



# The Implication of Work Values of Graduating Senior High School Students to College Readiness

Ruby B. Dimas<sup>1</sup>

Journal for Educators, Teachers, and Trainers, Vol. 13 (5)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 10 Aug 2022

Date of revision: 10 Oct 2022

Date of acceptance: 12 Oct 2022

**Ruby B. Dimas. Work Values of Graduating Senior High School Students: Its Implication to College Readiness. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 13(5). 109 – 119.**

---

Faculty member, Isabela State University, San Mariano Campus, Philippines



## **The Implication of Work Values of Graduating Senior High School Students to College Readiness**

**Ruby B. Dimas**

Email: rubydimas101@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

The study utilized a descriptive research method using Donald Super's Work Values Questionnaire in tracing the work values of 317 Grade 11 and 12 Senior High School Students of San Mariano National High School, San Mariano, Isabela. Mean, standard deviation, and analysis of variance with the Tukey test as post hoc was used in the interpretation of the data gathered. The significant differences in the work values of the students and the impact of the courses taken from the respondents on their work values in the workplace, working environment, interactions with co-workers, and work activities, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted, and Tukey HSD as post hoc test also conducted to the significant indicator. Generally, there was a significant relationship among the assessments of the senior high school students. The result confirms that the perceptions of the respondents on work values are almost the same. The work values of the senior high school students in the different strands are generally high and were considered important. While the work values in the workplace and the work values in activities significantly predict the work values of the senior high school except for work values with a co-worker. This connotes that there was no significant relationship in the assessment of the senior high school students to these variables. Educational authorities will cater to the need to strengthen the determined weaknesses in the work values in their workplace, working environment, interaction with co-workers, and work values activities; design intervention programs and activities to enhance specific dimensions of each work value subscale on values training and a case study to determine the effectiveness of the interventions initiated is suggested.

---

**Keywords:** Working Environment, Work Values, Work Values Activities

### **INTRODUCTION**

Values are standards and beliefs of an individual person which serve as a guide or direction in his or her role in society. These are abstract psychological concepts such as interests, inclinations, attitudes, and ways of decision-making. In this sense, they are standards, showing 'what ought to be' and direct and impact behavior (Chen, P. & Choi, Y, 2008). Within the perspective of work, Dose characterized work values as, "evaluative guidelines relative to work or the work environment by which people perceive what is 'right' or survey the significance of preferences" (Dose, J. J. ,1997). This definition adjusts to the primary conceptualization of 'work values' as proposed by Donald Super within the 1950s who characterized the term as "an objective, either a mental state, a relationship, or material condition, that one looks for to attain (Super, 1980). Encompassing the definition, Lyons (2003), Higgins, and Duxbury (2009) characterize work values as worldwide standards on the relative attractive quality of diverse highlights of work (e.g. pay, self-sufficiency, working conditions), and work relative results (e.g. achievement, self-esteem, self-fulfillment) that speak to cognitive expressions of the different needs or objectives that are tended to through one's work and working, financial related security, social interaction, mental stimulation, status, regard, and self-actualization needs. This proposes that work values are angles of individuals' working



lives that are critical and significant to them. It has concurred that work values are a subset of common ‘human values’<sup>6</sup> and contended that these are “hierarchically ordered” in individuals’ minds agreeing with their significance to the person (Lycos, 2003) and Lycos, et.al, 2009)

Indeed, the desire of people to be gainfully engaged in a job and work primarily to fulfill the main purpose of studying for many years is a natural inclination. Entering the world of work is not a joke for it entails one being ready to accept the duties and responsibilities attached to the job applied for. Likewise, the performance of tasks should be done excellently to contribute to the realization of the company’s vision and mission. This cannot be achieved alone by a single employee. One is expected to know how to work well with other employees and of course with the head of the unit and the head of the organization as well as the community people. The work environment plays a crucial role for the employees. Nowadays, employees may have many working alternatives, and the environment in the workplace becomes a critical factor for accepting and/or keeping jobs. The quality of the environment in the workplace may simply determine the level of employee motivation, subsequent performance, and productivity (Roe and Ester, 1999) and (Karen, 2002).

