

# UNDERSTANDING THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK: THE EFFECTS OF WORK VALUES AND WORK-VALUE CONGRUENCE

## Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to understand the importance that is attached to work by analyzing the link between work-related values and attitudes. In this respect, it is hypothesized that work values significantly predict work centrality and that this relationship is moderated by a newly proposed variable, the work-value congruence. Work-value congruence is conceptualized on the premise that different work values have varying degrees of influence on work centrality. It is proposed that as the distance between the act of working and the value it relates to (work-value congruence) differ, the relation between values and work centrality will change accordingly.

This study has been conducted on Turkish employees working in SME's, therefore; a Turkish work values inventory developed by Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) has been used along with Kanungo's (1982) work centrality test. In the study, work values have proved to act as an important predictor of work centrality. The analyses show that the individualistic, worldly and normative dimensions of work values predict work centrality respectively. The work-value congruence on the other hand, was not found to act as a moderator between work values and work centrality, however proved to behave similar to that of work values. It is suggested that, work-value congruence could be treated as an independent variable in future work related research. The cultural implications of the relation between work values, work-value congruence and work centrality are discussed along with gender differences found for work values in the study.

The importance attached to work has been a popular topic in the 1980s. An international research project called MOW (Meaning of Working International Research Project) carried out in 1987 was an important cornerstone in understanding how countries differed with respect to the meanings they attach to work. Inspired by the MOW project, this study aims to understand the importance attached to work by investigating work values, work-value congruence and work centrality of Turkish employees.

## Work Values

Theory and research on work values precede largely from the premise that work values are derived from people's basic value systems that help them navigate through the multiple spheres of their lives (Roe and Ester, 1999). An early definition by Rokeach (1973), states that a value is 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 (Uyguç, 2003). Rokeach defines beliefs about preferable modes of conduct 'instrumental values' and beliefs about preferable end-states 'terminal values'. In a value system, individuals rank-order their instrumental and terminal values along a continuum of importance. Work values on the other hand are more specific than general life values as they apply to a specific life domain. As such, work values influence the importance of work in the life of the individual (Šverko, 1989).

Some researchers stress that work goals can be regarded synonymous to work values since the concept of goals is a core element of values. For example, Zedeck (1997) has defined work values as goals that people strive to attain through working. Other definitions that stress the concept of goals have asserted that values signify desired goals scaled according to importance which guide a person's life (Tevrüz, Turgut, 2004), behavior that is directed towards goals (French, Kahn, 1962), and criteria for choosing those goals (Locke, 1976). In all the definitions given above it is evident that the concept of goals can be substituted for the concept of values.

In the definitions of work values, the idea of an "attitude towards or orientation with regard to work" constitutes a central element. Most definitions of work values agree with the notion that work values are specific goals that the individual considers important and attempts to attain in the work context. One of the most important aspect that comes to fore from the theories of work and work motivation, is that workers differ with regard to the reasons they have for working and the needs they want to satisfy through work (Beukman, 2005). Similarly, Nord et al (1990) has defined work values as, end states that guide individuals work related preferences that can be attained through the act of working.

Work values have been classified according to their types. Nord, et al. (1990) suggests that work values can be classified as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic work values refer to end-states that occur through work or in the course of people engaging in work activities such as a sense of accomplishment and are dependent on the content of work. Extrinsic work values refer to end states that occur as a consequence of work, regardless or independent of the state of the content of work per se such as family security (George, Jones, 1997). In addition to this binary classification, Ginzberg, et al (1951) has suggested a third dimension. This third dimension is named social/environmental values referring to relations with co-workers and the work environment itself.

Ros et al (1999) adopt the view that, like basic values, work values are beliefs pertaining to desirable end-states (e.g. high pay) or behavior (e.g. working with people) and examine the relationship between these basic values and work values. They argue that different work goals are ordered by their importance as guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings, and for choosing among different work alternatives. Because work values refer only to goals in the work setting, they are more specific than basic individual values.

