2006

Work centrality, work hours, and cultural values among European nations

Charlotte Wittenkamp
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Wittenkamp, Charlotte, "Work centrality, work hours, and cultural values among European nations" (2006). *Master's Theses*. 2934.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.k2b5-e622>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2934

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

WORK CENTRALITY, WORK HOURS, AND CULTURAL
VALUES AMONG EUROPEAN NATIONS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Charlotte Wittenkamp

May 2006

UMI Number: 1436960

Copyright 2006 by
Wittenkamp, Charlotte

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1436960

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Charlotte Wittenkamp

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Sharon Glazer, Ph.D.

Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D.

Mr. Torben Fridberg, Senior Researcher and International
Consultant, the Danish National Institute of Social Research,
Copenhagen

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

WORK CENTRALITY, WORK HOURS, AND CULTURAL VALUES AMONG EUROPEAN NATIONS

by Charlotte Wittenkamp

This study examined the relationship between work centrality (England, 1991) and cultural values (Schwartz, 1992), as well as the relationship between work centrality and work hours among 15,489 individuals in 22 countries throughout Europe. Archival data from the European Social Survey (Jowell and the Central Coordinating Team, 2003) were used. Results indicate that work centrality differs between people in Northern/Western and Southern/Eastern Europe. It was also found that the strength of the relationship between work centrality and weekly work hours differs significantly between countries. Conservatism and Autonomy cultural values might explain some of the differences in work centrality after weekly work hours are accounted for. Implications of these results for European organizations and the European work force are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes to Dr. Sharon Glazer for her patient support and encouragement through the process of finishing my thesis. Dr. Glazer helped me keep my focus and let me draw from her well of knowledge through the process of analyzing the data. Secondly, I would like to thank Dr. Howard Tokunaga and Mr. Torben Fridberg for reading my paper drafts and raising important aspects and questions to clarify my research direction. Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Shalom Schwartz for sharing data from his research with me. Last, but not least, thanks to my family for their encouragement and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
<i>The Meaning of Work</i>	3
<i>Prior Studies on Work Centrality</i>	6
<i>Work centrality vs. hours worked</i>	9
Hypothesis 1	11
<i>Work centrality and sex of worker</i>	11
Hypothesis 2	12
Hypothesis 3	13
<i>Cultural Values</i>	13
<i>Hofstede's cultural values: An overview</i>	13
<i>Schwartz's cultural values</i>	15
<i>Values and Work</i>	18
Hypothesis 4.....	19
Hypothesis 5.....	19
METHOD	20
<i>Participants</i>	20
<i>Measures</i>	20

<i>Importance of life aspect</i>	21
<i>Work-life questions</i>	22
<i>Demographic variables</i>	22
<i>Portrait Value Questionnaire</i>	22
<i>Cultural values</i>	23
<i>Procedures</i>	23
RESULTS	25
DISCUSSION	36
<i>Limitations</i>	43
<i>Future Directions</i>	44
REFERENCES.....	47
APPENDIX A: Human Subjects - Institutional Review Board Approval Letter	52
APPENDIX B: Questions from the European Social Survey	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Operational Definitions of Cultural Values	16
2 Work Centrality, Weekly Work Hours, and their Correlations per Country	26
3 Analysis of Differences in Correlations Between Countries	29
4 Work Centrality Regressed on Control Variables, Work Hours, Cultural Values, and the Interaction Between each Cultural Value and Work Hours	35

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1. The concept of work centrality	4
Figure 2. Organization of cultural values	17
Figure 3. Conservatism values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours	33
Figure 4. Harmony values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours	33
Figure 5. Affective Autonomy values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours	34

INTRODUCTION

The European Union (EU) covers the majority of European countries and will, in time, afford EU citizens the opportunity to legally work within any other member country (“Now that we are all ...”, 2005). Different economic conditions among the “old” (e.g., Denmark, Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, United Kingdom) and “new” member countries (e.g., Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Poland) might result in increased migration from Central and Eastern Europe to Western Europe (Krieger, 2004). For example, that Denmark has more than twice the purchasing power of Poland or Hungary (The Economist, 2005) might make Denmark an attractive place for Poles and Hungarians to work. It is an ongoing discussion in Western Europe whether these immigrants’ attitudes toward work differ from those endorsed by the Western European host countries to the extent that it negatively impacts these immigrants’ assimilation into the workforce (LeBor, 2004).

Thus, the overall aim of this study is to address this concern by analyzing differences in national average attitudes toward work (i.e., work centrality, defined as the degree of importance working has on the life of an individual; European Social Survey, 2004). Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) argue that social factors (e.g., union strength, social inequality, and educational accessibility) explain much of the difference in work centrality across nations, but using Hofstede’s (1984b) culture values measures, they found that cultural values explain differences beyond these social factors. Schwartz (1999) suggested that differences in work attitudes might be a consequence of

culture's influence on individuals. He hypothesized that certain culture values are compatible with and others conflict with work centrality.

The first objective for this research is to examine how work hours might relate to work centrality. The second objective is to analyze if cultural values (i.e., guiding principles nations endorse; Schwartz, 1999) relate to work centrality. Finally, cultural values might be related not only to work centrality, but might also moderate the relationship between work hours and work centrality. Thus, the interaction between work hours and cultural values on work centrality will be examined.