The success and/or failure of individuals in the world of work may be attributed greatly to the values they have towards work. For those who succeed, they possessed the needed work values not only personal attributes but social attributes as well. Employees, regardless of their status (permanent, temporary, casual, student-trainee, etc.) are satisfied or dissatisfied, productive, or not productive, motivated, or not motivated can be attributed to how they perceive work values.

As per the K to 12 programs of the Department of Education (DepEd), the Graduating Senior High School Students of San Mariano National High School were deployed at Isabela State University, San Mariano Campus for their immersion activity. As a part of their curriculum, they need to undergo this phase to be acquainted with the world of work. Specifically, acquire knowledge and skills, and imbibe within themselves appropriate attitudes and values towards work. Also, this is a training ground for them to be ready when they will be entering college. It is noteworthy to consider therefore that the work values perception of employees and student-trainees in the organization is a great factor in the organization’s success and productivity. Hence, this study.

### **Objectives**

This study assesses the Work Values of Graduating Senior High School Students: Its Implication to College Readiness. Specifically, it sought to 1. determine the work values of the immersed senior high school students in the following sub-scales work values in the workplace, in the working environment, with co-workers, and in activities. This research also determines if there is a significant difference in the work values of the students across different tracks and the implications of their work values.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The study utilized a descriptive research method to trace the work values. According to De Leon et al, 2012, descriptive survey research is an organized attempt to analyze, interpret, and report the present institutions. It deals with the cross-section of the present time. Its purpose is to get groups of classified, generalized, and interpreted data for the guidance of application in the immediate future.



### **Participants**

Complete enumeration was used in this study. A total of 317 respondents of Grades 11 and 12 Senior High School in the different tracks namely: Academic, TVL, Arts and Design, and Sports for the Year 2019- 2020 of San Mariano National High School, San Mariano, Isabela.

### **Instruments**

The Work Values Questionnaire based on Donald Super's Work Values Inventory (WVI) was the instrument used in determining the work values of the graduating students in their Workplace, Work Environment, Co-workers, and Work Values Activities. This questionnaire consists of 40 items, and it takes approximately 15 to 20 minutes to accomplish.

This assessment introduces work values as related to career development. Super's inventory was devised originally as a research tool in the Career Pattern Study of the late 1940s. After extensive further development, the inventory was made available to the profession in 1970, and by 2000, it was virtually out of print.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

The work values questionnaire is based on Donald Super's Work Values Inventory (WVI). It has undergone thorough validation and approval for use. It is researcher modified and self-administered. There is no time limit to answer the test but the average time for students to finish answering the questions is 15 to 20 minutes. General and specific directions are given.

### **Data Analysis**

The obtained data were entered in the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 16.0 software licensed to TEAM EQX; the data were critically entered in the codebook of the SPSS to eliminate discrepancies in conducting the data analyses. The data underwent screening, cleaning, and checking for errors, checking of categorical variables, and continuous variables, and assessing normality to check the possible wrong entries, outliers, and homoscedasticity of data in the codebook. It was tested for multivariate normality with the weighted mean or frequency count. Mean, standard deviation, and analysis of variance with Turkey test as post hoc was used to interpret the data gathered.

To identify significant differences in the work values of the students and to evaluate the impact of the courses taken by the respondent on their work values in the workplace, working environment interactions with co-workers, and work activities, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted and Tukey HSD as post hoc test also conducted to the significant indicator.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 shows the weighted mean responses and verbal interpretation of the work values in the workplace in the different strands of the immersed senior high school students. It reveals that under ABM 12, all the descriptors were assessed by the students as "very important" with the same weighted mean of 4.59. For AF 12, all the work values were assessed as "very important" with an overall mean value of 4.49. As to BBP 12, the student-respondents found out that most of the work



values in the workplace were “very important” with an overall mean score of 4.41, however, the work values; “Spirituality” and “Status” were assessed as “important” with the same mean value of 4.13. For DM 12, the work values; “Balance”, “Honesty” and “Status” were found to be “important” with the same mean value of 4.17, whereas the rest was “very important” with and the overall mean value of 4.27. In EIM 12, most of the work values were found to be “very important” except for “integrity”, “honesty”, and “power” which were assessed by the student-respondents as “important” with mean values of 3.94, 3.95, and 4.13. On the other hand, the overall assessment of the EIM 12 for the work values was “very important” with an overall mean value of 4.32. For ICT 12, all the work values were assessed as “important” with an overall mean value of 4.26 aside from “honesty” which is assessed as “neutral with a mean value of 3.24. For STEM 12, all the work values were firmly believed by the respondents to be “very important” with an overall mean value of 4.39.