Elizur (1984: in Tevrüz, Turgut, 2004) arrived at a related trichotomous classification of work values by considering the modality of their outcomes. The first work value in this classification refers to working conditions, pay and benefits therefore is defined as the instrumental outcome of work. The second work outcome includes an affective element and refers to social relations with associates, therefore is named as the affective outcome. The final component is called the cognitive work outcome and refers to responsibility, interest and achievement. This classification largely overlaps with extrinsic, intrinsic, and social values introduced above. Ros et al. (1999) views these three types of work values as conceptually parallel to three of the higher-order basic human values: intrinsic work values directly express openness to change values—the pursuit of autonomy, interest, growth, and creativity in work. Extrinsic work values express conservation values; job security and income provide workers with the requirements needed for general security and maintenance of order in their lives. Social or interpersonal work values express the pursuit of self-transcendence values; work is seen as a vehicle for positive social relations and contribution to society. In addition to the three work values defined above, Ros et al. (1999) has suggested that a fourth distinctive type of work value could be defined which parallels the basic self enhancement higher-order value type. This type of work values, like self-enhancement, should be concerned with prestige or power. The fourth type of value has been classified as extrinsic in some studies (Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrod, & Herma, 1951; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Rosenberg, 1957) or intrinsic in others (Borg, 1990; Crites, 1961; Elizur, 1984: in Ros et al., 1999).

Another study that supports the four-dimensional work value categorization of Ros et al. (1991) is a cross-cultural study by Elizur et al. (1991). The study revealed that, the category designated as cognitive, could be split into two separate regions of intrinsic and of prestige values. Among the distinctive intrinsic work values were interesting work, meaningful work, opportunity for growth, and use of ability and knowledge. Among the prestige values were company that you are proud to work for, advancement, influence in the organization, and influence in work.

The results of a study on work values and its dimensions conducted in Turkey by Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) parallels the studies in the West. In their study, Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) derived 12 factors that explained work values and indicated that these factors aggregated on three value dimensions. These three value dimensions are referred to as ‘functions of work’ and are labeled individualistic, normative and worldly work values. The individualistic dimension includes; information seeking, independence, meaning in life, action seeking, and keeping oneself busy. The second dimension, normative work values, includes fulfilling religious duties, aiding society, creating order, and avoiding negativity. The worldly dimension, on the other hand, includes earning bread, enjoyment, and achieving status. These dimensions are in line with the value dimensions derived in the West. However, ‘avoiding negativity’ or ‘negativity avoidance’, a factor in the normative dimension, is composed of values such as; avoiding alienation, striving to be on the right track, and preserving health, has not emerged as one of the factors of work values in Western studies. Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) argue that some of the values and goals are culture dependent and the ‘avoidance’ factor has emerged in their study due to the role of ‘avoidance’ in the Turkish culture.

As can be seen from the definitions and conceptualizations, work values constitute an important part of the experience of work. Work values are central aspects of the experience of work since they determine the meaning that work, jobs, and organizational experiences have for people (George and Jones, 1997; James and James, 1989). People try to make sense of their work experiences by judging how these experiences stack up against their work values (James and James, 1989; Jones and Gerard, 1967). Work values, therefore, function as the evaluative standards people use to interpret their work experiences and determine the meaning that individuals attribute to work, jobs, organizations, and specific events and conditions George and Jones, 1997; James and James, 1989).

### **Work Centrality**

The concept of work centrality has mainly been derived from basic values. According to Kanungo (1982), work centrality is a normative belief about the value and importance of work in the configuration of one’s life, and it is a function of one’s past cultural conditioning or socialization. Some researchers (e.g. Kanungo, 1982) use the term ‘work involvement’ or ‘involvement with work’ to define work centrality. Work centrality is the degree of importance of work in general rather than involvement in the present job. Therefore, work centrality differs from other concepts like, organizational commitment and job involvement. An empirical study by Paullay, et al. (1994) has clarified the distinction between work centrality and job involvement and has demonstrated that these two concepts actually appeared to be two distinct constructs. In the study by Paullay et al., job involvement is defined as the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one’s present job; and work centrality is defined as the beliefs that individuals have regarding the degree of importance work plays in their lives. Although a moderate, positive correlation was indicated between the measurement instruments of job involvement and work centrality, the confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the hypothesis that job involvement and work centrality were two distinct constructs.

The conceptualization of work centrality rests on the assumption that individuals place work in one of their life spheres and attribute differing levels of importance to those life spheres. Work centrality is rooted in the central life interest literature (Dubin, 1956; Dubin, Champoux, & Porter, 1975; Hirschfeld and Feild, 2000; Peterson and Ruiz-Quintanilla, 2003), which refers to the importance a person places on work relative to other interests in life. Dubin (1956) has argued that social behavior differ as individuals in modern industrial society proceed serially through distinctive social settings. An individual moves from one portion of life space to another and the portion of

life space in which individuals focus their life interests become central. Not all social settings have equal salience for the individual. The individual's preference for carrying out particular acts in his/her work sphere, defines the basis of that person's work centrality (Dubin, 1956; Dubin, Champoux, & Porter, 1975).

