Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization

工作價值觀：一個組織社會化的整合架構及例證之應用

本文以整合為目標探討了各種關於工作價值觀及倫理之獨立研究流。首先探討了職業行為、論及工作價值觀的管理和組織行為之文獻，新教工作倫理的建立以及商業倫理理論，驗證這些不同研究領域是如何相互交流。本文提出工作價值觀的全面定義、反映了核心要素的架構，並減少了對其概念上分界的混淆。該架構是由一個 2x2 維結構所組成，一個是由個人價值觀到社會共識型價值觀的連續過程，而另一個則對應道德與偏好價值觀。這個研究檢視了每個象限結果及象限之間的關係。最後本文針對提出的組織社會化架構之意涵作探討，以說明其在應用上的潛力。

　　組織研究者運用*工作價值觀*這個詞彙來概括從商業倫理到工作偏好的各種不同的概念。 然而，雖然有許多與它有關的研究，但很少有研究嘗試將工作價值觀視為多維結構（Roberson，1990）來探討。 在概念層面上，其中一種研究是將焦點放在將喜好（Pryor，1979,1981）或需求(Super，1973)視為其工作價值。 其他研究集中在工作的道德倫理觀念。

令人驚訝的是，商業倫理文獻通常沒有考慮到價值觀，而新教工作倫理學的研究亦沒有考慮到商業倫理； 然而，這些領域竟可以互相交流。

　　本文整合了對於工作價值觀及倫理學文獻的各種不同之相關研究，並為未來的相關研究提供了一個組織架構。 雖然工作價值觀的文獻正不斷在增加，但尚未建立一個統一的定義。 具體來說，文獻不考慮工作價值觀的多樣化領域，整合商業倫理研究，也不將各種不同的價值觀類型做區別。 以期能整合出一個更加完整且有用的類型學，一個包含偏好、道德、社會共識及價值觀的 2X2 維架構。本文提出了工作價值觀的完整定義和反映了核心要素的架構，減少對其概念上分界的混淆，並整合了不同理論和研究。最後，針對這個擬定的架構如何實際運用在組織做說明，並對其在組織社會化上的應用作探討。

價值觀

　　對於工作價值觀的討論是以檢視價值觀本身的概念作為開端。 儘管這個術語被廣泛地運用在各種不同的文獻中，但相對的，很少研究（Clare＆Sanford，1979），甚至幾乎對於價值觀是如何形成的共識甚少（Borg，1990; Clare＆Sanford，1979; Kilmann，1981; Kluckhohn，1951; Payne，Rokeach，1968，1973; Wiener，1988）。 理論家將價值觀比作信念（Rokeach，1968，1973）、需求（Super，1973）、目標（Schwartz＆Bilsky，1987）、選擇目標的標準（Locke，1976）和態度（Eagly＆Chaiken，1992; Fishbein＆Ajzen，1975）。 某些理論家

很盡力的將價值觀與其他建構作出區別（Kluckhohn，1951；Payne，1980；Rokeach，1973；Scott，1965）。而這些研究對於價值觀是否只關乎於偏好（例如 Rokeach，1968，1973)或偏好是否有道德上的可欲性（Beyer，1981；Kluckhohn，1951；Scott，1965）有特別激烈的爭論。

大多數的價值理論家也同意價值觀的確可作為選定目標或行動指導的一個持久穩定的標準（Kilmann， 1981；Kluckhohn，1951；Rokeach，1968，1973；Schwartz＆Bilsky，1987）（England，1967；Kluckhohn，1951；Meglino，Ravlin＆Adkins，1989；Rokeach，1968，1973）。多數的價值理論家或明或暗的指出，價值觀是受到文化、社會及人格的影響而發展出來的。

價值理論家對價值觀研究的重要性而不是態度的重要性有所爭論,價值觀並非對應特定對象或情況；而態度則是與某些特定對象有關。但價值觀是標準，而態度不是。此外雖然一個人所擁有的價值觀少於態度，但這點卻使價值觀成為一個更經濟的結構 (Rokeach，1968)。價值觀在認知系統中佔據了十分重要的地位，成就一個人人格的形成，決定了態度，且與動機有更加緊密的關係。最後，由於價值觀與社會科學及經營管理方面皆有所關聯，因此相對的，它對於科際合作是淺力無窮的(Rokeach，1968)。

盡管對於價值觀和態度間的差異有許多爭議，態度研究仍然可以應用於價值觀的探討，不管是在特定或一般的情況之下，兩者都能夠被測量出來，但價值觀比態度更能對應到特定情境，且與時間及空間上更有一致性，價值觀也可以通過直接經驗或影響的過程中來習得（Fazio＆Zanna，1981），越多關於態度或價值觀的經驗或知識，就越容易習得。然而價值觀研究主要集中在內容，態度研究則基於分析心理過程(Eagly＆Chaiken，1992)，特別是態度的轉換。因此，因為價值觀研究就理論方面還未臻完善，將態度研究應用在價值觀研究是有益的（James，James＆Ashe，1990）。

總而言之,雖然理論家慢慢了解到將價值觀與其它的概念區分開來是很重要的（Kilmann，1981；Kluckhohn，1951；Rokeach，1973；Senger，1971），實際操作起來卻不太成功。 事實上，有些人認為這樣持續的交流會產生對價值觀領域不良的影響，這樣的情況在其工作方面的應用更是顯而易見。

工作價值觀

錯綜複雜的工作組織是探索人類價值觀的理想情境（Connor&Becker，1975）。雖然對工作價值觀的概念與實踐方面的議題有逐漸增加的趨勢（Judge&Bretz，1992），但這項議題需要更多研究的關注（Connor&Becker，1975；Powell, Posner & Schmidc, 1984）。工作價值觀的研究主要探討員工的動機層面（Brown，1976）以及對員工、主管和其餘組織內成員間互補價值重要性的認知（如 Meglino，Ravlin&Adkins，1991），也越來越多的研究關注道德價值觀的議題（如 Payne，1980;Saul，1981）。最後，Connor&Becker（1975）提出了價值觀對衝突、溝通、組織績效和管理行動皆有影響，例如控管方式的差異。

儘管有潛在影響，工作價值觀的研究對工作價值觀的定義及概念仍缺乏共

識，研究結果時常過於分散且狹隘。更重要的是，雖未明白承認(在一般的價值觀理論)，工作價值觀是否只關乎於偏好，或是應優先考慮偏好之外的元素，這些問題仍待解決。此外，這類元素是否只跟道德價值觀(Berger, Olson& Boudreau, 1983; Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Scocc, 1965)或社會決定價值(Locke, 1976; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987; Rokeach, 1968; Schein,1985)有關，這個問題也還沒完全得到解決，接下來的文章將會討論。

工作價值觀和職業行為

工作價值觀被視為對工作型態或工作環境的偏好，人們會認為這是決定工作的重要因素(e.g. Lofquisc &Dawis, 1971; Pryor, 1979, 1981; Super, 1973)。因此，Zycowski（1970）將工作價值觀定義為一種居中於人類情感導向和類似滿意度這種外在因素的概念（P.176）。典型的研究是用價值觀來跟工作滿意度(e.g. Bucler, 1983; Drummond & Scoddard,1991)和職業選擇(e.g. Ben-Shem & Avi-Iczhak, 1991)做比較。三項研究已經將工作價值觀概念化，並發展出一套用以測量工作價值觀的工具。

Super：職業工作價值觀。Super（1973）認為比起喜好，價值觀更趨向於因需求而產生，因自我需求的滿足而達成，因不同的工作或職位而滿足。Super 的工作價值觀量表（WVI; Super, 1970）是用以評量職業行為的價值觀最為人所知的工具，主要是以學生為樣本。O'Connor &Kinnane (1961)確立了 WVI 中的 6 項因素：物質財富、利他主義、工作環境與同事、啟發-創新、成就感-聲望，和獨立性-變異性。近來，Super 發展出一套價值觀量表(Nevill & Super, 1989)，工作重要性調查的美國版本（WIS，1980 年），包含 21 個工作價值觀，但這個量表並不如 WVI 受到重視。

Lofquist &Dawis：重要性。 Lofquist＆Dawis（1971）認為價值視需求的結合，他們的明尼蘇達重要性問卷(MIQ; Gay, Weiss, Hendel, Dawis & Lofquisc, 1971)以重要性的層面來將價值觀概念化（Lofquisc＆Dawis，1978），與 Super 的 WVI 相似。MIQ 分為六種構面：安全、自主性、利他主義、舒服、成就感與強化。

Pryor：工作偏好。Pryor使用「偏好」這個詞，因為他認為工作價值觀與個人工作喜愛和偏好有關，而不是與什麼是好、什麼該做有關。通常者兩者是相符的，但不一定如此，個人的道德態度很少考慮到所有與工作性質相關的偏好(Pryor, 1979)。Pryor (1979)並沒有將興趣和偏好區分開來。無論如何，工作層面的偏好與職業偏好不同(Pryor, 1981)，Pryor(1979)並沒有限制工作層面偏好的數量，有多少工作的層面就有多少的偏好。他將他的工作層面偏好量表將價值觀分為12種因素(WAPS; Pryor, 1979, 1981)：安全、自我發展、利他主義、生活型態、體能活動、分離性、獨立、名望、管理、同事、創意和金錢 (Pryor, 1981)。根據回應模式、階級的選擇，和影響因素的模式，Pryor (1990)發現工作層面偏好是穩定

的。

整合。 雖然就意義上來說，目標(Super)、需求(Lofquist＆Dawis)或偏好(Pryor)的定義是不同的，但它們測量的構造似乎是差不多的。擁有特定的價值觀，人們在找工作時會有特定的性質。

在比較了一些不同的研究之後，Pryor（1982）承認概念的整合是必要的，並將他的WAPS拿來跟其它量表作比較，以期能找到一些相似之處，但他在比較上的經驗並不純熟。

MacNab＆Ficzsimmons（1987）運用了多元特質多元方法研究來探討明尼蘇達重要性問卷（Lofquist＆Dawis，1971）、工作價值觀量表（Super，1970）、加拿大版本的工作重要性調查(WIS，1980)和工作偏好量表（Pryor，1979）。他的分析測得了八項元素：權威、夥伴、創意、獨立、安全、利他、工作環境和榮耀。分析比較之後，結果顯示這八種特質，在不同的量表測出相似的結構，但不幸的是，這個相似性並未被廣泛地承認與應用。除了這些相似性，許多仍未調查差異性的價值觀類型將隨著工作價值觀組織架構的建立而變得重要。