**Table 1** Work Values in the Workplace

Descriptors	ABM 12		AF 12		BBP 12		DM 12		EIM12		ICT 12		HUMMS12		STEM 12	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
<b>ACHIEVEMENT:</b> Being to meet your goals	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	4.66	VI	3.96	I	4.32	VI	4.49	VI
<b>BALANCE:</b> Time for family, work, and play	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.65	VI	4.17	I	4.58	VI	3.96	I	4.33	VI	3.88	VI
<b>INDEPENDENCE:</b> Control of your own destiny	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.65	VI	4.22	VI	4.66	VI	3.85	I	4.42	VI	4.37	VI
<b>INFLUENCE:</b> Able to have an impact on others	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	4.26	VI	4.06	I	4.34	VI	4.49	VI
<b>INTEGRITY:</b> Stand up for your beliefs	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	3.94	I	4.13	I	4.3	VI	4.49	VI
<b>HONESTY:</b> Telling the truth and knowing that others are telling the truth	4.59	VI	4.56	VI	4.29	VI	4.17	I	3.95	I	3.24	N	4.39	VI	4.49	VI
<b>POWER:</b> Control over others	4.59	VI	4.56	VI	4.32	VI	4.44	VI	4.13	I	3.94	I	4.03	I	4.49	VI
<b>RESPECT:</b> Care and trust of self and others	4.59	VI	4.44	VI	4.45	VI	4.5	VI	4.35	VI	3.96	I	4.15	I	4.49	VI
<b>SPIRITUALLY:</b> Believing In your core beliefs	4.59	VI	4.56	VI	4.13	I	4.33	VI	4.34	VI	3.91	I	4.18	I	4.37	VI
<b>STATUS:</b> Having influence and power over others	4.59	VI	4.56	VI	4.13	I	4.17	I	4.35	VI	3.94	I	4.18	I	4.37	VI
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.59</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>VI</b>

3.41- 4.20- Important (I); 2.61- 3.40 – Neutral (N); 1.81- 2.60 – Unimportant (U); 1.01-1.80 – Very Unimportant (VU)

Few studies examine workplace values cross-culturally and qualitatively and have become prevalent in management disciplines due to links to motivation (Herzberg, 2017), employee satisfaction (Barnett, 2013) and Herzberg (2017), and organizational commitment<sup>10</sup>. The 2 represents the work values in the working environment.





**Table 2** Work Values in the Working Environment

Descriptors	ABM 12		AF 12		BBP 12		DM 12		EIM12		ICT 12		HUMMS12		STEM 12	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
<b>FAST PACED:</b> Work that has many things happening at one time.	4.12	I	4.33	VI	3.65	I	3.67	I	4.16	I	4.11	I	4.31	VI	4.29	VI
<b>FLEXIBLE:</b> Work that is not set to a specific time schedule	4.59	VI	4.33	VI	4.35	VI	4.17	I	4.32	VI	3.96	I	4.15	I	4.1	I
<b>HIGH EARNINGS:</b> Work that has the potential to make a lot of money	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.48	VI	4.56	VI	4.45	VI	3.96	I	4.2	I	4.29	VI
<b>LEARNING:</b> Work that is intellectually challenging to you	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	4.26	VI	3.96	I	4.31	VI	4.29	VI
<b>LOCATION:</b> Work that is in a convenient place and an easy commute	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.97	VI	4.11	I	4.31	VI	3.94	I	4.59	VI	4.29	VI
<b>PREDICTABLE:</b> Work where you know what is going to happen day after day	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.3	VI	4.22	VI	4.47	VI	4.19	I	4.39	VI	4.95	VI
<b>QUIET:</b> Work where there are few disruptions throughout the day	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.35	VI	4	I	4.26	VI	3.96	VI	4.14	I	4.95	VI
<b>RELAXED:</b> Work where there are few pressures to get things done	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.48	VI	4.33	VI	4.39	VI	3.51	VI	4.33	VI	4.46	VI
<b>STRUCTURED:</b> Work where it is organized and has a specific set time	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.32	VI	4.17	I	4.42	VI	4.26	VI	4.44	VI	3.71	VI
<b>TIME FREEDOM:</b> Work where you set your own schedule and plan how and when you do your work	4.12	I	4.27	VI	4.32	VI	4.22	VI	4.39	VI	4.28	VI	4.34	VI	3.24	VI
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>VI</b>