Work centrality has been studied in an international research project (MOW – Meaning of Working International Research Project, 1987). In the MOW study, there are two major theoretical components of the work centrality construct; the value orientation and the decision orientation. The value orientation toward working as a life role involves (i) identification with work, and (ii) involvement or commitment to working. The decision orientation view of work centrality parallels Dubins' (1956) central life interests, Barker's (1968) theory of behavioral settings, and Heider's (1958) theory of interpersonal relationships.

Considering that the concept of work centrality has derived from work values, it is believed that work values or goals are an important determinant of centrality. Previous research has not focused specifically on the relations between work centrality and work values. However, it is possible to mention a few studies that might shed light on the role of work values on work centrality. In the study of Hirschfeld and Feild (2000), work centrality has been defined as normative beliefs on the value and importance of working. The study by Kanungo and Misra (1988) can be regarded as another study supporting the role of values on work centrality. Similarly, the research conducted by Tevrüz (1999) states that the work sphere is related with the three dimensions of work values. According to the study, as one's values incline towards society development, self-actualization and avoidance of harm, the place working occupies in one's life increases. On the other hand, in the study of Turgut and Tevrüz (2003), as a person values societal development and independence, the time allocated for working increase, and as one increasingly values earning bread and status, time allocated for working decreases.

The variance of work values or goals among individuals creates difference on the importance one attributes to working. It is believed that those who increasingly value individualistic work goals will attribute greater importance to working than those who value worldly and normative work goals. An empirical study, which directly links work values and work centrality was not evident in the literature. However, by definition, work centrality is affected by values and is formed by the person's beliefs towards working (MOW, 1987). In this respect, it is possible to assume that:

**Hypothesis-1:** Differing work values may have an increasing or decreasing effect on work centrality.

#### **Work-Value Congruence**

The above hypothesis predicts that different work values have varying degrees of influence on work centrality. It is believed that as the distance between the act of work and the value it relates to (work-value congruence) differ, the relation between values and work centrality changes accordingly. Work-value congruence is a concept that is believed to exist in explaining relations between basic variables such as values/goals and attitudinal variables like centrality, satisfaction, citizenship and commitment. It is defined as the distance between one's values or goals and one's belief in attaining the specific value/goal through the act of work. Bourdieu (1973, 1977) asserts that the formation of goals in a specific life sphere, change according to the belief in reaching that specific goal. Individuals observe events around them and make judgments –consciously or unconsciously- about the attainability of their goals and act according to their perception of the attainability of the goal. Zedeck (1997) argues that work values influence the importance of work in the life of the individual, and add that this relationship is moderated by the perception of one in attaining the specified goals through the act of working (p.327).

An empirical study questioning the attainability of work values through working has not been found in the literature. Therefore, a pilot study by the author was designed to investigate the link between values and work. The participants were asked to rate work value dimensions defined by Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) in terms of their attainability by the act of working on a four dimensional scale. The results showed that the least attainable values through working were 'religiosity' and 'avoidance' and the values that can mainly be attained by working were 'making a living' and 'gaining status'. When the twelve work values were placed in the dimensions they previously belonged in Tevrüz and Turgut's study (2004), the work value dimension most likely to be attained by work occurred to be the 'worldly work values' and the dimension least likely to be attained emerged as the 'normative values'.

In the light of the findings from the pilot study and the views of Bourdieu and Zedeck, the second hypothesis states:

**Hypothesis 2:** The prediction power of 'individualistic' and 'worldly' work values' in explaining work centrality will be greater than that of 'normative' work values.

#### **Sample**

The study is completed by the online contribution of employees working in SME's. 100.000 Turkish employees have been randomly selected and an electronic link of the survey has been sent to their personal e-mail addresses. In total, 1440 employees participated for the research. After a review, 749 responses were found relevant for analyses. 188 (25.3%) of the participants are female and 555 (74.7%) are male; 133 (17.8 %) of them are high-school graduates, 467 (62.4 %) have university degrees, 103 (13.8 %) have masters and 34 (4.5%) of them hold a PhD degree. The average age of the participants is 33.64 and has 7.04 years of tenure.