有關工作行為的價值觀

與將價值觀視為沒有道德或社會可欲性的偏好之職業行為研究相反,管理和組織行為文獻認為價值觀體係有可能但不一定需要具有道德元素。

*England：個人價值量表。*England（1967）的個人價值系統是專門針對工作環境而開發的，且被視為一個非常持久的概念架構，會影響一個人的行為。England認為價值觀屬於意識形態或哲學(England, 1967; England, Dhingra & Agarwal, 1974)，使人們能夠理解個人在工作中的行為。價值觀的重要性在於它們與管理者間的人際關係、倫理，及問題的察覺和解決。個人價值量表共有 66 個概念，主要關於個人對組織持有的主要信念體系及行為；可分成五類：企業組織的目標、個體的目標、人群團體、對人群的觀念，和對一般議題的觀念。基於Allport-Vernon-Lindzey 的部分價值觀研究（1960），回答是根據權力（重要性）還有為什麼價值觀被認為是重要的,這些層面有:務實的(理想主義 vs.實用性;"成功"），倫理-道德（"正確"）或情感導向（愉悅）。

*Ravlin & Meglino：行為偏好。*Ravlin，Meglino 和他們的同事(Meglino 等人., 1989, 1991; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987, 1989)將工作價值觀定義為對各種社會期望的工作行為模式的偏好，因此應當被呈現（Ravlin＆Meglino， 1989）。Meglino，Ravlin和他們的同事們似乎認為工作價值觀是屬於大方向的,可以在所有的工作環境中展現。他們運用相對重要量表(Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka & McNeely, 1985)，一項具有批判性的技術來評估成就、對他人的關注、誠實和公平。研究這項觀點的學者們開始探究價值觀的測量，例如社會可欲性和階級 (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987, 1989)、工作價值觀與其構面,如感知與下決定 (Ravlin & Meglino,

1987)、企業文化 (Meglino et al., 1989)、領導者滿意度 (Meglino et al., 1991)，和工作的選擇 (Judge & Brez, 1992)。

成果的重要性。一些並非把焦點放在價值觀系統的研究，通過衡量個人對特定成果的重要性來探究個人價值觀。這些研究大多是以 Locke（1976）工作價值觀的概念為基礎，研究指出，價值觀是人們想要或希望能達成的，它是被習得的而不是以生俱來的。Locke（1976）認為人會因他們的價值觀而有所不同，這也決定了他們的選擇和情緒反應。這些研究的主題有工作滿意度（如 Berger et al。，1983; Butler，1983），承諾（如 Mottaz，1986; Oliver，1990），組織選擇（如 Bar-Ilan & Ramat-Gan，1982），和參與 (Knoop，1991)。 研究者通常設計出一套自己的結果清單，而不同的研究就會產生不一樣的清單，不幸的是，這使得不同研究的成果更難被拿來互相比較。

工作的重要性

與工作類型的偏好（如在職業文獻中研究的價值觀）相反，幾個研究流已經調查了工作本身對人類的重要性程度，以及是那些重要性。大多研究都集中在新教工作倫理（PWE），很少注重其它所謂的"倫理"。工作意義研究（MOW 國際研究團隊，1987 年）就明確地討論了工作價值觀的重要性。

新教倫理。Weber (1958) 提出的新教倫理為財富的積累提供了道德上的藉口（從而激勵了資本主義）。 根據 Weber 新教理論的觀點來看，工作是一種神聖的呼召，因此必須為神的榮耀而做，世俗的成功是恩典的象徵。PWE 的個人的特性包含勤奮，自律，禁慾主義和個人主義（Feather，1984; Wollack，Goodale，Witjing & Smith，1971）。Weber 的新教理論及他所提出的資本主義相關言論遭受到批評（Furnham，1984），心理學家仍然對那些認同這種倫理並引發的其他態度和行為感興趣。因此，工作倫理的心理學研究變得比較不受 PWE 信念的影響。

PWE 結構中的三項測量方式很常被應用在研究中。新教倫理量表(Mirels & Garrett, 1971)將 PWE 視為一種人格變項，Blood (1969) 認為個人如何看待工作一般應該與他們對特定工作的態度有關；他的測量工具包括一個前新教倫理量表和一個較少使用的非新教倫理量表。如同 Blood (1969)，Wollack et al（1971）提出了一項指數是對應於個人對一般工作而非對特定工作的看法。工作價值觀研究包含以下六項：活動偏好、工作投入、以工作為榮、對工作所得的態度、社會地位和追求上進。

研究發現PWE中各種測量的指數皆與工作滿意度 (e.g. Blood, 1969; Stone, 1976)、工作的投入 (e.g. Shove,Thornton & Shove, 1990)、組織承諾 (e.g. Kidron, 1978; Shove *et al.,*1990)、職業生涯特點 (Shove *et al.,* 1990)，和領導者-部屬交換

關係 (Steiner, 1988)。PWE的比較研究發現，新教倫理量表（Mirels＆Garrett，1971），前新教倫理量表（Blood，1969）和工作價值觀調查量表中的內在量表（Wollack等，1971） 呈正相關（Waters＆Zakrajsek，1991）。

其它「倫理」。雖然Nord，Brief，Atieh＆Doherty（1988）高估了PWE在組織行為概念上的影響，但是他們的觀點也因此反映出，只單單關注這一個結構可能會忽略個人可能有其它想要的結果。事實上，PWE曾被拿來與其他價值觀系統做比較，如組織信念系統（工作對於如何對團體有貢獻和促進一個人的成功有價值）、人本主義信念（工作使人成長和發展，這比工作結果更重要）、休閒倫理（工作的價值只在於提供休閒的手段;人類的成就在休閒活動中實現）和馬克思主義相關的信念（例如Buchholz,1978）。這五種系統皆不相同：Furnham & Rose (1987) 認為PWE與休閒和福利倫理呈負相關，而與財富倫理不相關。

工作意義。工作意義研究 (MOW, 1987; Claes & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1994; England & Whitely，1990；Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1990)是一項針對個人對工作的看法 (並非特定的職業) 的跨國研究。研究中的變項與近來的工作價值觀有最直接關係的包括：工作重心、視工作為權利或義務，以及認知中心性、依賴性和評估工作成果的批判性。根據訪談的結果，MOW研究人員根據這些變項的組合開發了幾種模式，並就這些模式在其國內外樣本間出現的頻率做討論。

　　正如與職業行為相關的工作價值觀一樣，上面所討論的價值觀也有一些重要的相似之處。雖然與工作意義研究相關的價值觀並未被標示為"倫理"，因為有新教工作倫理或休閒倫理，但它們仍有一些重要的相似處。當價值觀是與工作的意義和工作如何使人類達到成就感有關時，這些學者傾向於使用"倫理"這個詞。而上述的五個倫理系統可能與MOW (1987)研究中提出的工作意義模式有一些關聯。

企業倫理價值系統

雖然工作價值觀文獻將焦點集中在其與態度間相互的關係,大部分的企業倫理研究著重在個人的倫理道德決策標準是如何建立及這樣會對決策的制定有何影響。倫理是一種價值系統，因此，儘管很少明確地討論價值觀本身，但企業倫理的文獻可以用於對價值觀的討論。Kahn（1990）的倫理研究中有一部分引用提到了將不同學科的概念聯繫在一起的重要性。 事實上，為了讓價值觀和倫理學有更進一步的發展，管理學和社會科學應該要有更多的交流。

　　*韋氏字典*將倫理定義為（1）一門探討好與壞及討論道德責任與義務的學科;和（2）一組道德原則或一組價值觀。但倫理學理論家並不同意倫理學領域有描述人們如何在選擇行動方案中表達自己的價值觀或制定其應該採取什麼樣的價值觀和行動方針（Donaldson＆Dunfee，1994）。因此，在道德行為、描述性情境和個人情境之間的標準存在著概念上的差距（Kahn，1990）。一些提倡者認為，倫理理論是在"尋求一個能夠明確告訴我們什麼事情該做，或什麼事情值得做的

原則" (Jansen & Von Glinow, 1985, p. 816)。雖然這些定義都暗示著是有一些客觀的標準來確定倫理價值觀的"正確性",但大多數研究者都傾向於透過問卷調查或情境來做倫理價值觀及行為的描述性研究(Ford & Richardson,1994),只有少數(e.g. Carroll, 1979; Saul, 1981)是以規範性的觀點進行。此外,關注的大多不是價值觀系統的內容(即什麼是對的什麼是錯的),而是內容是如何制定的(例如Brady,1985,1986; Jones,1991)或什麼對價值觀系統的發展有影響(例如Trevino,1986)。

倫理價值觀系統的規範性指導方針主要建立在倫理的經典哲學基礎上(Cavanagh,Moberg & Velasquez,1981; Fritzsche & Becker,1984; Gatewood & Carroll,1991):功利(效益)主義理論,權利理論和公平正義理論。在功利主義方法中,對選擇行為的規範與行動能得到最大的社會利益。權利理論使價值觀得以維護個人的權利,如正當程序、言論自由、隱私權和許可,而公平正義理論則呼籲公平及公正的價值觀。這些理論可以為堅持原則,最大化個人利益和最大化共同利益之間的差異做總結(Victor & Cullen,1988)。通常什麼是合理的手段和結果總是模擬兩可的(Elsbach & Sutton,1992);因此,這些理論採用的標準可能經常彼此衝突。Saul(1981)試圖減少這類規範性準則的模糊性,如同它所提出的個人利益應置於公司利益之下,而公司利益又次於社會利益的這項原則。

關於個體如何建立決策標準這點,傳統倫理理論提供了兩個看似相互矛盾的模型:形式主義:強調通過傳統和先例而發展的倫理; 和強調結果和創新的功利主義(Brady,19B5,1986)。這不同於上面所討論的功利主義; 在這裡的價值觀並沒有對"好"結果制定標準。Brady認為在許多情況下,形式主義和功利主義都有助於行為的原則或價值觀的形成,但他並沒有提到為什麼要評估先例所提出的標準,或是評價結果的標準。

在倫理研究中也提到了情境的特性,並指出它對於價值觀有影響。 組織氣候(Payne,1980; Victor & Cullen 1988)和文化(Gatewood & Carroll,1991; Schein,1985; Schneider,1990; Treviňo,1986)與倫理和價值觀非常有關連,它被定義為組織成員的共同假設,價值觀和信念 (Treviňo,1986)。適當行為的明確規範形成了價值觀,並幫助人們能判斷在什麼情況下應該怎麼做才算是恰當的,良師益友或是權威人士也可以作為價值觀的模型。正式的倫理準則會影響員工所持有的倫理價值觀。除了關於倫理和價值觀的組織標準,法律制度、社會倫理準則和專業標準也對價值觀的構成有影響(Gatewood & Carroll, 1991)。倫理價值觀和後續行為的抉擇也可能受到個體差異變項影響,如認知道德發展(Trevino,1986; Victor & Cullen,1988)、自我力量(Trevino,1986)、場依賴性(Trevino,1986),和控制點(Jones,1991; Trevino,1986)。