4.21-5.00- *Very Important (VI)*; 3.41- 4.20- *Important (I)*; 2.61- 3.40 – *Neutral (N)*; 1.81- 2.60 – *Unimportant (U)*; 1.01-1.80 – *Very Unimportant (VU)*

Presented in Table 2 are the weighted mean responses and verbal interpretation of the work values in the working environment in the different strands of the immersed senior high school students. It shows that for ABM 12, their assessment of the work values in the working environment was “important” with an overall mean value of 4.16 and for this strand, it was only the work value “flexible” was found to be “very important” with a mean value of 4.59. As to AF 12, all the work values in the working environment were assessed “very important” with an overall mean value of 4.28. Regarding BP 12, all the work values had been assessed as “very important” with an overall mean of 4.37 except for “fast-paced” values which were found as “important” only. For BM 12 and ICT 12, the work values in the working environment were “important” in their assessment while, EIM 12, HUMMS 12, and STEM 12 respondents assessed the work values as “very important” which is evidently shown in their overall mean values of 4.34, 4.32 and 4.26. The results attributed to Schein indicated that environment was an important factor for person-organization fit (Schein, 2017). In like manner, the result of the study of Chen and Youngsoo (2008) found that comfort and security (about work) were ranked as the most important work value dimensions.



Displayed in Table 3 are the weighted mean responses and verbal interpretation of the work values in interactions with co-workers in the different strands of the immersed senior high school students. It reveals that the strands ABM 12, BBP 12, EIM 12, and ICT 12 believed that the work values in interactions with co-workers were “important” having overall mean values of 4.03, 4.10, 4.04, and 4.06. On the other hand, the strands AF 12, DM 12, HUMMS 12, and STEM 12 assessed the work values in interactions with co-workers as “very important” bearing mean values of 4.33, 4.26, 4.31, and 4.22. Furthermore, the ABM 12 respondents confirmed that “competition” as one of the work values was assessed as “neutral” with a mean value of 3.38. According to Gordon and Hartman (2009) and Vecchio (1989) that spending so much time at work leads to the development of friendships among people at the workplace. The relationship between a leader & his subordinates can have a major impact on the performance of the employees.

**Table 3** Work values in Interaction with Co-Workers

WORK VALUES IN INTERACTIONS WITH CO-WORKERS:	ABM 12		AF 12		BBP 12		DM 12		EIM12		ICT 12		HUMMS12		STEM 12	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
<b>COMPETITION:</b> Work where you compete with others	3.38	N	4.11	I	4.35	VI	4.22	VI	4.26	VI	3.94	I	4.14	I	4.37	VI
<b>DIVERSITY:</b> Work where there are people with different workers	3.97	I	4.56	VI	4.35	VI	4.00	I	3.76	I	4.38	VI	4.31	VI	4.36	VI
<b>FRIENDSHIPS:</b> Work where you socialize with co-worker	3.97	I	3.56	I	3.55	VI	4.44	VI	3.76	I	4.15	VI	4.46	VI	4.20	I
<b>LEADERSHIP:</b> Work where there are good leaders managing the organization	3.97	I	4.44	VI	3.55	VI	4.67	VI	3.92	I	4.28	VI	4.28	VI	3.85	I
<b>MANAGEMENT:</b> Work where there is strong management	3.97	I	4.44	VI	4.35	VI	4.22	VI	3.68	I	3.72	I	4.46	VI	4.07	I
<b>OPEN COMMUNICATION:</b> Work where information is not held back from employees	3.97	I	4.44	VI	4.35	VI	3.78	I	4.37	VI	4.19	I	4.04	I	4.20	I
<b>RECOGNITION:</b> Work where you are acknowledged for your work and contributions	4.71	VI	4.44	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	4.23	VI	3.09	I	4.27	I	4.34	VI
<b>SUPPORT:</b> Work where you help and support each other	4.12	I	4.44	VI	4.74	VI	4.67	I	3.84	I	4.28	VI	4.29	VI	3.78	I
<b>TEAMWORK:</b> Work where working together is important	4.12	I	4.44	VI	3.68	I	4.11	I	4.23	VI	4.28	VI	4.38	VI	4.49	VI
<b>TRUST:</b> Work where you can count on each other	4.12	I	4.44	VI	3.55	I	4.22	VI	4.39	VI	4.30	VI	4.43	VI	4.51	VI
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>VI</b>