Previous cross-cultural research in the domain of work has primarily used Hofstede's cultural values (e.g., Ali, Al-Shakhis, & Nartaraj, 1991; Harpaz, Honig, & Coetsier, 2002; Parboteeah & Cullen, 2003). The present study examines Schwartz's (1992; 1996; 1999) cultural values in relation to work centrality.

In the next section of this thesis, literature on work centrality and cultural values are reviewed. Five hypotheses are presented throughout this literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Meaning of Work

The meaning of work can be seen as “shared interpretations of what people want of and expect from work” (Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1991, p. 84). However, interpretations of work differ. For example, Heller (1991) describes work as something previously imposed on enslaved people and prisoners of war. Ruiz-Quintanilla and England (1996) note that some individuals define work as a burden, others define it in terms of exchange and responsibility, and yet others emphasize social benefits from work. Within each nation there is a dominating conceptual and functional meaning of work and this meaning differs from nation to nation. England and Harpaz (1990) note that participants from Japan, Germany, and the Netherlands differ on the extent to which they agree with statements describing properties of work (e.g., you get money for doing it; others profit by it; you do it to contribute to society). In particular, participants from Germany and Japan cluster around a rather negative perspective of work (e.g., you have to do it; someone tells you what to do), whereas participants from the Netherlands center on the notion that people contribute to society through work.

England and Harpaz (1983) assert that societal norms and work goals influence work centrality, which further influences the meaning of work. The Meaning of Work (MOW) group’s (1987) study confirms the validity of this model (see Figure 1) across cultures. A longitudinal study of members of the Israeli labor force demonstrates stability of the model over a period of 12 years (Harpaz & Fu, 2002). The model is explained below.

Figure 1. The concept of work centrality.

Note. This diagram is adapted from Harpaz et al. (2002)

Societal work norms refer to expectations for engaging in work (i.e., obligations) and expectations that society provides opportunities for work (i.e., entitlement). Harpaz and Fu (2002) conclude, based on test and retest 12 years later of an Israeli sample, that entitlement norms are stable over time. However, there are variations from one country to another in the feeling of obligation to work. Nørregård-Nielsen and Østergaard (2004) note that whereas more than 70% of Danes and Swedes disagree with the statement “A person should only work if he/she feels like it,” less than 50% of Estonians, Poles, and East Germans disagree. Results for Great Britain and West Germany are in between those for the Scandinavian countries and the Central/Eastern European countries. In all countries agreement is higher among younger participants than among older participants. Thus, there is a generation difference in the sense of work obligation. According to Harpaz et al. (2002) work obligation influences work centrality, hence one might ask if a lower sense of work obligation, as found by Nørregård-Nielsen and Østergaard, indicates that work centrality is higher in Western than in Eastern Europe.

Work goals can be dichotomized as extrinsic goals (e.g., payment and benefits, status) vs. intrinsic goals (e.g., meaningful occupation, influence). Specific work goals differ in importance across nations when taking organizational seniority (Harpaz, 1990; Mitroff & Denton, 1999) and age (Nørregård-Nielsen & Østergaard, 2004) into account. Data from Belgium, Germany, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, and USA indicate that “Good pay” has lower priority among managers than among employees (Harpaz). Among US managers and HR executives, the highest priority is given to “realizing one’s full

potential” and in third priority is “earning money” (Mitroff & Denton). Likewise, pay has lower priority in countries where payment (or government subsidies) that is adequate for subsistence is taken for granted (e.g., Denmark, Sweden) than in countries with a less regulated labor market (e.g., Great Britain, Estonia, Poland; Nørregård-Nielsen & Østergaard). Influenced by norms and goals, individuals develop a sense of how important work is as a source for developing identity, a means for activities and recognition, and a basis for forming priorities as to how to spend one’s time.

Together, these objectives form the concept referred to as *work centrality* or *work role centrality* (England, 1991; Paullay, Allinger, & Stone-Romero, 1994). In other words, the more central work is in someone’s life, the more likely he or she will identify with his or her work or work role, find the activities and recognition from engaging in the activities of work meaningful, and devote time to engage in work.

Prior Studies on Work Centrality

Numerous studies have measured work centrality in *relative* terms (e.g., How will you distribute 100 points of importance between family, work, leisure, religion, politics, friends, volunteering?; Hapaz & Fu, 2002; Harpaz & Snir, 2003; MOW, 1987; Snir & Harpaz, 2004), and others have measured it in *absolute* terms (e.g., On a scale from 0 to 10 how important is work to you?; Arvey, Harpaz, & Liao, 2004; European Values Survey, 1999; England, 1991). Looking at relative importance of work, the MOW group collected data from random samples of the labor force in Belgium, West Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, USA, and Yugoslavia. The MOW group found that work falls short in importance only to Family, with an

exception of Japan and Yugoslavia where work is the most important life aspect, and Germany where work comes in third after Family and Leisure (MOW, 1987). A study by Frieze et al. (2004) shows that students in Central/Eastern Europe (Croatia, Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, Slovenia) who are thinking of emigrating have higher work centrality and lower family centrality than those without such inclination. These results suggest that immigrants from Eastern/Central Europe might be more productive than local laborers.