零散的職業價值觀念

先前的那些章節顯示出不同的職業價值構想包含了集中的和分類的職業價值。就以當前的論點而言能夠做出許多總評。首先, 許多相同的處理方式在研究領域中被大量的忽視。(例如普遍因素從 WVI, VS, MIQ, WAPS 顯示出 職業選擇工具和正面積極的 PWE 措施的交互關係) 更進一步的研究調查和認知範圍評估出相同或者是類似的概念。職業價值和尋找工作是否和工具類似關聯的標準變因,例如工作滿意度(WAPS, MIQ, WVI,VS 案件中有提到),或者職業選擇是一種令人讚賞的目標(WAPS, MIQ, WVI,VS 案件中有提到)。

第二 橫跨工作價值多方面的焦點也被大量的忽視。 在研究範疇中,例如:職業表現會由各人喜好中反映出價值,在其他領域,例如商業道德,對社會標準影響為起因來強調出價值。

多樣的重視,例如新教倫理,工作環境的喜好,管理價值中個人對組織觀念和跨文化的內容必須經過調查來顯示出他們中的關係並且反映出工作的基本價值。Ravlin & Meglino (1987) 發現親新教論上數值比較低的人比較不看重成就,數值較高的人傾向保守主義並且著重在 Rokeach 價值問卷項目裡的贖救,順從,自制力,成就感和社會認同。就以此內容而言,評論職業價值領域的界線,在跨文化研究裡應該也該被注視。然而研究者們必須對新的變數保持開放的態度。規模是以危機處裡為基礎

例如被用於 Ravlin, Meglino 以及他們的同事們 (Cornelius et al., 1985)。

為了研究的可比較性,然而更高的一致性衡量方式應被列入應用,而不是只做重點項目來評分做研究。除此之外,少許的研究包含了可被分類的面向,除了被 Borg 延用的 Elizur(1984)著作。Elizur 定義出工作價值出自工作結果和工作效能關係兩種層面。所有的嘗試不會被用來定義工作價值觀念的領域範圍。而且此層面理論提供工作價值觀的結構維度經常被認為是許多不同層面的綜合(Borg, 1990) 事實上理論層面的矛盾必須互相獨立完全用盡在特別職業領域的情況中(Dancer, 1990)。在許多層面裡,多種的工作價值觀念就像是諺語中的瞎子摸大象的行為。理論家專注在某一特定的工作價值領域來確認領域裡些許的重疊或關係然後提出不同的工作價值定義。 由於此零散性,此工作價值的論點能從內容和結構思考的框架取得利益。

Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization

Jennifer J. Dose*

University of Minnesota Morris, Division of Social Sciences, 203 Camden Hall, 600 East 4th Street, Morris, MN 56267-2134, USA

This article examines the work values and ethics literatures with the goal of integrating these diverse and independent research streams. The vocational behaviour literature and the management and organizational behaviour literature on work values, the Protestant Work Ethic construct, and business ethics theory are first reviewed and discussed, demonstrating how insights from these diverse research areas can inform each other. I propose a comprehensive definition of work values and a structural framework that reflects the central elements of the construct and reduces confusion over its conceptual boundaries. The framework consists of a two-by-two dimensional structure, with one continuum ranging from personal to social consensus-type values, and the other axis corresponding to moral versus preference values. The contents of each resulting quadrant and the relationships between quadrants are examined. Implications of this proposed structure for organizational socialization are discussed to illustrate its potential applica-

Organizational researchers use the term *work values* to encompass a variety of notions ranging from business ethics to work preferences. Yet there has been little recognition of the numerous distinct, albeit related, meanings and few attempts to study work values as a multidimensional construct (Roberson, 1990). On a conceptual level, one focus has been on work values as preferences (e.g. Pryor, 1979,1981) or as derived from needs (e.g. Super, 1973). Other research has focused on work values as a system of ethics. Somewhat surprisingly, the business ethics literature has not typically considered the literature on values, nor has research on the Protestant Work Ethic considered the field of business ethics in general; nevertheless, these fields can inform each other.

This article examines the work values and ethics literatures with the goal of integrating a variety of independent research efforts and providing an organizing framework to guide future research. Although the work values literature is growing, a consistent definition of the construct has not been established. Specifically, the literature tends not to consider the diverse areas of work values, to integrate business ethics research, nor to distinguish adequately between types of values. To achieve a more integrative and useful typology, a two-by-two dimensional structure denoting preference, moral, social consen-

*Requests for reprints.

sus, and personal values is described. This article proposes a comprehensive definition of work values and a structural framework that reflects the central elements of the construct, reduces confusion over conceptual boundaries and provides an integration of theory and research. Finally, to illustrate the relevance of this proposed framework for organizational practice, its application to organizational socialization will be discussed.

Values

A discussion of work values appropriately begins with an examination of the values concept itself. Despite use of the term in a variety of literatures, comparatively little research (Clare & Sanford, 1979) and even less consensus exist concerning what constitutes a value (Borg, 1990; Clare & Sanford, 1979; Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Payne, 1980; Rokeach, 1968, 1973; Wiener, 1988). Theorists have alternatively likened values to beliefs (Rokeach, 1968, 1973), needs (Super, 1973), goals (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987), criteria for choosing goals (Locke, 1976), and attitudes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1992; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Certain theorists have taken pains to distinguish values from other constructs (i.e. Kluckhohn, 1951; Payne, 1980; Rokeach, 1973; Scott, 1965). A particularly heated controversy involves whether values are merely preferences (e.g. Rokeach, 1968, 1973) or are preferences that are morally desirable (Beyer, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Scott, 1965).

Most values theorists *do* agree, however, chat values are standards or criteria (Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1968, 1973; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987) for choosing goals or guiding action and are relatively enduring and stable over time (England, 1967; Kluckhohn, 1951; Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1989; Rokeach, 1968, 1973). Most theorists propose, implicitly or explicitly, that values develop through the influences of culture, society and personality.

Values theorists argue for the importance of research on values as opposed to attitudes. A value does not correspond to a particular object or situation; whereas attitudes are attached to specific objects. Values are standards, but attitudes are not. Additionally, individuals have fewer values than attitudes, making values a more economical construct (Rokeach, 1968). Values occupy a more central position in the cognitive system and personality make-up of individuals, determine attitudes, and are more closely linked to motivation. Finally, the study of values provides the potential for relatively more interdisciplinary collaboration since values play a role throughout the social sciences and management (Rokeach. 1968).

Notwithstanding the debate over the relative merit of or distinctions between values and attitudes, attitude research can still be applied to values specifically. Both can be measured on a continuum from general to specific, with values being more general than attitudes and not corresponding to a particular situation. Values are more consistent than

attitudes across both time and circumstance. Like attitudes, values can be learned either through direct experience or influence processes (Fazio & Zanna, 1981). The more experience or knowledge about the object of the attitude or value, the stronger it is. Whereas value research has focused largely on content, attitude research has been based on analyses of psychological processes (Eagly & Chaiken, 1992), specifically attitude change. Thus, the application of attitude research to values would be beneficial since values research is not well-grounded in theory (James, James & Ashe, 1990).

Work values 221

In summary, although theorists appear to recognize che importance of distinguishing values from ocher related concepts (Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Senger, 1971), this cask has been less chan successful. In face, one mighc argue chac che conciuing dialogue has had che unforcunace consequence of fragmencing che values domain. Nowhere is chis fragmentation wichin che values liceracure so evidenc as in ics application co work.

Work values

An ideal concexc for exploring human values is che complex work organizacion (Connor & Becker, 1975). Alchough interest in work values on both conceptual and practical levels has been increasing (Judge & Bretz, 1992), the topic warrancs even greacer research accencion chan ic has received (Connor & Becker, 1975; Powell, Posner & Schmidc, 1984). Work values research has been driven by concern for che mocivacion level of employees (Brown, 1976) and by recognicion of che imporcance of complemencary values among the employee, supervisor, and che resc of che organizacion (e.g. Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1991). An increasing concern over echical values has been evidenc as well (e.g. Payne, 1980; Saul, 1981). Finally, Connor & Becker (1975) have proposed chac values have implicacions for conflicc, communicacion, organizacional performance, and managerial actions such as emphasis on goals and cypes of concrol.

In spice of che diversicy of pocencial implicacions, che wricings on work values suffer from che same lack of consensus regarding definicion and concepcualizacion as do chose on values in general. As a resulc, research efforcs are ofcen fragmented, involving narrow foci. Mosc imporcanc, alchough noc recognized explicidy (as ic is in general values cheory), che cheorecical discincction as Co whecher work values are merely preferences or have an addicional elemenc of what *should* be preferred remains unresolved. A further complication concerns whecher chis 'oughc-should' elemenc relaces only co moral values (Berger, Olson & Boudreau, 1983; Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Scocc, 1965) or co socially decermined values as well (Locke, 1976; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987; Rokeach, 1968; Schein, 1985). By icself, each of chese foci is incomplece, as will be discussed lacer.

Work values and vocational behaviour

Work values have been invescigaced as preferences for che cype of work or work environmenc

individuals would like or consider imporcanc in job decisions (e.g. Lofquisc &

Dawis, 1971; Pryor, 1979, 1981; Super, 1973). Thus, Zycowski (1970) defined work

values as 'a sec of concepcs which mediace becween che person's affeccive oriencacion and

classes of excernal objeccs offering similar sacisfaccion' (p. 176). Typical areas of invescigacion

are values *vis-a-vis* job sacisfaccion (e.g. Bucler, 1983; Drummond & Scoddard,

1991) and career choice (e.g. Ben-Shem & Avi-Iczhak, 1991). Three research programmes

have presented concepcualizacions of work values and developed inscrumencs chac

measure whac they define as che work values domain.

Super: Vocational work values. According co Super (1973), values derive from needs and are

more general chan incerescs. Work values are goals chac one seeks co accain co sacisfy a

need; chey may be sacisfied by more chan one kind of activity or occupacion. Super's Work

222 *Jennifer J. Dose*

Values Inventory (WVI; Super, 1970) is arguably che besc-known inscrumenc for assessing

values in cerms of vocacional behaviour, mostly using studenc samples. O'Connor &

Kinnane (1961) idencify six faccors in che WVI: macerial success, alcruism, condicions

and associaces, heuriscic—creacive, achievement—prescige, and independence—variecy.

More recencly. Super has developed che Values Scale (Nevill & Super, 1989), an American

version of che Work Importance Scudy (WIS, 1980), which measures 21 vocacional

values; however, this inventory has not received as much atcencion as che WVI.

Lofquist & Dawis: Importance. Lofquisc & Dawis (1971) have conceived of values as needs

which are grouped according co cheir underlying commonalicies. Their Minnesoca

Imporcance Quescionnaire (MIQ; Gay, Weiss, Hendel, Dawis & Lofquisc, 1971) conceptualizes

values along a dimension of imporcance (Lofquisc & Dawis, 1978) much like

Super's WVI. The faccor scruccure of che MIQ shows six values: safecy, auconomy, comforc,

alcruism, achievemenc and aggrandizemenc.