4.21-5.00- Very Important (VI); 3.41- 4.20- Important (I); 2.61- 3.40 – Neutral (N); 1.81- 2.60 – Unimportant (U); 1.01-1.80 – Very Unimportant (VU)



**Table 4** Work Values Activities

Descriptors	ABM 12		AF 12		BBP 12		DM 12		EIM12		ICT 12		HUMMS12		STEM 12	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
<b>ANALYTICAL:</b> Work that requires interpretation of data	4.12	I	4.56	VI	4.48	VI	4.22	VI	4.47	VI	4.66	VI	4.25	VI	4.59	VI
<b>CHALLENGING:</b> Work that is mentally and physically challenging	3.82	I	4.44	VI	4.48	VI	4.00	I	4.39	VI	4.66	VI	4.38	VI	4.39	VI
<b>CREATIVE:</b> Work that uses imagination and creative talents to produce results	3.38	I	4.44	VI	4.32	VI	4.11	I	4.21	VI	4.49	VI	4.31	VI	4.61	VI
<b>HELPING:</b> Work that is helping people	3.97	I	3.56	I	2.26	U	4.00	I	4.08	I	4.30	VI	3.90	I	4.49	VI
<b>Leading Edge:</b> Work on new and innovative products or projects	3.97	I	3.56	I	3.71	I	3.39	I	4.10	I	4.02	I	4.00	I	4.61	VI
<b>PHYSICAL:</b> Work that has a lot of physical activity	3.97	I	3.56	I	3.71	I	3.89	I	4.23	VI	3.96	VI	4.12	I	4.61	VI
<b>PUBLIC CONTENT:</b> Work that has daily interaction with the public	4.12	I	3.56	I	4.23	VI	4.11	I	4.61	VI	4.28	VI	3.80	I	4.61	VI
<b>RESEARCH:</b> Work that searches for new information	4.12	I	3.56	I	4.35	VI	3.67	I	4.21	VI	4.36	VI	4.43	VI	4.46	VI
<b>RISK TAKING:</b> Work that may be dangerous or risky	4.12	I	3.56	I	4.19	I	3.11	I	3.89	I	4.28	VI	4.76	VI	4.07	I
<b>VARIETY:</b> Work where many different tasks are done during the day	4.12	I	3.56	I	2.90	N	4.11	I	4.32	VI	4.49	VI	4.03	I	3.78	I
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>VI</b>

4.21-5.00- Very Important (VI); 3.41- 4.20- Important (I); 2.61- 3.40 – Neutral (N); 1.81- 2.60 – Unimportant (U); 1.01-1.80 – Very Unimportant (VU)

Glanced in Table 4 are the weighted mean responses and verbal interpretation of the work values activities in the different strands of the immersed senior high school students. It affirms that the assessment of the student-respondents under ABM12, AF12, BBP12, DM12, and HUMMS12 on the work values activities was “important” having overall mean values of 3.97, 3.83, 3.86, and 4.20. However, the strands EM 12, ICT 12, and STEM 12 assess these variables as “very important” with mean values of 4.25, 4.35, and 4.42. MOW International Research Team<sup>14</sup> defined working as those activities carried out in formal organizational settings, for pay, and in employment relationships, excluding volunteer work; work in the family, church, or community; political work; self-employment; and non-vocational activities.