During the 1980s work centrality dropped in importance for Germans, while the importance of leisure increased relative to the importance of work (Ruiz-Quintanilla & Wilbert, 1991). Work centrality in the US also decreased significantly during the 1980's, with a particular decrease for those who had very high work centrality, but an increase for people with very low work centrality (England, 1991). In contrast, in Israel, work centrality was stable from 1981 to 1993 (Harpaz & Fu, 2002). Furthermore, Harpaz and Fu (1997) found that women in USA, Japan, Germany, and Israel have lower work centrality than men and that people with higher levels of education have lower work centrality than people with less education. Nørregård-Nielsen and Østergaard (2004) found the importance of work depends upon whether the respondent is working or not working, and attitudes differ between working and non-working respondents depending on the country from where they come. Thus, work is considered important or very important by over 90% of the working population in all countries in their analyses (Denmark, Sweden, West and East Germany, Great Britain, Estonia, and Poland). Further, whereas 92% of non-working respondents in the Polish

sample consider work important or very important, only 58% among British non-working respondents indicate work as important or very important. Another study on work centrality among non-working subjects shows that work centrality increases over the first couple of months of unemployment, but then drops as unemployment takes on a more permanent character (Kulik, 2001).

Work centrality is also studied by asking if the respondent would work even if he or she has no financial need to do so (non-financial commitment to work). The MOW study reports that 69% of the British sample and 93% of the Japanese sample say they will continue working even if they do not need the money. People in the remaining countries (Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Israel, and USA consecutively) were between the British low and the Japanese high (Harpaz, 1989). Snir and Harpaz (2002a) found that a majority of Israeli subjects will continue to work, but the same subjects think *people in general* will stop working. An American study of actual lottery winners show that only 6% of lottery winners quit working altogether. The size of the prize is a significant determinant influencing that decision, followed by work centrality (Arvey et al., 2004). Some of the prizes in Arvey et al.'s study were too small (\$24,000.00) to support the winner, and unfortunately the data do not show details about winners for whom the prize made them financially independent of other income.

Work centrality also accounts for significant variance in time spent working (Cullen & Paboteeah, 2005; Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Snir & Harpaz, 2004), length of job tenure (Dublin, et al. 1975), and absenteeism (Addae & Johns, 2002). Further, work centrality correlates positively with organizational commitment (Hirschfeld & Field,

2000; Mannheim, Baruch, & Tal, 1997) and with job satisfaction (Mannheim et al.). According to Mannheim et al. the relationship with job satisfaction is bi-directional, but with slightly stronger effects for job satisfaction affecting work centrality than vice-versa. This finding implies that work centrality can be influenced by the general climate in the labor market and lowered by degenerating work conditions under economic downturns. Hence, the reduction in work centrality reported in Germany and the US during the 1980's might be explained more as a consequence of economic recession than by individual priority changes.

Work centrality vs. hours worked. Among Israeli participants in the MOW study, Snir and Harpaz (2004) found that the weekly number of hours worked is not related to the absolute level of leisure centrality (i.e., the subject would work the same number of hours regardless if he or she answered that leisure was important or not). However, using the same dataset, Snir and Harpaz (2002b) also found that Israeli participants, who hold leisure *more* important than work, work fewer hours than those who indicate that work is more important than leisure. Overall, Snir and Harpaz (2002b; 2004) and Harpaz and Snir (2003) show a positive correlation between total weekly work hours and work centrality.

Although the number of hours worked has decreased significantly over the last 30 years in all of Europe (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2004), Bishop's (2004) study of work patterns reports large differences in work hours between the UK, France, Denmark, and Sweden in what can be considered normal work patterns. Whereas part-time employment (<30 hours per week) is normal among UK

women, with 43% of women belonging to this category, only 9% of UK men work less than 30 hours per week. In comparison, 28% of women and 10% of men work part-time in Denmark. At the other end of the spectrum, 56% of the men and 20% of the women in the UK report that they work more than 50 hours per week. In Sweden only 14% of men and 6% of women work that much. When dividing the work force into occupational groups, over 20% of UK employees in the industry sector report working more than 50 hours per week compared to only 1% of Danish and Swedish employees. In comparison, 30-40% of agricultural and fishing workers report working more than 50 hours per week in all four countries.

The above results might lead to the assumption that work centrality is considerably higher in Great Britain than in Denmark and Sweden, at least in the industry sector. However, Nørregård-Nielsen and Østergaard (2004) found that for both Denmark and Great Britain, 93% of working subjects in the European Values Study (EVS) respond that work is very or relatively important – and 96% of Swedes find work as important. Among non-working subjects, the British figures are significantly lower – 58% – than the Swedish and Danish, 83% and 72%, respectively. Their results do not show if more British find work *very* important and if more Scandinavians find work *somewhat* important; nonetheless, the figures show that on a four-point scale with two positively and two negatively worded response options (EVS, 1999), more British than Scandinavian respondents use the negatively worded response options.

According to Bern's (1965; 1972; cited in Franzoi, 2000) Self Perception Theory, behavior can influence attitude. People who work longer hours than average

might infer that work is very important to them. As work centrality is measured through participants' perceptions, and not the amount of hours actually worked, the dominant work pattern in participants' reference groups might influence self-perceptions of working more or less than average and thus affect the notion of work as a central aspect in life.

Although previous studies find differences in dominating work hour patterns as well as in work centrality between countries, it is expected that the positive relationship between work centrality and work hours found among Israelis (Snir and Harpaz, 2002b; 2004) can be generalized to other countries. Therefore, it is hypothesized that

H₁: Within countries there will be a positive correlation between work centrality and work hours.