## Findings

The factor analysis on work values revealed three dimensions (KMO = 0.868 and Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining 65 per cent of the total variance. The results indicated that the factor structures of this analysis overlap at a degree with those of Tevrüz and Turgut's (2003) work value concept and its dimensions. Tevrüz and Turgut's (2004) study on work values assert that the person could work for worldly or materialistic goals such as gaining money or status; for normative goals like creating a home and an orderly life or for individualistic goals of advancement and self-improvement. In our study, some differences in the factor item loadings have been determined. In Tevrüz and Turgut's (2004) study the worldly values consisted of making a living, enjoying life and gaining status; the individualistic dimension includes gaining/using information, gaining freedom, having an active life, finding meaning in life and keeping oneself busy; and the normative dimension was made up of fulfilling religious duty, contribution to society, creating an orderly life and avoiding negativity. On the other hand, our study manifests that in addition to making a living and gaining status; gaining freedom, contributing to society and gaining/using knowledge, load on the worldly dimension of values. The individualistic dimension in our study only includes enjoying life, having an active life, finding meaning in life and keeping oneself busy. Finally the normative dimension is composed of fulfilling religious duty and avoiding negativity. As can be seen, some of the items that originally loaded on the individualistic and normative dimensions of work values have loaded on the worldly dimension in our study.

The factor analysis on work centrality revealed that all six items loaded on one factor (KMO = 0.850 and Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining 55 per cent of the total variance. The table below summarizes the factor loadings and factor reliability.

The analysis also revealed that work value congruence loaded on three dimensions (KMO = 0.848 and Bartlett's Test significant at .000 level) explaining about 55 per cent of the total variance. However, the reliability analysis of the three factors only confirmed the reliability of the first two factors ( $\alpha_{F1}=0.7584$ ;  $\alpha_{F2}=0.7462$ ). Therefore, the third factor was not included in further analyses ( $\alpha_{F3}=0.3806$ ). Since this variable represents the distance a person perceives a value to be reached by the act of working, it is important to review the mean scores of each item and each factor. The mean scores showed that the first factor is perceived to be more likely whereas the second factor is perceived to be less likely to be achieved by the act of working. Therefore the factors were named as high and low work-value congruence respectively.

The correlation analysis shows that work centrality is significantly correlated with all the other variables in question. Work-value congruence is also in significant relations with the sub dimensions of work values.

In the research model, the effects of work values and work-value congruence on work centrality are examined through a series of regression analyses. The regression results show that our model is viable. Work-value congruence inserted in the first step has significant effect on work centrality ( $\beta = 0.391$ ). In the second step, work value dimensions; "individualistic", "worldly" and "normative" values, which are believed to have greater effect upon work centrality than work-value congruence are inserted. These work value dimensions have positive significant contribution on work centrality respectively ( $\beta_{\text{individualistic}} = 0.213$ ,  $\beta_{\text{worldly}} = 0.178$  and  $\beta_{\text{normative}} = 0.162$ ). As the work value dimensions are inserted in the regression analysis the effect of work-value congruence on work centrality declines.

MODEL	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	$\Delta R^2$	F	$\Delta F$	P <sub>model</sub>		$\beta$	t	P
Model 1	,153	,152	,153	117,871	117,871	,000	Work-Value Cong.	,391	10,857	,000**
Model 2	,238	,233	,085	50,654	24,077	,000	Work-Value Cong.	,258	6,805	,000**
							Worldly Work Values	,178	5,125	,000**
							Individualist Work Values	,213	5,865	,000**
							Normative Work Values	,162	4,554	,000**
Independent variables: work-value congruence, worldly work values, individualistic work values, normative work values Dependent variable: Work Centrality										

**Table 1 Regression Analysis for Model Testing**

Further regression analyses on the moderating role of work-value congruence reveal that a significant effect has been indicated only for the interaction of worldly values and work-value congruence. The results also show that not only does work-value congruence have a significant effect on centrality but it also decreases the effect of work values on centrality. This result, hints a mediating effect of work-value congruence between values and centrality. Therefore, the mediating role of work-value congruence has been tested in the relationship between each of the work values and centrality. However, work-value congruence, does not fully abolish the effect of values on centrality ( $\beta_{\text{Worldly}} = 0.161$ ,  $p_{\text{Worldly}} = 0.000$ ;  $\beta_{\text{Individualistic}} = 0.187$ ,  $p_{\text{Individualistic}} = 0.000$ ;  $\beta_{\text{Normative}} = 0.136$ ,  $p_{\text{Normative}} = 0.000$ ) but rather it decreases their effects. This result enables us to conclude that work-value congruence does not act as a moderator and that it only has a partial mediator role. This leads us to the conclusion that the effect of work-value congruence on centrality is greater than that of the effect of values. This portrait depicts it would be advisable to treat work-value congruence as an independent variable.

