Work values in tourism: Past, present and future

CrossMark

Emmanouil Papavasileiou [a,*], Sean Lyons [b], Gareth Shaw [c], Anthimos Georgiou [d]

[a] *University of Portsmouth Business School, UK*
[b] *Guelph University, Canada*
[c] *University of Exeter, UK*
[d] *International Management Institute Switzerland, Switzerland*

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

Although work values are important psychological variables in organisations, little research has been done to clarify the way in which work values are conceptualised. We address the need within the field to understand and engage with wider debates within social science literature by presenting an up-to-date review of work values in tourism research and a synthesis of paradigms pertaining to established value models and theories. We reconceptualise work values as a second-order projection of intrinsic, extrinsic, prestige and social types of values in the work settings of tourism. We then test the conceptual validity of this model through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis using data from Japanese tourism workers.

Introduction

For decades, organisational scholars have applied the construct of values to understand personal identification in organisations (Ashforth, Schinoff, & Rogers, 2016). Unfortunately, despite many advances, the work values literature lacks synthesis, making it challenging to apply to practical settings. Leuty and Hansen (2011) concluded that "Little work has been completed to summarize and organize different conceptualisations of work values (p. 381) . . . [and although] the current study provided much needed examination of work values, future research can continue to develop our understanding of the construct" (p. 389).

The application of work values to tourism research goes back to the foundational work of Abraham Pizam and associates, which examined the work values profiles of tourism and hospitality students (Neuman et al., 1980; Pizam & Lewis, 1979; Pizam, Reichel, & Neumann, 1980). The subject resurfaced when Mok, Pine, and Pizam (1998) and Wong and Chung (2003) reported the work value profiles of hotel workers in Hong Kong. Chen and associates twice revisited this theme in the USA, first identifying the work value profiles of three generations of hospitality workers (Chen & Choi, 2008) and then comparing the work values profiles of hospitality workers to hospitality students (Chen & Tesone, 2009). Generational differences in work values were also reported by Gursoy, Chi, and Karadag (2013), using a sample of frontline and service contact employees. Meanwhile, Chu (2008), Wong and Liu (2009) and White (2006) provided evidence of tourism and hospitality students' work value profiles from Taiwan, Hong Kong and a multinational context, respectively.

Unfortunately, each of these studies utilised a different work values typology, an approach that has stymied confusion in work values research within a variety of disciplines, such as management (Gehman, Trevino, & Garud, 2013), vocational behaviour (Leuty & Hansen, 2011) and organisational behaviour (Lyons, Higgins, & Duxbury, 2010). When faced with a body of literature that is mature, but fractured, it is beneficial to critique, synthesize, update and add missing pieces in order to provide a way forward for future developments (Tribe & Liburd, 2016). Our objective is to make such a contribution to the literature concerning work values in tourism.

To accomplish this, we follow the steps for conceptual research identified by Xin, Tribe, and Chambers (2013) and Tribe and Liburd (2016), providing both quantitative (volume and context) and qualitative aspects (comparison of definitions and typologies, conceptual gaps, synthesis and reflection). We begin with an outline of the search strategy and a brief description of the research context, focusing on the size of the samples of the studies under review as well as their occupational and cultural identities. The features recurrently mentioned in the definitions of work values are provided and the method used to derive the typologies is examined. Emphasis is placed on the assessment utilised to extract the work values data, the method of analysis and the derived number of types.

Our analysis reveals a significant gap between the dominant conceptualisation of work values as expressions of values in the work setting and the derived typologies. To address this gap, a series of paradigms pertaining to evolved values model and theories are then presented, reflecting on (a) the meaning of general life values and value systems; (b) the relationship of work values vis-à-vis general life values; (c) the types of work values; and (d) the relationship between the types.

Based on our review, we reconceptualise work values as a second-order expression of intrinsic, extrinsic, prestige and social values in the work setting of tourism. Extending earlier reconceptualisation approaches, such as Reisinger and Steiner (2006) in object authenticity, Russo and Segre (2009) in destination and property regimes and Tribe and Liburd (2016) in tourism knowledge systems, we provide evidence of conceptual validity by means of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The analysis is based on data from the 2008[1] *Working Persons Survey* (WPS) in Japan. Our conceptualisation reveals a better fit when compared against structurally competing models (i.e., all items loaded into one factor and a first-order equivalent) as well as alternative theoretically derived models (i.e., second-order with three factors and an intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomisation).

Work values in tourism research

Search strategy

Our search strategy was designed to find empirical quantitative studies about values related to the supply element of tourism, the human capital (i.e., students) and the labour force. The search period was from February 1979 – the year Pizam and Lewis's seminal article *"Work Values of Hospitality Students"* was published – to December 2015. We first identified relevant published studies, using Scopus and ISI Web of Knowledge (WoK), the leading online international databases for tourism publications (Figueroa-Domecq, Pritchard, Segovia-Pérez, Morgan, & Villacé-Molinero, 2015). The search terms applied in all cases were "tourism", "hospitality", "leisure", "values" and "work values". Relevant studies were identified by examining their title, abstract and the full text (Phillips & Moutinho, 2014). Studies that focused on the role of values in the production element of tourism, such as tourist shopping behaviour (Choi, Heo, & Law, 2015) were excluded. Similarly, papers with a qualitative research focus such as Gursoy, Maier, and Chi's (2008) in-depth focus group discussion study of work values and generational gaps of US hotel workers were excluded.

The first search identified 14 empirical studies of work values published in six academic journals (i.e., Annals of Tourism Research; International Journal of Hospitality Management; International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management; Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research; The Service Industries Journal; Tourism Management). Second, the search of previous reviews within the wider organisational studies such as Parry and Urwin (2011) resulted in the inclusion of Chen and Choi's (2008) study. Third, using Google Scholar, we searched the studies that cited the fifteen previously identified cases. This procedure added three papers (Chen & Tesone, 2009; Koroglu & Gezen, 2014; Wong & Liu, 2009) resulting in a total sample of eighteen empirical tourism studies of work values published from 1979 to 2014.

A two wave history

In the late-1970s and early-1980s, tourism scholars were amongst the first researchers to provide distinct work value profiles within the organisational context. Despite this important early contribution concerning the motivational impacts of work values, further research in tourism stagnated for almost two decades. The partial decoupling in the 1980s and 1990s of tourism research from that in general management and social sciences (Shaw & Williams, 2009) and the relative neglect of research, at that time, in the area of tourism supply (Baum, Kralj, Robinson, & Solnet, 2016; Ladkin, 2011) probably played a role in the decline in empirical research. However, the phenomenal growth of tourism employment over the last 20 years has raised concerns about people resourcing, which has been recognised as the most challenging issue for practitioners in the industry (Baum et al., 2016; Ladkin, 2011). As the world of work has evolved, due to changes imposed by political,

---

[1] We use the 2008 data because later years do not include the necessary assessment of work values.