Pryor: Work preferences. Pryor adopced che cerm 'preferences' because he viewed work

values as being concerned wich whac individuals like or prefer in a job inscead of what

chey chink is good or oughc co be done. Ofcen chese cwo elemencs will coincide, buc this

is noc necessarily che case; individuals' moral accicudes will seldom accounc for all of cheir

preferences related co che nacure of work (Pryor, 1979). Pryor (1979) does noc discinguish

incerescs from preferences; however, work aspecc preferences are discinguished from vocacional

preferences (Pryor, 1981). Pryor (1979) does noc limic che number of conceivable

work aspecc preferences; chere are as many as chere are work aspeccs. He does, however,

discinguish 12 faccors in his Work Aspecc Preference Scale (WAPS; Pryor, 1979, 1981):

securicy, self-developmenc, alcruism, life-scyle, physical accivicy, decachment, independence,

prestige, management, co-workers, creativity, and money (Pryor, 1981). Pryor

(1990) found work aspect preferences to be stable according co response paccern, hierarchy

of choice and faccor paccern.

Integration. Alchough defined differendy in che sense of being equaced wich goals (Super), needs (Lofquisc & Dawis), or preferences (Pryor), chese measures appear co be assessing similar conscruccs. Possessing a cercain value or set of values leads individuals co seek jobs characterized by cercain accribuces. Among che handful of scudies chac compare more chan one model, Pryor (1982) acknowledges che need for concepcual incegracion and compares a cluscer analysis of his Work Aspecc Preference Scale co faccors derived from ocher scales, finding some similarities. He did noc compare che scales co each ocher empirically, however. Macnab & Ficzsimmons (1987) conducced a mulcicraic—mulcimechod scudy of che Minnesoca Imporcance Quescionnaire (Lofquist & Dawis, 1971), che Work Values Invencory (Super, 1970), che Canadian version of che Values Survey (WIS, 1980) and che Work Aspecc Preference Scale (Pryor, 1979). A confirmacory faccor analysis found eighc faccors: auchoricy, co-workers, creacivicy, independence, securicy, alcruism, work condicions and prescige. Convergent and discriminant validity analysis indicaced chac for chese eighc 'craics', che differenc scales measured very similar conscruccs. Ic is unforcunace chac chis similaricy is noc more widely recognized and ucilized. Noc only are chese similaricies relevanc, buc largely uninvescigaced differences from ocher cypes of values will become important as che organizing framework of work values is builc.

Work values 223

Values concerning work behaviour

In concrasc co research in vocacional behaviour, which views values as preferences wich no moral or social desirabilicy connocacion, some research in che managemenc and organizacional behaviour liceracure views values syscems as possibly buc noc necessarily having a moral elemenc.

England: Personal Values Questionnaire. England's (1967) personal values syscem was developed specifically for che work environmenc and is viewed as a relacively permanenc percepcual framework chac shapes and influences one's behaviour. England conceived of values as ideologies or philosophies (England, 1967; England, Dhingra & Agarwal, 1974) chac enable underscanding of individuals' behaviour ac work. The imporcance of values lies in cheir relation co a manager's incerpersonal relacions, echics and percepcion of and solutions CO problems. The Personal Values Quescionnaire was conscrucced of 66 concepcs relevanc co major belief syscems and behaviour in organizacions; chese were grouped inco five classes: goals of business organizacions, personal goals of individuals, groups of people, ideas associaced wich people, and ideas abouc general copies. Based in part on the *Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values* (I960), responses are scaled both according to power (importance) and *why* che value was deemed imporcanc; dimensions are: pragmacic (idealism vs. praccicalicy; 'successful'), echical-moral ('right'), or affecc-orienced Cpleasanc').

Ravlin & Meglino: Behaviour preferences. Ravlin, Meglino and their colleagues (Meglino

etal., 1989, 1991; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987, 1989) define work values as preferences for various socially desirable modes of work behaviour, which thus 'ought' co be displayed (Ravlin & Meglino, 1989). Meglino, Ravlin and cheir colleagues appear co concend chac work values are general oriencacions chac can be displayed in all work seccings. Developed using a critical incidencs technique, che Comparacive Emphasis Scale (Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka & McNeely, 1985) assesses achievemenc, concern for ochers, honesty and fairness. Researchers using chis view of work values have initiated a programme of research chac considers aspeccs of work values measuremenc such as social desirabilicy and hierarchy (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987, 1989) as well as che relacionship of work values co ocher conscruccs such as percepcion and decision making (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987), corporace culcure (Meglino *et al.,* 1989), leader sacisfaccion (Meglino *et al.,* 1991), and job choice (Judge & Brecz, 1992).

Importance of outcomes. Rather than focusing on a value syscem, some research has invescigaced individual values by measuring che importance individuals give co a parcicular ouccome. Much of chis line of research is based on Locke's (1976) concepcion of work values, which states chac values are whac one desires or seeks co accain and are learned racher chan innace. According co Locke (1976), individuals differ in whac chey value, and chis decermines cheir choices and affeccive reaccions. Research copies focus on job sacisfaccion (e.g. Berger *etal.,* 1983; Bucler, 1983), commicmenc (e.g. Moccaz, 1986; Oliver, 1990), organizacional choice (e.g. Bar-Ilan & Ramac-Gan, 1982), and parcicipacion (Knoop, 1991).

Researchers commonly devise their own lists of outcomes; therefore, che liscs are noc consiscenc across scudies. Unforcunacely, chis makes comparison of resulcs across scudies difficult.

224 *Jennifer J. Dose*

The significance of work

In contrast to preferences for cypes of work (values such as chose invescigaced in che vocacional liceracure), several research screams have invescigaced che excenc co which work icself has significance for people and whac chac significance is. Much research has focused on che Procescanc Work Echic (PWE) and, co a lesser excenc, ocher so-called 'echics'. The Meaning of Working scudy (MOW Incernacional Research Team, 1987) mosc explicitly discusses work values in cerms of ics significance.

Protestant Work Ethic. Weber (1958) proposed chac che Procescanc work echic provided che moral juscificacion for che accumulacion of wealch (and chus fuelled capicalism). According co Weber's view of Procescanc cheology, work is a divine calling and muse cherefore be done co che glory of God; worldly success is a sign of grace. Characceriscics of individuals subscribing co che PWE include induscriousness, self-discipline, ascecicism, and individualism (Feacher, 1984; Wollack, Goodale, Wicjing & Smich, 1971). Alchough Weber's incerprecacion of Procescanc cheology and ics conneccion co capicalism has been

cricicized (Furnham, 1984), psychologiscs remain incerested in characceriscics of individuals who subscribe co chis echic and in correlations wich ocher atcicudes and behaviours. Psychological invescigacion of che work echic, cherefore, has become somewhac independenc of PWE beliefs as described by Weber.

Three measures of che PWE conscrucc have been proposed and used relacively frequendy in research. The Procescanc Echic Scale (Mirels & Garrecc, 1971), views PWE as a personalicy variable. Blood (1969) cheorized chac how individuals view work in general should be relaced co accicudes cowards cheir parcicular jobs; his measure is composed ofa pro-Procescanc echic scale and a less frequently used non-Procescanc echic scale. Like Blood (1969), Wollack *et al.* (1971) proposed an index chac corresponds co individuals' views cowards work in general racher chan co a specific job. The Survey of Work Values contains six scales: accivicy preference, job involvemenc, pride in work, accicude cowards earnings, social scacus and upward scriving.

Research has found scores on various measures of che Procescanc Work Echic co be relaced co job sacisfaccion (e.g. Blood, 1969; Scone, 1976), job involvemenc (e.g. Shove, Thorncon & Shove, 1990), organizacional commicment (e.g. Kidron, 1978; Shove *et al.*, 1990), career salience (Shove *et al.*, 1990), and leader-member exchange (Steiner, 1988). Comparacive research conducced on PWE measures found che Procescanc Echic Scale (Mirels & Garrecc, 1971), che pro-Procescanc Echic Scale (Blood, 1969), and che incrinsic scales of the Survey of Work Values (Wollack *et al.*, 1971) co be posicively correlaced (Wacers & Zakrajsek, 1991).

Other 'ethics'. Alchough Nord, Brief, Acieh & Dohercy (1988) overescimaced che impacc of che PWE on organizacional behaviouriscs' concepcions of work, cheir poinc is well caken chac a focus only on chis conscrucc overlooks alcernace end scaces chac individuals mighc desire. In face, che PWE has been compared co ocher value syscems such as che organizacional belief syscem (work has value for how ic serves group incerescs and concribuces co one's success), che humaniscic belief syscem (work is imporcanc for individual growch and developmenc and chis is more imporcanc chan work oucpuc), che leisure echic (work is only valued as a means co provide leisure; human fulfilmenc is found in leisure accivicies) and Marxisc-relaced beliefs (e.g. Buchholz, 1978). The five syscems are discincc from each
Work values 225
other: Furnham & Rose (1987) found PWE to be negatively correlated to the leisure and welfare ethics and uncorrelaced with the wealth ethic.

The Meaning of Working. The Meaning of Working study (MOW, 1987; Claes & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1994; England & Whitely, 1990; Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1990) is a cross-national exploration of individuals' perceptions about working itself (as opposed to a particular job). The variables in the study which are most directly related to the present discussion of work values include work centrality, the view of work as either an entitlement or an

obligation, and the cognitive centrality, dependence and criticality of valued work outcomes. Based on the results of interviews, MOW researchers developed several patterns according to combinations of these variables. These patterns have been discussed in terms of their relative frequency within and across the national samples.

Just as with work values related to vocational behaviour, the set of values discussed above shares some important similarities. Although values related to the Meaning of Working study have not been labelled 'ethics' as have the Protestant Work Ethic or leisure ethic, they share some important parallels. These authors tend to use the term 'ethic' in the sense of a system of values about what meaning work has and how it is related to human fulfilment. The five systems of 'ethics' discussed above may bear some relation to the patterns of work meaning discussed in the MOW (1987) study.

Business ethics as a value system

Although the work values literature has tended to focus on attitudinal correlates, a considerable portion of the business ethics literature has emphasized how individuals establish criteria for an ethical/moral decision and how this influences decision-making behaviour (Brady, 1986; Jones, 1991; Trevino, 1986). An ethic is a value system. As such, although seldom explicitly discussing values *per se,* the business ethics literature can be useful in informing a discussion of values. As part of his agenda for ethics research, Kahn (1990) cites the importance of tying together concepts from various disciplines. Indeed, management and the social sciences have much to offer each other in developing the area of values and ethics.