Work centrality and sex of worker. Women have been shown to have lower work centrality than men (Harpaz & Fu, 1997) just as part-time employment is more prevalent among women than among men (Bishop, 2004). Christensen and Christensen (2004) examined women's attitudes towards work and family in Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, and Malta based on data from the European Values Survey. They analyzed agreement with statements proposing that women should or should not work outside the home. A large group of women agree with all statements, for example, "women need a job to develop their skills" and "to work at home is just as satisfying as working outside the home." In Italy and Hungary this ambivalent group represents over 50% of women in the study, in West Germany and Malta the ambivalent group represents 40%, but in Great Britain, Denmark and

Sweden it represents around 20%. Based on these results, Christensen and Christensen cluster countries into four groups. The first group is Liberal (Great Britain) and includes countries that don't subscribe to traditional family values, but who don't think work is important. Social-democratic (Denmark, Sweden) countries comprise the second group where everybody is expected to work. Third is Continental Europe (West Germany, Italy, Hungary), where countries subscribe to traditional values but at the same time find women should work. Fourth are Traditional (Malta) countries where women are not expected to work. The analysis also looks into work patterns of women and shows that societal norms for working outside the home influence how many women work full-time (over 30 hours/week). In Denmark, Sweden, and Hungary almost 60% of women who are ambivalent in their work/home priorities work full-time, whereas only 23% of British and 28% Maltese women in this category work full-time. In Italy and West Germany, one in three women in this category work full-time.

If ambiguity regarding the relative importance of work influences these women's work centrality one might expect a weaker relationship between work centrality and work hours for women than for men. Likewise, if societal expectations influence how much women work regardless of their priorities a consequence might be a weaker relationship between work centrality and work hours. Hence, for the present study Christensen and Christensen's (2004) findings lead to the following hypotheses:

H₂: Within country, the correlation between work centrality and work hours will be stronger for men than for women.

H₃: The above correlations between work centrality and work hours, although expected to be in the same positive direction, will differ in magnitude across national cultures. Correlations will be stronger in the Scandinavian countries than in Eastern/Central European countries.

Cultural Values

Societal work norms (England & Harpaz, 1983) are supposedly influenced by more general values. Values are desirable, transsituational goals that serve as guiding principles in people's lives (Schwartz, 1992). Culture is, in part, a system of values that changes slowly and distinguishes one group from another (Hofstede, 1983a). A culture embedded in a society reinforces the prevailing value systems by, for example, passing legislation that encourages certain behaviors and discourages others (Schwartz, 1999). In cross-cultural research the unit of analysis is the group, typically the nation (although in some instances groups with significantly different histories may be analyzed separately, for example the former West- and East-Germany).

Hofstede's cultural values: An overview. In Hofstede's (1984b) seminal research on IBM employees between 1967-1973, cultural values were organized along four dimensions. First is Individualism-Collectivism operationalized as a distinction between loyalty to self and immediate family vs. loyalty to the whole in-group (e.g., the family, the clan, the peer group, the organization; Hofstede, 1983a). Second is Masculinity-Femininity operationalized as the degree to which societies "use the biological existence of the two sexes to define very different social roles for men and women" (Hofstede, 1984a, p. 390). Third is Uncertainty-Avoidance determined in

terms of tolerance for ambiguity. Fourth is Power-Distance, reflecting "the difference between the extent to which the boss can determine the behavior of the subordinate and the extent to which subordinate can determine the behavior of the boss" (Hofstede, 1984b, p. 72).

Hofstede's (1984b) work has been the cornerstone of many studies. A study by Harpaz et al. (2002) is of particular interest to the present paper as it links differences in cultural values to differences in work centrality. Harpaz et al. show that for young people in countries low on Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) work-centrality changes more with immersion into work life than for young people from high UA cultures. In addition three years into their professional lives young people in low UA countries have higher work centrality than young people in high UA countries. In another study Ali et al. (1991) found that although managers from both India and Saudi Arabia have high work centrality, Indian managers have higher levels of work obligation and work entitlement than Saudi managers, and they also are more individualistic.

Although research linking work values with Hofstede's (1984b) cultural values has been published, Hofstede developed his theory *post hoc*, forming his theory based on data that were already collected for a different purpose. An additional shortcoming that might impede universal application of his theory was lack of data from developing countries and former communist countries. Another general concern with relying on Hofstede's classification of countries along cultural characteristics (developed over 35 years ago) is that many countries have experienced increased industrialization, changed economic circumstances, and have had shifts in political systems since the early 1970's,

around the time when Hofstede's data were collected. With increased exposure to western norms, values appear to have shifted and Hofstede's indices have become inaccurate (Spector et al., 2001).

Schwartz's cultural values. Based on these criticisms, Schwartz (1992; 1994; 1999) developed, *a priori*, a values survey for the purpose of creating a universal measure of values. He focused on values referring to desired goals (e.g., social equality, justice, honesty) and transcending specific situations and actions (Schwartz, 2002). Using 56 value descriptions, Schwartz (1992) found that within each of 20 countries, 45 of the values consistently clustered into similar groups indicating a similar understanding of the underlying concepts regardless of nationality and parallel patterns in the relationships between the values.