**Table 5** Significant Differences in the Work Values

Variables	F-Value	F-Critical	Interpretation
Work Values in the Workplace	14.80	2.14	S
Work Values in the Working Environment	2.19	2.14	S
Work Values with Co-workers	1.56	2.14	NS
Work Values Activities	3.78	2.14	S
Overall	2.14	2.04	S

*Note: S-Significant; NS-Not Significant*

Table 5 shows the test of significant difference in the work values as assessed by the senior high school students on different strands. It reveals that in terms of work values in the workplace, in the working environment, and in activities; the computed f-values of 14.80, 2.19, and 3.78 were greater than the critical value of 2.14, thus the null hypothesis was rejected. This purports that there is a significant difference in the assessments of the senior high school students on the above-mentioned variables. However, regarding, work values with co-workers, the computed f-value of 1.56 is less than the critical value of 2.14 hence, the null hypothesis was accepted. This suggests that there was no significant difference in the assessment of the senior high school students as to this variable.

Generally, the overall f-computed value of 2.14 is greater than the critical value of 2.04 which suggests that there is a significant difference among the assessments of the senior high school students since the null hypothesis was rejected. The result confirms that the perceptions of the respondents on work values are almost the same regardless of the track they belong to. The result of the study implies that it is innate to every individual to wish and claim for the different work values subscales for these are vital tools to make him or her have job satisfaction, be motivated to work, and consequently become productive in all work activities.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the work values of the senior high school students in their different strands are generally high and were considered important. While the work values in the workplace and the work values in activities significantly predict the work values of the senior high school except for work values with co-workers. This suggested that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the senior high school students as to this variable.

In addition, the study would be the basis of the work values of the student in the different strands. School authorities will cater to the need to strengthen the determined weaknesses in the work values of the senior high school students regarding their workplace, working environment, interacting with co-workers, and work values activities. It will pave the way by harnessing the work values of the senior high school students while they are on the in-school premises.



It is incumbent therefore for employers, administrators, and supervisors to consider employees' work values. The advanced world requires working environments that are dynamic, responsive, and arranged universally so that they can meet the challenges of the 21st century and into the long term. The workplace must engage and motivate employees. An understanding of the nature of work values helps managers and employees in making a working environment where work values act to complement each other instead of creating conflict. In so doing, work values can play a central part in cultivating positive and sound working environments and more importantly to enhance the challenged administrators of work.

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, it is highly recommended that school authorities may design intervention programs and activities to enhance specific dimensions of each work value subscale beneficial for senior high school students. Such programs can be in the form of relevant seminars and training on work values. Besides, a case study to determine the effectiveness of the interventions initiated is suggested.



## REFERENCES

1. Chen, P. & Choi, Y. (2008). Generational differences in work values: a study of hospitality management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 2008, 20(6), pp. 595 – 615. socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(3), pp. 219-240.
2. Dose, J. J. (1997). Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(3), pp. 219-240.
3. Super, D. E. (1980). A lifespan, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 16(3), 282-298.
4. Lyons, Sean. (2003). An Exploration of Generational Values in Life and at Work. Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.22215/etd/2004-05791>.
5. Lyons, Sean T., et al. (2009). Work Values: Development of a New Three-Dimensional Structure Based on Confirmatory Smallest Space Analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.658>.
6. Roe, Robert A. and Peter Ester (1999). Values and Work: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Perspective.” *Applied Psychology*, vol. 48, no. pp. 1–21., Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00046.x>.
7. Karen, W.S and Sutton, C.D. (2002). “Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 363–382., Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.147>.
8. Barrett, R (2013). *Liberating the Corporate Soul*. Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080510156>.
9. Herzberg, F, et al. (2017). *The Motivation to Work*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
10. Dov, E and Koslowsky M. (2001). Values and Organizational Commitment.” *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 22, no. 7, 2001, pp. 593–599., <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720110408967>.
11. Schein, E. (2017). *Organization Culture and Leadership*. John Wiley & Sons
12. Chen, P, and Youngsoo, C. (2008). “Generational Differences in Work Values: A Study of Hospitality Management.” *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 595–615., <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810892182>.
13. Gordon, J and Hartman, R (2009). Affinity-Seeking Strategies and Open Communication in Peer Workplace Relationships.” *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 115–125., <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870902873184>.
14. Vecchio, R.P. (1989). *The Meaning of Working*, MOW International Research Team, Academic Press, London, 1987. No of Pages: X + 400. Price: £38.00.” *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 97–98., <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030100109>.