Webster's Dictionary defines ethics as (1) a discipline dealing with what is good and bad or with moral duty and obligation; and (2) a group of moral principles or set of values. Ethics theorists disagree, however, on the extent to which the field of ethics describes how people *do* express their values in choosing courses of action or prescribes what values and courses of action *should* be taken (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1994). Thus, a conceptual gap exists between prescriptive standards for ethical behaviour and descriptive situational and personal contexts (Kahn, 1990). According to some proponents, ethical theory 'seeks the principles that will tell us the right thing to do, or what things are worth doing' (Jansen & Von Glinow, 1985, p. 816). Although these definitions imply that there are some objective criteria for determining the 'rightness' of an ethical values system, most researchers focus on descriptive investigation of ethical values and behaviour through questionnaires or scenarios (Ford & Richardson, 1994). Only a minority (e.g. Carroll, 1979; Saul, 1981) give prescriptive views. Additionally, the focus is not, for the most part, on the content of values systems (i.e. *what* is right or wrong), but rather on how that content is determined (e.g. Brady, 1985, 1986; Jones, 1991) or what influences the development of ethical value systems (e.g. Trevino, 1986).

Theorizing in the area of prescriptive guidelines for an ethical values system has been founded largely on the classic philosophical bases for ethics (Cavanagh, Moberg & Velasquez, 1981; Fritzsche & Becker, 1984; Gatewood & Carroll, 1991): utilitarian theories, theories of rights, and theories of justice. In the utilitarian approach, the act or rule for behaviour chosen leads to the greatest social good. Rights theories guide values to ensure individual rights such as due process, free speech, privacy and consent. Finally, the theory of justice calls for values of equity, fairness and impartiality. These theories can be summed up in terms of the distinction between adhering to principle, maximizing individual interests and maximizing joint interests (Victor & Cullen, 1988). Often what constitutes legitimate means and ends are conflicting and unclear (Elsbach & Sutton, 1992); thus, the criteria these theories employ may often conflict with each other. Saul (1981) has attempted to reduce the ambiguity of prescriptive guidelines such as these by suggesting a principle whereby personal interests are subordinate to company interests, which are, in turn, subordinate to societal interests.

Turning to models of how individuals establish decision criteria, classical ethics theory offers two seemingly conflicting models: formalism, which emphasizes an ethic developed through tradition and precedent; and utilitarianism, which emphasizes results and innovation (Brady, 19B5, 1986). Note that this is distinct from the utilitarianism discussed above; here, values are based on outcomes received by a decision maker with no criteria given for a 'good' outcome. Brady argues that in many instances, both formalism and utilitarianism are useful in forming principles or values for action. Brady does not, however, discuss why criteria based on precedent should be valued or what the criteria for evaluating consequences should be.

Situational characteristics also have been investigated with regard to ethics, and have implications for values. Organizational climate (Payne, 1980; Victor & Cullen 1988) and culture (Gatewood & Carroll, 1991; Schein, 1985; Schneider, 1990; Trevifio, 1986), which is defined as the shared assumptions, values and beliefs of organizational members (Trevino, 1986), have been widely associated with ethics and values. Clear norms about appropriate behaviour shape values and help individuals judge what is appropriate in a given situation. Significant others such as mentors or authority figures can model values. Finally, a formal code of ethics can influence the ethical values employees hold. In addition to organizational standards for ethics and values, the legal system, society's code of ethics and professional standards constitute influences as well (Gatewood & Carroll. 1991). Choices of ethical values and subsequent behaviour also may be affected by individual difference variables such as cognitive moral development (Trevino, 1986; Victor & Cullen, 1988), ego strength (Trevino, 1986), field dependence (Trevino, 1986) and locus of control (Jones, 1991; Trevino, 1986).

The fragmented state of the work values concept

The preceding sections highlighted the varying conceptions of work values, content foci and the ways in which work values have been classified. Several overall comments can be made regarding the state of the field. First, similarities of approaches *within* research areas are largely ignored (e.g. common factors shared by the WVI, VS, MIQ and WAPS vocational choice instruments and positive correlations of PWE measures). Further investigation and *recognition* of the extent to which scales assess the same or similar constructs, as

well as exploracion of whecher che inscrumencs have similar relationships with cricerion variables such as job sacisfaccion (in che case of Procescanc Work Echic scales), or occupacional choice (in che case of che WAPS, MIQ, WVI and VS) is a laudable goal.

Second, relationships *across* various foci of work values are largely neglecced as well. Research domains, such as vocacional behaviour, have focused on values decermined by individual preference, while ocher areas, such as business echics, emphasize values as resulcing from che normacive influence of sociecy. Various foci such as che Procescanc Work Echic, preferences for work environmenc, managerial values, individual versus organizacional perspectives, and cross-culcural concent muse be invescigaced co elucidace che relacionships becween chem and co shed lighc on che work values conscrucc in general. Scill, some invescigacion of relacionships becween foci do exist. Ravlin & Meglino (1987) found chac chose scoring low on che pro-Procescanc Echic Scale (Blood, 1969) rank achievemenc as less imporcanc. High-scoring individuals on che Procescanc Echic Scale (Mirels & Garrecc, 1971) are also likely co be high in conservacism and co assign more imporcance co che Rokeach Value Survey icems of salvacion, obedience, self-concrol, sense of accomplishmenc and social recognicion (Feacher, 1984).

In cerms of concent, che difficulcy of assessing che boundaries of che work values domain, parcicularly in cross-culcural research, should also be noced. Researchers muse cherefore remain open co new variables. Scales chac are based on cricical incidenc, such as used by Ravlin, Meglino and cheir colleagues (Cornelius *et al.,* 1985), racher chan being formed *a priori,* are well suiced for chis purpose. For che sake of comparabilicy across scudies, however, greacer consiscency in measuremenc should be praccised, racher chan using a unique lisc of imporcance racings for each scudy.

In addicion co che narrow focus on concenc, very liccle research has involved dimensions inco which che concenc can be classified. One excepcion is che work of Elizur (1984) which was excended by Borg (1990). Elizur defined che work values conscrucc according co cwo facecs: modalicy of ouccome and relacion co performance. No accempc was made co define che limics of che work values domain. A furcher problem wich chis use of facec cheory co provide dimensional scruccure for work values is chac alchough work values have usually been considered as composices of differenc facec elemencs (Borg, 1990), chis is, in face, concradiccory co facec cheory since facecs muse be mucually exclusive and joincly exhauscive

in che concexc of a parcicular domain (Dancer, 1990).

In many ways, various perspeccives on work values are like che proverbial blind men accempcing co describe an elephanc: cheoriscs have concencrated on particular areas of ehe work values coneene domain, acknowledging lieele overlap or relaeionship beeween coneene areas, and proposing differene definieions of work values. Due eo ies fragmeneed naeure, ehe eopic of work values would benefie from a framework chac more fully considers boch concenc and scruccure.

A framework for work values

A good definicion of che work values would include all concepcualizacions and research which are relevanc co che conseruce, yee will diseinguish work values from oeher conseruces. As noeed, ehere is no widely accepced definicion of work values (Pryor, 1981; Zycowski, 1970). I propose che following definieion based on logic and previous eheory: work values are evaluaeive scandards relacing co work or che work environmene by which

228 *Jennifer J. Dose*

individuals discern what is 'right' or assess the importance of preferences. Some work values may also have a degree of social consensus about whether they should be subscribed to, while other values are seen to be equally acceptable according to the choice of each individual. This definition utilizes the dominant view of values as standards (e.g. Kilmann, 1981; Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1968), but also recognizes that work values may be classified according to certain properties.

A concept's central elements must be reflected in any dimensional structure (Wiener, 1988). I propose that work values will vary along two dimensions: (1) whether the value held exhibits a moral element, and (2) the degree of social consensus regarding the importance or desirability of the particular value (see Fig. 1). The moral component expresses a standard that distinguishes whether something is right or wrong; alternatively, values may simply be preferences for which there is no moral aspect. The extent to which the value possesses an evaluative (should-ought) element has been extensively debated in the context of the definition of values; however, I contend that both preferences and conceptions of what is right and wrong fall within the boundaries of the values construct along the personal-social consensus continuum. Within the range of preferences, some values are more widely viewed as desirable; there is greater social consensus on their desirability. Values do not always coincide with those of a social group, however. Thus, values may be held personally or socially and may or may not have a moral element.

This framework is in some ways an extension of the instrumental and terminal dimensions used in Rokeach's (1973) values survey with some important differences. For Rokeach, a single value could not be classified along both dimensions. Only instrumental values could be moral or competence values and only terminal values could be personal or social. Since many of Rokeach's instrumental and terminal values are related (e.g.

loving and mature love) or could be changed from instrumental to terminal by changing
the part of speech (e.g. independent to independence), a two-by-two classification provides
a more precise yet parsimonious structure. Additionally, scales in the work values
literature do not distinguish between instrumental and terminal values. The term 'preferences'
more nearly describes the opposite of moral values, distinguishing standards that
denote right and wrong from those that do not.

Moral versus preference values

The attitude literature has proposed the need for distinction between moral obligation
and personal preference (Gorsuch & Ortberg, 1983). This distinction has particular relevance
for work values since some values (and corresponding decisions) have moral considerations
while others are merely preferences without moral implications. Work values
are moral to the extent that they follow standards of right and wrong such as the theories
of rights, justice, and utilitarianism (Cavanagh *etal.,* 1981) or Saul's (1981) ethical guidelines.
Moral values may be held consensually or individually. Values that include
standards of importance or liking, but no element of right and wrong, are classified as
preferences. Previous literature has not recognized this important distinction (e.g.
England *et al.,* 1974; Gatewood & Carroll, 1991; Kahn, 1990). England, for example,
pointed to the conceptual nature of values as a continuum between preferential
approaches and normative approaches; his term 'normative' includes both moral and
socially desirable values. Moral values are likely to be more strongly internalized than are

Work values

Moral

229

Personal ethics code

-Theory of rights

-Theory of justice

-UtiliUrianlsm (Cavanagh et al., 1981)

-Societal interests (Saul, 1981)

-Morai-ethical values (England, 1967)

Qenetic component of moral values

(Keller etal., 1992)

Protestant Work Ethic

-Mirels & Oarrett (1971)

-Woilacketal. (1971)

Personal

WAPS (Pryor, 1979)

WVI (Super, 1973)

VS (Nevill & Super, 1985)

MIQ (Lofquist & Dawis, 1978)

(authority, cowor1(ers, creativity.

security, working conditions, prestige)

Importance of outcomes

Leisure "ethic" (Buchhoitz, 1978)

Meaning of Working (MOW, 1987)

Aesthetic (England, 1967)

Oiganizational ethics code

-Theory of rights

-Theory of justice

-Utilitarianism (Cavanagh et al., 1981)

-Societal Interests (Saul, 1981)

Ethics climate

Professional code

Legal code

Fomialism (Brady, 1985)

Humanistic lwlief system (Buchhoitz, 1978)

Protestant Woric Ethic

-Blood (1969)

-Nord et al. (1988)

Social Consensus

Cross-cultural values (Hofstede 1984)

Utilitarianism (Brady, 1985)

Pragmatic values (England, 1967)

Altruism, individualism/independence

(Pryor, 1979; Super, 1973)

CES (achievement, heiping, honesty.

faimess; Cornelius et al., 1985)

Organizational belief system

Marxist-related beliefs (Buchhoitz, 1978)

Preference

Figure 1. A framework for work values.

socially influenced values in general. The idea that perceptions of the self include a sense

of duty ot obligation is an important one (Higgins, 1987; Scott, 1965).