In order to compare cultures, country-level averages for each of the 45 values were plotted in a smallest space analysis and revealed a circular pattern (see Figure 2) with seven cultural value types, including Intellectual Autonomy, Affective Autonomy, Mastery, Hierarchy, Conservatism, Harmony, and Egalitarianism (see Table 1 for definitions). Cultural values close to each other (e.g., Conservatism values and Harmony values) typically have correlations with other variables that are close to one another, whereas cultural values opposing each other on the circle (e.g., Autonomy values and Conservatism values) will have opposing correlations.

Table 1

Operational Definitions of Culture Values

Conservatism	Status quo; avoid inclinations of individuals that might disturb the traditional order
Harmony	Protection of environment
Egalitarian Commitment	Transcendence of selfish interests; helpfulness, social justice, and world at peace; equality
Intellectual Autonomy	Creativity, curiosity
Affective Autonomy	Stimulation, excitement
Mastery	Active efforts to modify one's surroundings and get ahead of other people
Hierarchy	Legitimacy of hierarchical role and resource allocation

Note. This table is similar to that found in Schwartz (1996, pp. 101-104).

Figure 2. Organization of cultural values.

Note. This figure is adapted from Schwartz (1999, p. 29).

Values and Work

Schwartz's (1992) value system has not been used extensively in the context of work attitudes. An exception is the study by Ros, Schwartz, and Surkiss (1999) examining the relationship between work goals and Schwartz's individual level values among Spanish teachers and teacher students. Results from their study suggest that people who subscribe to self-enhancing values (e.g., power, achievement) as well as people who subscribe to self-transcending values (e.g., benevolence, tolerance) see work as something positive. Likewise, work holds equal importance to people valuing change as to people valuing stability. Thus, individual level values might not explain overall work centrality.

At the culture level of analysis, Schwartz (1999) hypothesized that work centrality would be compatible with Mastery and Hierarchy values, but conflict with Affective Autonomy, Egalitarianism, Harmony, and Conservatism values. The reasoning behind this would be that the work domain of life is a natural arena where one might display assertive and controlling activities, and the acceptance of hierarchical structures in corporations legitimates actions that might increase power and wealth. This all feeds into the values emphasized in Mastery and Hierarchy cultures. Schwartz computed a value composite as *the mean of compatible cultural value scores (Mastery, Hierarchy) minus the mean of conflicting cultural value scores (Affective Autonomy, Egalitarianism, Harmony, and Conservatism)* and compared this composite to work centrality for Japan, USA, and Germany. Schwartz found support for his hypothesis among older (teacher) samples, but not for the younger (student) samples. Germany

showed the lowest work centrality and the lowest score on the value composite; however, Japanese students had higher work centrality than US students, even though US students had a higher value composite. Given the limited number of cultures and inconsistent results in Schwartz's study, the present study will examine his hypotheses.

The cultural value structure assumes that values close to each other would have similar correlations to other variables, but opposing values would have opposing correlations with other variables. Schwartz (1999) proposed that work centrality would conflict with Conservatism and with Affective Autonomy values, but in the cultural value structure Conservatism and Affective Autonomy oppose each other. Therefore, they are not hypothesized to relate with work centrality, although the relationship will be examined.

H₄: At the culture level of analysis, work centrality will correlate positively with Mastery and Hierarchy cultural values.

H₅: At the culture level of analysis, work centrality will correlate negatively with Egalitarianism and Harmony cultural values.

METHOD

Participants

For the purpose of the present study a sub-sample of the total ESS dataset is used. Respondents to the survey who were under 21 years of age at the time of the data collection, who were not born in the country where data were collected, and who were not employed were omitted from the study. The reason for dropping participants not born in the country is that immigrants might have values more similar to those of their native country than to those of their host country (Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdrzalek's, 2000; Sussman, 2000). Next, in order to use only respondents who had discriminated sufficiently when answering the "important aspects in life" questions (see below) the sample was further reduced. Finally, two participants who reported that they normally worked more than 120 hours per week were dropped. Thus, 15,489 subjects or 37.9% of the total sample was used in the current study. The number of participants in each country is shown in Table 2. Of these 15,489, 53.2% were men and 46.8% were women (compared with 48.5% men and 51.5% women in the total sample population). Mean age was 41.5 years ($SD = 11.1$ years), from a low of 38.6 years in France to a high of 44.2 years in the Czech Republic. Average years of formal education was 13.1 years ($SD = 3.7$ years), varying from 8.8 years in Portugal to 14.2 years in Denmark.

Measures

The European Social Survey (ESS) builds on the experiences from the European Values Survey (EVS; 1999) that was first conducted in 1981 and again in 1990 and 1999. The survey assessed numerous topics (e.g., trust in governmental institutions,

attitudes toward immigration, and well-being, health and security). Questions of particular interest to the present study are the importance of different aspects in life, particularly leisure and work; questions related to work hours; items questioning individual attitudes toward central values; and demographic questions. All questions used for this study are shown in Appendix A (the entire survey can be found at: www.ess.nsd.uib.no/index.jsp?year=2003&country=&module=documentation).

Survey questions were posed through interviews in the local language. Questions had been through a procedure of translation by at least two translators, review, adjudication, pre-testing, and documentation to assure identical meaning across nations (ESS, 2004). Some questions were adapted to cover local conditions (e.g., reflecting the educational system, political party affiliation); however this did not apply to any of the questions relevant to the present study.