MODEL	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	F	ΔF	P <sub>model</sub>		β	t	P
Model 1	,047	,049	33,26	33,264	,000	Worldly	,220	5,768	,000
Model 2	,176	,130	70,72	102,975	,000	Worldly	,161	4,485	,000
						Work-Value Congruence	,365	10,148	,031
Model 3	,181	,007	49,19	5,229	,000	Worldly	,162	4,524	,000
						Work-Value Congruence	,371	10,316	,000
						Worldly *WVC	,081	2,287	,023*
Independent variables: work-value congruence, worldly work values, interaction of worldly work values and WVC Dependent variable: Work Centrality									

**Table 2 Regression Analysis on the moderating effect of Worldly Work values and WVC**

In order to test gender differences in work values and work centrality t-tests are applied. Table 3 depicts that men attach greater importance to normative values than women do ( $\text{mean}_{\text{women}}=1.50$ ;  $\text{mean}_{\text{men}}=1.88$ ) and that women attach greater importance to individualistic values than men do ( $\text{mean}_{\text{Individualistic/women}}=2.20$ ;  $\text{mean}_{\text{Individualistic/men}}=1.99$ ).

	GENDER	N	MEAN	STD. DEV.	t	p
Worldly	Women	186	2.7419	.49654	2.46	.014*
	Men	543	2.6188	.61663		
Individualistic	Women	181	2.2099	.69929	3.29	.001**
	Men	530	1.9906	.79573		
Normative	Women	184	1.5054	.91733	-4.42	.000**
	Men	544	1.8860	1.03790		
Centrality	Women	183	3.66	.975	-0.78	.432
	Men	549	3.73	1.066		

**Table 3 ANOVA test for Gender Differences**

### Discussion

The research results for work values indicate that value dimensions are in line with the value dimensions derived in the West. However, ‘avoiding negativity’ or ‘negativity avoidance’, a factor in the normative dimension, is composed of values such as; avoiding alienation, striving to be on the right track, and preserving health, has not emerged as one of the factors of work values in Western studies. Tevrüz and Turgut (2004) argue that some of the values and goals are culture dependent and the ‘avoidance’ factor has emerged in their study due to the role of ‘avoidance’ in the Turkish culture.

Our research model is built on the premise that the specific goal or value that drives a person to work is important in determining behavior in the work setting. In the present study, Tevrüz and Turgut’s (2004) work goals/values inventory is used and some differences in the items loadings of the factor structure are determined. Some of the items that originally loaded on the individualistic and normative dimensions in Tevrüz and Turgut’s study have loaded on the worldly dimension in this study. This difference may be attributed to the samples used in the two studies. Tevrüz and Turgut’s study was conducted on a mixed sample comprised of university students while in this study the test was applied to working people only. This finding may be linked with the value change or value shift hypothesis by Inglehart (1997) who claims that there is a growing importance of post-materialist values in industrial societies. He asserts that concern for quality of life and environment, political participation and self-realization, predominance of intellectual, social and aesthetic criteria are seen to spread among younger persons born after World War 2 in comparison to older generations who adhere to more materialistic values such as, economic growth, law and order and security concerns (Ruiz Quintanilla & Wilpert, 1991). The post-materialistic values defined by Inglehart (1997) seem to parallel the individual centered or individualistic values and the materialistic values to parallel the utility centered or worldly values in the present study. This similarity found in the value dimensions allows support for the value shift hypothesis in explaining differences in the value dimensions found in the study of Tevrüz and Turgut and this one since the studies were conducted on different generations.

The difference in the item loadings of the factor structure in Tevrüz and Turgut’s study and our study, require an investigation of the names given to each factor revealed. The worldly value dimension is composed of items such as; a living and gaining status; gaining freedom, contributing to society and gaining/using knowledge, which designate the utility a person can access through working. Therefore, it is recommended that this factor be named “utility centered work values” rather than “worldly work values”. In the individualistic value dimension, items, which stress individuality such as enjoying life, living an active life and finding meaning in life, have loaded. Since these items focus on the individual goals a person may want to attain through work it is recommended to name this factor “individual centered work values”. On the other hand, since normative work values are made up of items which focus on avoiding the negative such as; fulfilling religious duty and trying to avoid negative events, it is suggested to name this factor “avoidance centered work values” instead of “normative work values”.