Social consensus

Social consensus values are those which members of a certain culture agree are relatively

important, not only for themselves but for others as well. Clearly, no value is universally

advocated or advocated to the same degree; this is why social consensus and personal

values do not form a dichotomy. In contrast to personal values, which are based on or chosen

largely due to personal experience, social consensus values are more often learned due

to the influence of others (Fazio & Zanna, 1981). Greater social consensus may also lead

to greater attempts to influence individuals towards the majority view. In the moral

range, there is likely to be social influence informing individuals of the standards of what

is 'right'.

A large portion of the work values literature discusses the social construction of values.

Culturally shared understandings play a role in defining what is valued (Scott, 1965). The

230 *Jennifer]. Dose*

social environment or context affects construction of meaning by providing a guide to

socially acceptable beliefs and focusing individuals' attention on particular stimuli

(England, 1967; England *etal.,* 1974; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Shared values are indicative

of an organizational or even national culture (Hofstede, 1984; Hofstede & Bond,

1984; Meglino *etal.,* 1989; Schein, 1985; Trevino, 1986). Social norms are necessary for

the establishment of an ethical climate (Payne, 1980; Victor & Cullen, 1988). Social

learning theory (Bandura, 1977) implies that appropriate work values are modelled in the

organizational setting (Weiss, 1978), and that work values can be modified as individuals

are socialized (Berger *etal.,* 1983; Connor & Becker, 1975; Weiss, 1978). Social consensus

is an important factor in moral decisions (Jones, 1991); values used in decision

making include not only the personal values of the decision maker, but also values of those

to whom the decision maker must respond (Beyer, 1981).

It should be recognized that *advocating* certain values does not mean *adherence* necessarily

follows. Although altruism is highly regarded, for example, it is not always practised.

The attitude literature has extensively investigated the relationship between

attitudes and behaviour; although a review of that research is peripheral to the present discussion,

it would be relevant to future investigations of the relationship between attitudes

and values.

Personal values

Not all work values are socially determined, however, or have equivalent social desirability

(Ravlin & Meglino, 1989). This idea is evidenced by two areas of the values

literature: work preferences and value conflict. Types of work desired (Super, 1973),

preferences for aspects of work (Pryor, 1979), or generally what individuals perceive to

be important about their work environment and work outcomes (Locke, 1976; Lofquist

& Dawis, 1971), constitute different but equally worthwhile alternatives. Additionally,

work values have been found to have a genetic component (Keller, Bouchard, Arvey, Segal

& Dawis, 1992), thus not socially influenced. Finally, only the altruism and independence

scales of Super's Work Values Inventory (Super & Mowry, 1962) and Pryor's Work Aspects

Preference Scales (Pryor, 1983) were susceptible to social desirability effects. Therefore,

rather than treating social desirability as a measurement problem, it may be more fruitful

to consider the degree of social desirability as an indicator of the extent to which the value is socially determined or part of a shared culture (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). The existence of value conflict also implies that all work values do not possess the same degree of social consensus. Values are personal; thus, points of interface between individuals with different values can create conflict (Brown, 1976; Connor & Becker, 1975; Senger, 1971). Although the ethics literature cites the importance of organizational and societal normative values (e.g. Saul, 1981), agreement on appropriate values is far from universal (Katz & Khan, 1978; Payne, 1980). The ethics literature posits that people may have several sets of moral codes—as many as they may have influential social groups (Beyer, 1981; Strother, 1976). The key reference group is likely to be the one which is most salient in that situation, perhaps due to proximity or reward power. Different groups of organizational stakeholders may have different values systems; ethics may conflict resulting in ambivalence or pluralism (Jansen & Von Glinow, 1985; Payne, 1980; Payne & Giacalone, 1990; Tetlock, 1986). Again, although there is a certain degree of congru*Work values* 231

ence among social groups, the desirability of certain values is hardly universal. Finally, personal ethical standards may differ from those of the organization, resulting in conflict as well (Trevino, 1986). Whistleblowing is a good illustration of behaviour influenced by this type of value conflict—even though the salient reference group holds certain values, the individual chooses not to act in accordance with them. Violation of normative values in any sense makes a case for personal determination of values (Elsbach & Sutton, 1992; Payne, 1980; Payne & Giacalone, 1990).

Integration of structure and content: A two-by-two diagram

Social—moral quadrant

Based on the proposed dimensional structure, conceptions of values and ethics can each be placed into one of the four quadrants. Many values systems proposed by the business ethics literature occupy the social-moral quadrant. As ethics, they are principles concerning moral duty. Organizational ethics codes, professional codes and legal codes are all socially determined value systems with a moral component dictating what is 'right'. An ethical climate is also a socially shared system. Formalism is an ethic based on tradition and precedent; thus, it also contains an element of social consensus. Theories of rights, justice and utilitarianism (Cavanagh *et al.,* 1981), and England's moral-ethical value system are placed in this quadrant when held by social consensus. The humanistic belief system (e.g. Buchholz, 1978) is also socially determined and dictates that work 'ought' to be for individual growth. Finally, both Nord *et al.* (1988) and Blood (1969; Hulin & Blood, 1968) conceived of the Protestant Work Ethic as socially and culturally determined.

Personal—moral quadrant

Personal moral codes lie within the personal-moral quadrant. Whistleblowing, for example,

would involve a personal moral obligation that opposes the social consensus of the organization. Although individuals' personal values will often reflect social consensus, this is not necessarily the case (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Individuals may hold ethics of rights, justice, or utilitarianism (Cavanagh *et al.,* 1981) that are not shared by the organization (or vice versa). Personal moral codes are emphasized when the values of the organization do not conform to the values the individual deems important. Mirels & Garret (1971) conceptualized the Protestant Work Ethic as a personality variable, thus not under social influence, and Wollack *et al.* (1971) declared no position. Finally, since Keller *et al.* (1992) postulated a genetic factor in work preferences, a further research question is the possibility of a genetic personal-moral component.

Personal-preference quadrant

The vocational behaviour literature on work preferences (Lofquist & Dawis, 1978; Nevill & Super, 1989; Pryor, 1979; Super, 1973) falls primarily in this quadrant. The body of research that simply asks for ratings of what individuals find important belongs here as well. What individuals like or judge to be important varies by individual and, except for

232 *Jennifer J. Dose*

two values, has not been found to exhibit social desirability. The leisure 'ethic' (e.g. Buchholz, 1978) has no socially desirable or moral component; thus, it fits in this quadrant as well. As personal preferences, England's (1967) aesthetic or affective values also belong here. Finally, the meaning individuals ascribe to working (MOW, 1987) is derived from both personal experience and social influence; however, lack of agreement across individuals and the greater role played by personal experience advocate for placing it on the personal side of the personal—social continuum.

Social—preference quadrant

These values are consensually viewed as being desirable but impose no moral standard. Often the goal is success, as in Brady's (1985) concept of utilitarianism and England's (1967) pragmatic values. Super (1973) and Pryor's (1979) altruism and individualism scales were found to have a social desirability component. Ravlin & Meglino's (1987) values are seen as socially desirable as well. The organizational and Marxist-related belief systems (Buchholz, 1978) are shared consensually, but are concerned with achieving success or control rather than meeting any moral standard. Finally, as culturally determined values with no moral content, Hofstede's (1984) power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity/femininity values should be included here.

Relationships between the quadrants and directions for future research

The personal-social consensus dimension is not a dichotomy but a continuum: values domains may be closer or further from the centre. The degree to which the values is consensually seen as socially desirable determines whether it falls on the personal or social consensus end. A hypothesized genetic component of moral values would, of course, fall

on the personal end. The extent to which the Protestant Work Ethic is a socially desirable or personality variable is a question open to further research, but it may likely have both personal and social influences, thus falling closer to the mid-point within the personal—moral quadrant.

Although individuals often have a personal code of ethics, perhaps with the same content as one in the social—moral quadrant, the difference is that they hold these personal codes in the absence of social influence. Ethics need not be externally induced (Wallach & Wallach, 1990). Therefore, a particular point of interest occurs when the personal code is in conflict with organizational or societal normative values. Socialization, high selfmonitoring, and field dependence may all predict social rather than personal determinants of ethical codes. In contrast, individuals with an internal locus of control or high ego strength would be more likely to act according to personal values. Individuals' moral development may also be a factor (Trevino, 1986), particularly if an individual's stage of moral development is at odds with the organization's ethical climate. The presence of referent individuals or salient evidence of a particular value may enhance adherence to the social consensus (Reno, Cialdini & Kallgren, 1993). Another question for future research concerns the value pluralism resulting when societal and organizational value systems are not congruent, and how the employee tries to resolve this conflict.

Turning to the preference side of the personal-social continuum, preferences do not all have the same degree of social desirability. Even within the same instrument, some pref*Work values* 233

erences have a social desirability component while others do not (Pryor, 1979; Super, 1973). A potential research question involves how people choose between socially desirable values. Perhaps personal values determine the hierarchy.

The distinction between moral and preference values concerns whether the value corresponds to something *liked* or if it is attached to an obligation to do what is *right.* Thus, England's (1967) pragmatic values are often preferred because they lead to success, whereas values of justice may be held because they contain a moral component. Factors of the Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987) and Super (1973) and Pryor's (1979) altruism and individualism factors are not classified as moral values because these instruments assess values that are important preferences, not distinctions between right and wrong.

A benefit of this proposed structure is that by integrating work values models, it is possible to determine what future research would be beneficial. The small amount of research investigating more than one conception of work values (i.e. Macnab & Fitzsimmons, 1987; Pryor, 1982), has primarily examined measures to determine if various scales are actually assessing the same construct. Future research to test the model should take two directions. First, a more parsimonious view of values content can be established by

studies similar to that of Macnab & Fitzsimmons (1987). Second, comparison of values *across* quadrants can help determine if using values from more than one quadrant can enhance prediction of other variables such as job satisfaction or organizational commitment. The only study to consider work values in more than one quadrant was Ravlin & Meglino's (1987) comparison of the Protestant work ethic with other variables. Several instruments also have been used to predict organizational commitment, including ratings of importance of work outcomes and the Protestant Ethic Scale (Mirels & Garrett, 1971); research would profit from investigating these types of work values concurrently.

An illustrative application: Organizational socialization

Although this framework for work values has implications for many aspects of organizational theory, one particularly appropriate example concerns organizational socialization. Socialization is 'the process by which a new member learns and adapts to the value system, the norms, and the required behaviour patterns of an organization, society or group' (Schein, 1968, p. 1). The organizational socialization literature has discussed stage models of socialization (e.g. Wanous, 1980), tactics organizations use to inculcate new members (e.g. Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), and socialization processes such as sensemaking (e.g. Louis, 1980) and newcomer proaction (e.g. Morrison, 1993; Reichers, 1987), but has not focused extensively on these stages or tactics relative to the *type* of information organizations wish newcomers (or newcomers wish themselves) to learn.