Importance of life aspects. Questions related to the importance of different life aspects asked participants to rate how important family, leisure, politics, work, religion, friends, and volunteering were to the individual. The response format was an 11-point scale ranging from 0 (extremely unimportant) to 10 (extremely important). Questions related to the importance of different life aspects only have meaning if the ratings differ from one question to another. If all life aspects have the same score, it indicates that the participant was unable to reflect upon the relative importance of any of them. Hence, for the aspects of life questions, participants who answered five or more of the seven questions with the same score were dropped from further analyses.

Work-life questions. Participants' work-lives were assessed with several questions. One question addressed if the participant was currently employed, self-employed, or not employed was used to weed out non-working individuals. Two questions pertained to the amount of hours the subject worked per week, one question asked for the contracted number of hours, and one question asked for the number of hours the participant actually worked in a normal week regardless if he/she was paid for these hours or not. The latter question was retained. The questions on importance of life aspects came before questions related to if the person worked and how much the person worked, hence answering the questions regarding work status and number of hours should not have influenced the perception of work's importance as an aspect of life.

Demographic variables. Questions related to participant's sex, birth year, and years of education completed were used, as was a question if the participant was born in the country.

Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ). A short form of the PVQ (21 items instead of 45 items) was used in the ESS values module. Participants are asked to rate how much a fictional person resembles the participant. The response format is a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (very much like me) to 6 (not like me at all). For this paper, the PVQ was used solely to select participants who had discriminated between values, as participants who had given the same score to more than 16 of the 21 PVQ items were dropped from further analyses.

Cultural values. As the short form of Schwartz's Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ) used in the ESS questionnaire was geared towards calculating 10 *individual* level value types, and not optimal for constructing the seven *cultural values*, culture level analyses for the current study are based on cultural value scores from previous studies and obtained directly from Professor Shalom Schwartz. These scores were shared with the author and the chairperson of this thesis, but are not permitted for publication (personal communication, March 8, 2005). For culture level analyses, Luxembourg is omitted due to lack of culture level scores, and scores for Italy are taken from Schwartz (1996).

Procedures

The European Social Survey (ESS; Jowell et al. 2003) was administered in 2002 to the general population in 22 European countries, including Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. The aim was to get a representative sample of residents (citizens as well as non-citizens) over the age of 15. The database contains a total of 40,865 respondents, with a low of 1,207 respondents from Italy to 2,919 respondents from Germany. According to ESS documentation the overall response rate varied from 33% in Switzerland to 80% in Greece. ESS does not provide data about how many individuals were approached for the study.

Methods for selecting participants differed depending on the type of resident registers each of the participating countries had in place. The sampling method for all

countries is described in the ESS Data Documentation Report (2004). A couple of examples illustrate the variety of sampling methods. In Denmark the sample was randomly chosen from a Central Person Register containing 99.9% of the population, whereas in Austria the country was divided into local areas, each from which a fixed number of households was chosen randomly from local telephone directories with an additional random selection of households in the various areas to cover people not in the directory. The target person in the household was the first person over 15 years old to have a birthday after the interview. The majority of countries in the study used methods that were similar to the one used in Austria.

RESULTS

Based on Harpaz and Snir's (2003) method, work centrality was calculated as

$$\text{Work Centrality} = \text{Importance of work} - \text{Importance of leisure}$$

Using this method it would not make any difference if the participant mainly used the high end or the low end of the scale as the focus is on the relative importance, not the absolute values. Country sample size, percent of male and female respondents, means and standard deviations for work centrality and for weekly work hours, and correlations between work centrality and weekly work hours per country are shown in Table 2. Positive mean scores on work centrality indicate that work is seen as more important than leisure and negative scores indicate that leisure is seen as more important than work.

Table 2 shows that in half of the countries leisure is considered more important than work. Before testing the hypotheses, *t*-tests were run to determine if work centrality and weekly work hours differed significantly between men and women. Significant differences were found for both main study variables in some countries. Consequently, to test the hypotheses sex was held constant.

The first hypothesis proposed a positive relationship between work centrality and actual hours worked. Table 2 shows that Hypothesis 1 is mostly supported; correlations were positive and significant within most countries (significant correlations ranged from $r = .29, p < .01$ in Denmark to $r = .08, p < .05$ in Israel). In the Czech Republic, Greece, and Poland correlations were positive, but not significant; in Spain the correlation was negative, but not significant.

