time education or compulsory military service.

The interviewees provide information on individual characteristics (like gender and date of birth), household characteristics (such as marital status and number of children), social origin, income or other financial resources, attended education and training, job changes (like the date of job change, the kind of job change and reasons to change jobs), and opinions on paid labour and their current job. The OSA started collecting data in April 1985. The survey was replicated in September of the next year. From that moment on, respondents have been interviewed every two years about (changes in) their household situation, the labour market situation and/or their opinions. The data on the aspects respondents generally consider important in a job – our main independent variable in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 – were collected in the 1992 survey. To test the impact of work values on voluntary and forced job mobility, we start the analyses for these chapters with data of the 1992 survey. Our window of observation ends with data of the 2004 survey.
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