Work values and organizational socialization

Work values are but one facet of organizational life that new employees must learn; nevertheless, shared values represent a significant element of organizational culture (Schein, 1985; Wiener, 1988). The values component, however, has been relatively neglected in socialization research. Thus, it is proposed that the framework of work values can shed light on research needs relating to how and in what circumstances newcomers will adopt the values of their organization or work group.

234 *Jennifer J. Dose*

Two important points can be made regarding the organizational socialization literature and how it relates to work values. First, the organization does not usually need to create an entirely new set of values in its employees. Individuals are initially attracted to organizations with which they have attributes in common (Schneider, 1987). Similarly, the selection literature shows that interviewers prefer applicants who are similar to themselves (e.g. Rynes & Gerhart, 1990; Word, Zanna & Cooper, 1974). Nevertheless, organizations are likely to be comprised of individuals with at least some variability in personality, socio-economic background, and values. Uncertain economic conditions, loyalty to norms of a particular profession, unrealistic perceptions of the other party by the prospective employee or organizational representative, and the natural variation due to a large population of individuals imply that individuals will not be identical and that

some amount of socialization is in order.

A related issue is whether it is even in the best interests of the organization for individuals to conform with every aspect of organizational values. Thus, a model of work values in which the individual may not accept social influence in every situation complements Schein's (1968) view of the creative individualist who only accepts the pivotal norms of the organization.

A second point is that individuals do not always respond to socialization attempts. Although many traditional stage models (e.g. Buchanan, 1974; Feldman, 1976) assume that newcomers will adopt new values during the socialization process, recent research (Adkins, 1992; Ravlin, Meglino & Adkins, 1989) implies that socialization does not always result in changes in individuals' work values. Bell & Staw (1987) also support the idea that organizational influence is not as strong as once thought. Recent research (Chao, Kozlowski, Major & Gardner, 1994; Morrison, 1993) has emphasized the newcomer's role in information seeking or learning processes; however, gaining information does not necessarily mean assimilating it. The current work value framework can help explain what type of values will most easily be influenced during organizational socialization and be adopted by individuals.

Contribution of the work values framework

Work values falling along certain dimensions of the work values framework are more likely to be amenable to socialization attempts than others. Values on the social consensus end of the continuum will be more easily influenced by socialization tactics. Although values are relatively stable, the steps taken in many socialization strategies (e.g. unfreezing, 'upending experiences', or coercive persuasion; Schein, 1968) can serve to exert a great deal of social influence as newcomers seek to regain their sense of efficacy. Even in less severe socialization techniques, conformity pressures can influence socially desirable values. Furthermore, values such as these about which there is a consensus in the organization are ones about which newcomers will proactively seek information.

In contrast, work values in the personal-preference quadrant are unlikely to be affected by socialization attempts because the content deals largely with preferences for type of work environment. Personal values such as these are more likely to be formed through direct experience; thus, they are stronger, more stable over time, and less susceptible to social influence (Fazio & Zanna, 1981). For example, if individuals find that they value autonomy in their work environment, they are unlikely to be convinced otherwise.

Work values 235

Research has shown this type of work values to be related to job choice (e.g. Ben-Shem & Avi-ltzhak, 1991)- Thus, it is likely that newcomers either enter with work values that match the organization, or that they will discover a poor fit between themselves and the organization and subsequently leave.

Finally, the question of whether individuals will adhere to the organization's ethics code is evidenced by the distinction between the personal-moral and the social consensus—moral quadrants. Whether socialization will successfully affect individuals' adherence to the organization's ethical code is determined by the extent to which they agree with the organization's values or extol a different, personal ethical code. There may be conflict between individual and organizational values that cannot be resolved by socialization attempts. Conflict may also be created if work group values are at odds with larger organizational values; in this situation, individuals are more likely to accept the influence of their work group (Schein, 1968).

Theorists and practitioners have tended to view the socialization process as occurring in the same manner no matter what the particular socialization content, be it technical or social information (see Morrison, 1993 for an exception to this rule). As the discussion of the different types of work values illustrates, this is not the case even *within* the domain of work values. Recognizing different types and conceptualizations of work values is vital. Using only Pryor's work preference values, for example, would lead one to believe that work values cannot be changed at all. On the other hand, only considering England's value system implies that values are relatively easy to change.

It should be noted, however, that type of work value is not the only factor in whether individuals adopt organizational values. Value change is also dependent on pre-existing socialization or socialization to working itself (see work socialization of youth research project; e.g. Claes & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1994) and on the strength of the organizational culture (Adkins, 1992). An organization that has no widely propagated value system is not likely to impact the work values of organizational members. Nonetheless, the social influence manifested in both organizational socialization and work value formation demonstrates the interrelatedness of the two domains and the relevance of the work values framework.

The implication for organizational practice is that once leaders have determined the values to be sought in their members, the classification of those values according to the work values framework will help them establish the appropriate policy for ensuring that newcomers do, in fact, hold pivotal values. Personal—preference values would best be acquired through selection since post-employment socialization attempts are not likely to be effective. It is also important to characterize the personal-preference values necessary for *tht job* and not the organization as a whole. For example, some positions may require more autonomy than others. In contrast, social consensus values are more malleable and can be influenced by socialization tactics and by disseminating information to newcomers. Moral values are an important consideration in light of increasing societal scrutiny of ethical issues (Payne, 1980; Saul, 1981), but they create a special challenge. It is unlikely that a strategy of selection or socialization alone would be sufficient. Selection

efforts should be informative regarding the ethical climate of the organization and act as a screening device. Socialization can then further refine and sustain ethical norms.

In summary, values are diagnostic of one's identity, self-worth and world view; as such, they have major implications for our lives and our interactions with others. Because so

236 *Jennifer J. Dose*

much of our time is spent in a working environment, work values are particularly significant and salient. Work values have implications for the kind of career we choose, the work environment we prefer, and the kinds of decisions we will make. Clearly, however, work values are not all of one type and these types have implications for organizational life, particularly the effectiveness of socialization attempts.

References

Adkins, C. L. (1992). A field study of the stability of work values during organizational socialization. Paper presented at the National Academy of Management Annual Meeting, August.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E. & Lindzey, G. (I960). *Allport-Vemon-Lindzey Study of Values.* Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Bandura, A. *(X')ll). Social Learning Theory.* Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Bar-Ilan, U. & Ramat-Gan, 1. (1982). Policies of organizational choice at different vocational life stages. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly,* 31(1), 60-68.

Bell, N. E. & Staw, B. M. (1987). People as sculptors versus sculpture: The roles of personality and personal control in organizations. *Handbook of Career Theory,* pp. 232-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ben-Shem, L & Avi-ltzhak, T. E. (1991). On work values and career choice in freshman students: The case of helping vs. other professions./oamai *of Vocational Behavior,* 39, 369-379-

Berger, C. J., Olson, C. A. & Boudreau, J. W. (1983). Effects of unions on job satisfaction: The role of workrelated values and perceived rewards. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 32, 289-324.

Beyer, S. M. (1981). Ideologies, values and decision making in organizations. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Design, 2,* pp. 166-202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction.yoaraa/ *of Applied Psychology,* 55, 456-459.

Borg, I. (1990). Multiple facetisations of work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 39, 410-412.

Brady, E N. (1985). A Janus-headed model of ethical theory: Looking two ways at business/society issues. *Academy of Management Review,* 10, 568—576.

Brady, E N. (1986). Aesthetic components of management ethics. *Academy of Management Review,* 11, 337-344.

Brown, M. A. (1976). Values—A necessary but neglected ingredient of motivation on the job. *Academy of Management Review,* 3, 15-23.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations./ l(/OT/«/j/n?/zVe i'aenre Qaa^w/j, 19, 533-546.

Buchholz, R. A. (1978). An empirical study of contemporary beliefs about work in American *society. Journal of Applied Psychology,* 63, 219-227.

Butler, J. K. (1983). Value importance as a moderator of the value fulfillment-job satisfaction relationship: Group *differences. Journal of Applied Psychology,* 68, 420-428.

Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review, 4,* 297—505.

Cavanagh, G. E, Moberg, D. J. & Velasquez, M. (1981). The ethics of organizational politics. *Academy of Management Review,* 6, 363-374.

Chao, G. T, Kozlowski, S. W. J., Major, D. A. & Gardner, P (1994). The effects of organizational tactics and contextual factors on newcomer socialization and learning outcomes. In S. W. J, Kozlowski (Chair), Transitions during organizational socialization: Newcomer expectations, information-seeking and learning outcomes. Paper presented at the 9th Annual Conferences of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN, April.

Claes, R. & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1994). Initial career and work meanings in seven European countries. *Career Development Quarterly, 42,* 337—352.

Clare, D. A. & Sanford, D. G. (1979)- Mapping personal value space: A study of managers in four organizations. *Human Relations,* 32, 659—666.

Connor, P, E. & Becker, B. W. (1975). Values and the organization: Suggestions for research. *Academy of Management Journal,* 18, 550—561.

Work values 237

Cornelius, E. T , Ullman, J. P, Meglino, B. M., Czajka, J. & McNeely, B. (1985). A new approach to the study of work values and some preliminary results. Paper presented at the Southern Management Association, Orlando, EL.

Dancer, L. S. (1990). Introduction to facet theory and its applications. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 39, 365-377.

Donaldson, T. & Dunfee, T. W. (1994). Toward a unified conception ofbusiness ethics: Integrative social contracts theory. *Academy of Management Review,* 19, 252-284.

Drummond, R. J. & Stoddard. A. (1991). Job satisfaction and work values. *Psychological Reports* 69 1116-1118.

Eagly, A. H. & Chaiken. S. (1992). *The Psychology of Attitudes.* Eort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work *omcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology* 69, 379-389.

Elsbach, K. D. & Sutton. R. I. (1992). Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate action: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories. *Academy of Management Journal* 35 699-738. ' '

England, G. W. (1967), Personal values systems of American managers. *Academy of Management Journal,* 10 107-117.

England, G. W., Dhingra, O. P & Agarwal, N. C. (1974). *The Manager and the Man.* Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

England, G. W. & Whitely, W T (1990). Cross-national meanings of working. In A. Brief & W. Nord (Eds), *Meanings of Occupational Work.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Eazio, R. H. & Zanna, M. P. (1981). Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency. In L. Berkowitz *{Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* 14, 161-202.

Eeather, N. T. (1984). Protestant ethic, conservatism and *values.Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46* 1132-1141. '

Eeldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 21, 433-452.