Another important point that caught our attention was that working men attach greater importance to normative values than working women do; and that working women attach greater importance to individualistic values than men do. We can mention some studies that support this finding. The study by Karakitapoğlu Aygün and İmamoğlu (2002) on the values of university students, reveal that women attach greater importance to universal values than men; and that men attach greater importance to normative values than women. Since normative work values in our study is composed of religiously oriented items such as; fulfilling religious duty and gaining God's content, studies investigating the relationship between values and religiosity is also reviewed. In Uçanok's (2004) study, men score higher in the belief and worship dimensions of religiousness in comparison to women. Similarly, Uysal (2003) contends that men are more religious than women and that woman in the Turkish society seem to deviate from traditional religious values and become more secularized than men. The summary of these results portray that men in the Turkish society, hold stronger normative and religious values, compared to women. Therefore, it is of great importance that the variation of values in terms of gender be analyzed for other life spheres other than "work" in future studies.

Another presumption that plays role in the structure of our research is that differing work values have an increasing or decreasing effect on the centrality of work. The analyses show that the individualistic, worldly and normative values predict work centrality respectively. At this point, the analysis of the effects of the values in question on work centrality is crucial. According to Dubin (1956) and Barker (1968), a person seeks to attain instrumental goals or values in the less preferred life spheres and seeks terminal goals or values in the preferred life spheres. In this study, worldly values fit into the instrumental value definition while individualistic values fit in the terminal value definition. The result that those who hold individualistic values attach greater importance to work and that those holding worldly and normative values attach less importance to work. This result support the contentions of Dubin and Barker and reveal that individualistic values have a higher predictor effect on work centrality compared to worldly and normative work values.

An interesting finding which may shed light in understanding the change in the factors affecting work centrality may be traced in Ruiz Quintanilla and Wilpert's (1991) study. In their study conducted on a sample of the work-force of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ruiz Quintanilla and Wilpert compared data in 1983 with that collected in 1989 and found a significant decrease in the work centrality measure. This finding supports the hypothesis of a general decline in the importance of working in the life of persons in industrialist societies.

This study has stressed the effect of work-value congruence on the relationship between work values and work centrality, meaning that the person's perception of attaining his/her goals through working affects the importance attached to working regardless of his/her values. Some academics (Bourdieu, 1973; Zedeck, 1997) have dealt with this issue; however have not attempted to conceptualize it. It has been conceptualized in this study as 'work-value congruence'. This conceptualization is valuable in terms of enabling empirical research to be conducted to test its effects on other attitudinal and behavioral variables. The analyses reveal that work-value congruence does not have a strong moderator effect and that is much more meaningful when treated as an independent variable. Considering that work-value congruence is derived from values, it is reasonable to theoretically assume that work-value congruence acts as similar to values. Therefore, it is suggested that this new concept should be treated as an enduring belief that shapes specific modes of attitudes and behavior. The present study is therefore important introducing 'work-value congruence', which is believed to play a key role in understanding and explaining the dynamics among values and other concepts.

## References

- Barker, R. (1968). *Ecological Psychology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Barker, R. and Wright, H. F. (1949). Psychological Ecology and the Problem of Psychosocial Development. *Child Development*. 20 (3), 131-143.
- Beukman, T. L. (2005). *The Effect of Selected Variables on Leadership Behaviour within the Framework of a Transformational Organisation Paradigm*. University of Pretoria, Pretoria: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-11082005-083347/>
- Borg, I. (1990). Multiple facetisations of work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 39, 401-412.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. Aktaran Brown, R. *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*. Tavistock.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. Sage.
- Crites, J. O. (1961). Factor Analytical Definitions of Vocational Motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 43, 330-337.
- Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial workers' world: a study of the 'central life interests' of industrial workers, *Social Problems*. (3), 131-142.
- Dubin, R. (1958). *The World of Work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dubin, R., Champoux, J. E. and Porter, L. W. (1975). Central life interest and organizational commitment of blue-collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 411-421.
- Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: a structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379-389
- Elizur, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R. and Beck, I. M. (1991). The structure of work values: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 12, 21-38.