Table 2

Work Centrality, Weekly Work Hours, and their Correlations per Country

Country	n	% Male Fem.		Work Centrality Mean SD		Weekly work hours Mean SD		r Total	r Male	r Fem.
Austria	864	48.8	51.2	-.22	2.38	39.6	12.2	.11**	.19**	.05
Belgium	636	59.0	41.0	-.02	2.18	39.9	11.4	.18***	.14**	.24**
Czech Rep.	488	54.3	45.7	.56	2.39	44.5	11.0	.05	.05	.04
Denmark	814	54.4	45.6	-.60	1.91	39.0	10.2	.29***	.37**	.15**
Finland	945	51.7	48.3	-.04	1.94	41.3	11.5	.19***	.22**	.17**
France	517	53.8	46.2	.03	2.34	38.2	9.7	.12**	.13*	.11
Germany	1,190	57.5	42.5	.54	2.35	40.0	12.6	.15***	.04	.15*
Greece	576	51.2	48.8	1.15	2.02	47.2	15.4	.08	.11	.03
Hungary	509	48.9	51.1	.64	2.69	43.6	11.6	.09*	.21**	.14*
Ireland	722	51.0	49.0	-.35	2.50	41.8	16.5	.12**	.12*	.12*
Israel	542	56.1	43.9	.83	2.58	44.7	15.3	.08*	.10	.07
Italy	441	52.8	47.2	.73	2.22	42.2	12.5	.11*	.11	.11
Luxembourg	248	54.3	45.7	-.38	2.43	38.9	17.5	.13	.12	.12
Netherlands	1,040	55.9	44.1	-.67	1.79	34.7	13.4	.15***	.16**	.12**
Norway	1,025	54.9	45.1	-.24	1.94	38.2	10.1	.11**	.09*	.12*
Poland	648	63.2	36.8	1.25	2.28	45.8	14.6	.03	.02	.03
Portugal	504	50.4	49.6	.90	2.36	43.7	11.3	.09*	.08	.10
Slovenia	509	53.8	46.2	.05	2.15	45.9	9.2	.10*	.13*	.03
Spain	496	56.3	43.7	-.27	2.26	41.2	10.7	-.01	.04	-.04
Sweden	992	45.6	54.4	-.39	2.18	40.2	10.5	.17***	.24**	.07
Switzerland	899	54.9	45.1	.21	2.08	39.1	15.7	.14***	.25**	.03
UK	884	53.0	47.0	-.57	2.71	38.5	14.6	.15***	.25**	.04
Total	15,489	53.2	46.8							

Note. Correlations for total sample with sex held constant. Fem=Female.

*** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

To test Hypothesis 2, Pearson correlations were calculated split on both country and sex (see Table 2). Cohen and Cohen's (1983, pp. 54-55) procedure for testing significant differences between correlations was used. In most countries correlations were stronger for men (M) than for women (W), but not necessarily significantly stronger. Men had significantly larger correlations than women in Austria (M: $r = .19$, $p < .01$; W: $r = .05$, ns), Denmark (M: $r = .37$, $p < .01$; W: $r = .15$, $p < .01$), Sweden (M: $r = .24$, $p < .01$; W: $r = .07$, ns), Switzerland (M: $r = .25$, $p < .01$; W: $r = .03$, ns), and United Kingdom (M: $r = .25$, $p < .01$; W: $r = .04$, ns). Thus Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the strength of the relationships would vary from country to country. Using Cohen and Cohen's (1983, pp. 54-55) procedure to test for differences between independent correlations, some significant differences in the magnitude of the correlations between countries were found when sex was held constant (see Table 3). The strongest correlation between work centrality and work hours was for Denmark ($r = .29$, $p < .001$), and this result differed significantly from *all* other countries. Finland ($r = .19$, $p < .001$) differed significantly from Denmark, Czech Republic ($r = .05$, ns), Greece ($r = .08$, ns), Hungary ($r = .09$, $p < .05$), Israel ($r = .08$, $p < .05$), Norway ($r = .11$, $p < .01$), Poland ($r = -.01$, ns), and Spain ($r = .03$, ns). Belgium ($r = .18$, $p < .001$) and Sweden ($r = .17$, $p < .001$) differed significantly from Denmark, Czech Republic, Poland, and Spain. A group consisting of Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and United Kingdom (with correlations ranging from .14 to .15, $p < .001$) differed significantly from those of Denmark, Spain, and Poland. Austria

and Ireland ($r = .11$ and $.12$, $p < .01$, respectively) differed significantly from Denmark and Spain, and the remaining countries, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Slovenia (with correlations ranging from $r = .13$, ns, in Luxembourg to $r = .09$, $p < .05$ in Portugal) were not significantly different from any other countries except Denmark. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was mostly supported.

Moreover, the expectation that stronger correlations would emerge for Scandinavian countries than for Eastern European countries was partially supported. Denmark had a stronger correlation than all other countries followed by Finland. Poland and Czech Republic were among the countries with the weakest correlations.

To test Hypotheses 4 and 5, mean scores for work centrality were correlated with Schwartz's cultural values using Spearman's rank correlation, at the culture level of analysis. There was a positive correlation between work centrality and Conservatism values ($r = .55$, $p < .01$), and a negative correlation between work centrality with each of Affective Autonomy values ($r = -.48$, $p < .05$), Intellectual Autonomy values ($r = -.54$, $p < .05$), and Egalitarianism values ($r = -.44$, $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 4, proposing a positive correlation between work centrality and both Hierarchy and Mastery values, was not supported, as positive, but not significant correlations were found. Hypothesis 5 proposed a negative correlation between work centrality and Egalitarianism and Harmony values, but the hypothesis was only partially supported as a significant, negative correlation was found with Egalitarianism values but no significant correlation was found for Harmony values.