Eishbein, M. & Ajzen, A. (1975), *Belief Attitude, tntention and Behavior.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley,

Eord, R, C, & Richardson, W, D, (1994), Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 13, 205-221,

Eritzsche, D, J, & Becker, H, (1984), Linking management behavior to ethical philosophy—An empirical *investigmon. Academy of Management Journal,* 27, 165-175,

Eurnham, A, (1984), *Work values ^nd beliefs in Britain. Journal of Occupational Behaviour,* 5, 281-291,

Furnham, A, & Rose, M, (1987), Alternative ethics: The relationship between the wealth, welfare, work and leisure ethic. *Human Relations, 40,* 561-574.

Gatewood, R. D. & Carroll, A, B, (1991), Assessment of ethical performance of organizational members: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review,* 16, 667-690,

Gay, E, G,, Weiss, D, J,, Hendel, D, D,, Dawis, R. V. & Lofquist, R. H, (1971) Manual for the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire, *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation,* 28 (Bulletin No. 54).

Gorsuch, R, L, & Ortberg, J. (1983). Moral obligation and attitudes: Their relation to behavioral intentions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 1025-1028.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review,* 94, 319-340.

Hofstede, G. (1984). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review 9* 389-398. ' '

Hofstede, G. & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's cultural *dimensions. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 15* 417-433. '

Homer, P, M, & Kahle, L, R, (1988), A structural equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 54, 638-646,

Hulin, C, L, & Blood, M. R. (1968). Job enlargement, individual differences and worker responses. *Psychological Bulletin,* 69, 41-55.

James, L, R,, James, L. A. & Ashe, D, K, (1990). The meaning of organizations: The role of cognitions and values. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational Climate and Culture.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jansen, E. & Von Glinow, M. A, (1985), Ethical ambivalence and organizational reward systems. *Academy of Management Review,* 10, 814-822,

Jones, T. M. (1991), Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue contingent model. *Academy of Management Review,* 16,366-395,

238 *Jennifer J. Dose*

Judge. T, A, & Bretz, R, D, (1992), Effects of work values on job choice *decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, n,261-211.*

Kahn, W, A, (1990), Toward an agenda for business ethics research. *Academy of Management Review,* 16, 311-328,

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L, (1978), *The Social Psychology of Organizations.* New York: Wiley,

Keller, L, M,, Bouchard, T, J,, Arvey, R, D,, Segal, N, L, & Dawis, R, V, (1992), Work values: Genetic and environmental *inRuences. Journal of Applied Psychology, 11,* 79-88,

Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal,* 21, 239-247,

Kilmann, R, H, (1981), Toward a unique/useful concept of values for interpersonal behavior: A critical review of the literature on value. *Psychological Reports,* 48, 939-959,

Kluckhohn, C, (1951), Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T, Parsons & E, A, Shils (Eds), *Toward a General Theory of Aaion,* pp, 388-433, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,

Knoop, R, (1991), Achievement of work values and participative decision making. *Psychological Reports,* 68, 775-781.

Locke, E, A, (1976), The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* pp, 1297-1345, Chicago: Rand McNally,

Lofquist, L, H, & Dawis, R, V. (1971). Values as second-order needs in the theory of work adjustment.>:/r«a/ *of"Vocational Behavior,* 12, 12-19.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense-making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings, A(/OT/»«/rd//Ve Harare Qsaf/er/y, 25, 226-251,

Macnab, D, & Eitzsimmons, G. W, (1987), A multitrait-multimethod study of work-related needs, values *and preferences. Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 30, 1-15,

Meglino, B, M,, Ravlin, E, C, & Adkins, C, L. (1989), Work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the values congruence process and its relationship to individual *outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology,* 74, 424-432,

Meglino, B, M,, Ravlin, E, C, & Adkins, C, L, (1991), Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction. *Human Relations,* 44, 4 8 1 ^ 9 5 ,

Mirels, H. L. & Garrett, J. B, (1971), The Protestant ethic as a personality *variable. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology,* 36, 40-44,

Morrison, E, W, (1993), Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal,* 36, 557-589,

Mottaz, C. J, (1986), Gender differences in work satisfaction, work-related rewards and values, and the determinants of work satisfaction. *Human Relations,* 39, 359-378.

MOW International Research Team (1987), *The Meaning of Working.* London: Academic Press,

Nevill, D. D, & Super, D, E. (1989). *Manual for the Values Scale.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nord, W. R., Brief, A. P., Atieh, J, M, & Doherty, E, M, (1988), Work values and the conduct of organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 10, 1-42.

O'Connor, J. P, & Kinnane, J, E, (1961), A factor analysis of work *values. Journal of Consulting Psychology,* 8, 263-267,

Oliver, N, (1990), Work rewards, work values and organizational commitment in an employee-owned firm: Evidence from the UK, *Human Relations,* 43, 513-526,

Payne, S, L, (1980). Organizational ethics and antecedents to social control processes. *Academy of Management*

Review, 5,409-414.

Payne, S, L, & Giacalone, R. A, (1990), Social psychological approaches to the perception of ethical dilemmas. *Human Relations,* 43, 649-665,

Powell, G, N,, Posner, B, Z. & Schmidt, W. H. (1984). Sex effects on managerial values systems. *Human Relations,* 37,909-921,

Pryor, R, G, L, (1979), In search of a concept: Work values. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly,* 27, 250-256,

Pryor, R. G, L, (1981), Tracing the development of the work aspect preference scale, *Australian Psychologist,* 16, 241-257,

Pryor, R, G, L, (1982), Values, preferences, needs, work ethics and orientation to work: Toward a conceptual and empirical *integration. Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 20, 40-42,

Pryor, R, G, L, (1983), The influence of social desirability as a response set on the measurement of values/preferences related to work, *Australian Psychologist,* 18, 359-367,

Work values 239

Pryor, R, G, L, (1990), An investigation of factors affecting thestability of work aspect preferences, *Australian Psychologist,* 25, 189-209,

Ravlin, E,,& Meglino, B, M, (1987), Effect of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values *measate^. Journal of Applied Psychology,* 72, 666-673,

Ravlin, E, C, & Meglino, B. M. (1989). The transitivity of work values: Hierarchical preference ordering of socially desirable stimuli. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44,* 494—508.

Ravlin, E. C, Meglino, B, M, & Adkins, C, L. (1989), Stability of work values: Individual differences and relationship with decision making. *Resources in Education,* ED3O3751.

Reichers, A. E, (1987), An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates, *Acad/miy of Management Review,* 12, 278-287,

Reno, R, R,, Cialdini, R. B. & Kallgren, C. A, (1993), The transsituational influence of social *norm&.Joumal of Personality and Social Psychology, (A,* 104—112,

Roberson, L, (1990), Functions of work meanings in organizations: Work meanings an'd work motivation. In A, Brief & W, Nord (Eds), *Meanings of Occupational Work,* pp, 107-134, Lexingtor i, MA/New York: Free Press,

Rokeach, M, (1968). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass,

Rokeach, M, (1973), *The Nature of Human Values.* New York: Free Press.

Ruiz-Quintanilla, S, A, (1990), Major work meaning patterns: Toward a holistic f picture. In 13, Kleinbeck, H, Quast, H, Thierry, H, Hacker (Eds), *Work Motivation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbam m,

Rynes, S, L, & Gerhart, B, (1990), Interviewer assessments of applicant 'fit': An: exploEEDory investigation. *Personnel Psychology,* 43, 13-35,

Salancik, G, R, &Pfeffer, J, (1978), A social information processing approach to jo b attiOBties and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 23, 224—253,

Saul, G, K, (1981), Business ethics: Where are we going? *Academy of Managemen t Review,* '6, 269-276,

Schein, E, H, (1968), Organizational socialization and the profession of manage *:meat. industrial Management Review,* 9, 1-16,

Schein, E, H, (1985), *Organizational Culture and l^eadership.* San Francisco, CA:i JossejHBass,

Schneider, B, (1987), The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology,* 40, 437- 453.

Schneider, B. (1990). *Organizational Climate and Culture.* San Francisco, CA: Jc issey-Bffis.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W (1987), Toward a universal psychological structi ure of human *values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 53, 550-562,

Scott, W, A, (1965), *Values and Organizations.* Chicago, IL: Rand McNally,

Senger, J. (1971). Manager's perceptions of subordinates' competence as a fa- action of personal value orientations. *Academy of Management Journal,* 14, 4 1 5 ^ 2 3 .

Shove, T, H,, Thornton, G,, C, in.& Shove, L. M. (1990). Distinctiveness of t hree work attitudes: Job involvement, organizational commitment and career salience. *Psychological Rtepofts,* 67, 851-858.

Steiner, D, (1988), Values perception in *leader-member exchange. Jourvtal laf Social Psychology,* 128,611-618.

Stone, E, F, (1976), The moderating effect of work-related values on thie job scope-job satisfaction relationship, •Of^d«;2(j;/o»<j/BeAaw(»-^H<i"ff»»;dn *Performance,* 15, 147-167,

Strother,'.G, (1976), The moral codes,of executives: A Watergate-inspit ed look at Barnard's theory of executive responsibility. *Academy of Management Review, I,* 13-22,

Super, D.C. (1970). *Work Values Inventory.* Boston, MA: Houghton-MifHin.

Super, D, £,'(1973), The work values inventory. In D. G.JZytowski (Ed,), *Contemporary Approaches to Interest Measurement.,* pp, 189-205. Mirmeapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press,

Super, D, E. & Mowry, J, G, (1962), Social and persooail desirability in the assessment of work values *Educational and Psychological Measurement.,* 23,715—719,

Tetlock, P, E. <1986), A value pluralism model of ideological *reasonxng. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 50,819-827,

Trevifio, L, K, (1986), Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model *Academy of Management Review,* 11, 601-617,

Van Maanen, J, &Schein, E, (1979), Toward a theory of organizatiional socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 1,209-264,

Victor, B, & Cullen. J, B. (1988), The organizational bases of et,hical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 33, 101-125,

Waliach, M, A, & Wallach, L, (1990), *Rethinking Goodness.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

240 *Jennifer J. Dose*

Wanous, J, P (1980). *Organizational Entry: Recruitment, Selection and Socialization of Newcomers.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley,

Waters, L, K, & Zakrajsek, T, (1991), The construct validity of four Protestant ethic attitude scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 51, 117-122,

Weber, M, (1958), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Scribner,

Weiss, H, M. (1978), Social learning of work values in organizations, yo«r«a/ *of Applied Psychology,* 63, 711-718,

Wiener, Y, (1988), Forms of values systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and *maintenance. Academy of Management Review,* 13, 534-545,

Work Importance Study (1980), *Report of the Fourth Working Conference of the Work Importance Study.* Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia: WIS,

Wollack, S,, Goodale, J, G,, Witjing, J, P & Smith, P, C, (1971), Development of the survey of work values. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 55, 331-338,

Word, C, O,, Zanna, M, P, & Cooper, J, (1974), The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 10, 109—120,

Zerbe, W J, & Paulhus, D, L, (1987), Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *Academy of Management Review,* 12, 250—264,

Zytowski, D, G, (1970), The concept of work values. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly,* 18, 176—186,