- Frederick, W. C., Weber, J. (1990). The values of corporate managers and their critics: An empirical description and normative implications. In Frederick, W. C. and Weber, J. (Eds.). *Business ethics: Research issues and empirical studies* (pp. 123-144). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- French, J. R. P., Kahn, R. (1962). A Programmatic Approach to Studying the Industrial Environment and Mental Health. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18, 1-47.
- George, J. M., Jones, G. R. (1997). Experiencing Work: Values, attitudes, and moods. *Human Relations*, 50 (4), 393-416
- Ginzberg, E., Ginsburg, S. W., Axelrad, S. and Herma, J. L. (1951). *Occupational Choice: an approach to a general theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. And Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivaion to Work*. New York: Wiley
- Hirschfeld, R. R. Feild, H. S. (2000). General Commitment to Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21. 789–800.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Post-Modernization*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- James, L. A., and James, L. R. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 739-751.
- Jones, E. E. and Gerard, H. B. (1967). *Foundations of Social Psychology*. New York: Wiley
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982) *Work Alienation*. New York: Praeger.
- Kanungo, R. N. Misra, S. (1988). The Basis of Involvement in Work and Family Contexts. *International Journal of Psychology*, 23, 267–282
- Karakitapoglu Aygün, Z. and Imamoglu, E. O. (2002). Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(3), 333–351.
- Katz, D., Kahn, R. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Locke, E. A, Shaw, K. N, Saari, L. M and Latham, G. P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90: 125-152.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. in M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y., & Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of high-tech personnel. *Human Relations*, 50, 1537–1561.
- Meglino, B. M. and Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual Values in Organizations: Concepts, Controversies and Research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-390
- MOW (MEANING OF WORKING INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH TEAM) (1987). *The Meaning of Working: An Eight Country Comparative Study*. London: Academic Press
- Nord, W. R., Brief, A. P., Atieh, J. M., and Doherty, E. M. (1990). Studying meanings of work: The case of work values. In Brief, A. and Nord, W. (Eds.). *Meanings of occupational work: A collection of essays*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Parboteeah, P. K. and Cullen, J. B. (2003). Social Institutions and work centrality: explorations beyond national culture. *Organization Science*, 14 (2), 137 - 148
- Paullay, I. M. Alliger, G. M. and Stone-Romero, E. F. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79: 224–228
- Peterson, M. F. and Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (2003). Cultural socialization as a source of intrinsic work motivation. *Group & Organization Management*, 28(2), 188-216.
- Roe, R.A. and Ester, P. (1999). Values and work: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Perspective. *Applied Psychology: an International Review*, 48 (1), 1-21.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H., and Surkis, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An international review*, 48 (1), 49-71.
- Rosenberg, M. (1957). *Occupations and values*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Ruiz Quintanilla, A. S., & Wilpert, B. (1991). Are Work Meanings Changing. *European work and organizational psychologist*, 1 (2/3), 91-109.
- Šverko, B. (1989). Origin of individual differences in importance attached to work: A model and a contribution to its evaluation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34, 28–39.
- Tevrüz, S. (1999). Çalışma amaçları, bireyselci ve toplulukçu olma, çalışmanın yaşam içinde kapladığı yer. *M.Ü. Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı Bülteni*, 5: 3–11
- Tevrüz, S. and Turgut, T. (2004). Çalışma Amaçlarının Tesbiti ve Çalışma Amaçları Testinin Geliştirilmesi. *Öneri Dergisi*, 6 (22), 33-44.
- Turgut, T. and Tevrüz, S. (2003). Çalışma Amaçları, Meslekler ve Çalışmaya Ayrılan Zaman. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 57–80
- Uçanok, B. (2004). Çalışma Ahlakının Kontrol Odağı, Dindarlık ve Demografik Değişkenlerle İlişkisi. *M. Ü. Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı Bülteni*. Ekim 2004(9), 3-18.
- Uyguç, N. (2003). Cinsiyet, Bireysel Değerler ve Meslek Seçimi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 93-103.
- Uysal, V. (2003). *Geleneksellik-Cagdaslik Baglaminda Türkiye’de Dinadarlik ve Kadin*. Camlica Yayinlari.

Zedeck, S. (1997). Commentary on Diversity and Work-Family Values. in Earley and Erez (1997). *New Perspectives on International Industrial / Organizational Psychology*. 319- 332, New Lexington Press, San Francisco.