Table 3

Analysis of Differences in Correlations Between Countries

Country	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Austria	-										
2 Belgium	-1.45	-									
3 Czech Rep.	.98	2.18	-								
4 Denmark	-4.11	-2.36	-4.47	-							
5 Finland	-1.87	-.23	-2.57	2.36	-						
6 France	-.20	1.09	-1.05	3.37	1.40	-					
7 Germany	-.96	.67	-1.83	3.47	1.03	-.61	-				
8 Greece	.57	1.85	-.41	4.24	2.24	.68	1.45	-			
9 Hungary	.39	1.64	-.54	3.93	1.99	.52	1.22	-.15	-		
10 Ireland	-.24	1.17	-1.15	3.69	1.53	-.02	.66	-.76	-.58	-	
11 Israel	.45	1.72	-.50	4.06	2.08	.58	1.30	-.10	.05	.64	-
12 Italy	-.03	1.19	-.88	3.36	1.49	.14	.73	-.51	-.36	.16	-.41
13 Luxembourg	-.25	.77	-.94	2.51	.98	-.09	.36	-.64	-.51	-.08	-.55
14 Netherlands	-.80	.77	-1.69	3.50	1.13	-.48	.14	-1.30	-1.08	-.52	-1.16
15 Norway	.06	1.56	-.96	4.34	2.01	.26	1.08	-.53	-.34	.31	-.41
16 Poland	1.54	2.79	.41	5.33	3.29	1.54	2.52	.86	.99	1.70	.95
17 Portugal	.36	1.61	-.56	3.89	1.95	.50	1.18	-.17	-.03	.55	-.07
18 Slovenia	.20	1.46	-.70	3.74	1.80	.35	1.02	-.32	-.17	.40	-.22
19 Spain	2.05	3.19	.94	5.55	3.67	2.01	2.97	1.39	1.49	2.19	1.47
20 Sweden	-1.42	.20	-2.20	2.85	.48	-1.01	-.53	-1.84	-1.60	-1.10	-1.69
21 Switzerland	-.73	.79	-1.61	3.42	1.14	-.43	.18	-1.23	-1.02	-.46	-1.09
22 UK	-.79	.73	-1.66	3.35	1.07	-.49	.11	-1.28	-1.07	-.52	-1.14

Table 3 (Continued)

Analysis of Differences in Correlations Between Countries

Country	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
12 Italy	-									
13 Luxembourg	-.20	-								
14 Netherlands	-.61	-.27	-							
15 Norway	.09	.30	.91	-						
16 Poland	1.33	1.31	2.34	1.54	-					
17 Portugal	.34	.49	1.05	.31	-1.01	-				
18 Slovenia	.20	.37	.89	.15	-1.17	-.14	-			
19 Spain	1.80	1.71	2.79	2.06	.60	1.51	1.66	-		
20 Sweden	-1.12	-.67	-.65	-1.55	-2.89	-1.57	-1.41	-3.30	-	
21 Switzerland	-.57	-.24	.04	-.83	-2.23	-.99	-.83	-2.69	.67	-
22 UK	-.62	-.28	-.02	-.89	-2.28	-1.04	-.88	-2.74	.60	-.06

Note. Calculation of z-scores based on Cohen and Cohen (1983, pp. 54-55).

$p < .05$ for values $z \geq |1.96|$.

To further examine the relationships between cultural values and work centrality, dichotomized versions of each of the seven cultural values were created. A score of 1 was given to participants from countries whose score on that particular cultural value was on or above the median of the value score for all countries; otherwise a score of 0 was given. Using a dichotomy, as opposed to the actual cultural values scores allowed for the inclusion of Italy, as the cultural values scores for this country were obtained from a different source than the scores for the other countries. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis found that sex, age, years of education, and hours worked accounted for 4% of variance in work centrality. Each cultural value was then examined and yielded small, but significant variance in work centrality. Conservatism values and Autonomy values explained additional variance in work centrality after control variables and work hours were accounted for ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .01$). Finally, the interaction between work hours and each cultural value yielded same significant, but hardly noticeable, variance in work centrality (see Table 4).

Significant, but small, moderating effects ($\Delta R^2 < .001, p < .05$) were found for each of Conservatism, Harmony, and Affective Autonomy values. In order to plot the significant interaction effects, data based on 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for work hours and 0 or 1 for the moderator variables (i.e., cultural values) were plotted.

Figure 3 shows almost identical slopes for the relationship between work centrality and work hours, regardless of score on Conservatism values. Work centrality is generally higher for countries high on Conservatism values.

Figure 4 shows a slightly different picture for Harmony values. At low work hours, countries high on Harmony values show higher work centrality than countries low on these values. However, at high work hours, work centrality is similar regardless if the country is high or low on Harmony values.

Figure 5 shows a picture for Affective Autonomy values that is directly opposite to that for Conservatism values in Figure 3. Countries *low* on Autonomy values have higher work centrality than countries high on Autonomy values. Moreover, work centrality for low number of work hours in low Autonomy value countries is almost at the level of work centrality for high number of hours in high Autonomy value countries. As Autonomy values oppose Conservatism values this picture is expected.

Figure 3. Conservatism values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours.

Figure 4. Harmony values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours.

Figure 5. Affective Autonomy values moderating the relationship between work centrality and work hours.

Table 4

Work Centrality Regressed on Control Variables, Work Hours, Cultural Values, and the Interaction Between each Cultural Value and Work Hours

Variables	B	ΔR^2	R^2
Step 1: Sex	-.04 **	.01 **	.01 **
Age	.07 **		
Years of full-time education	-.08 **		
Step 2: Work Hours	.17	.03 **	.04 **
<u>Cultural values</u>			
Step 3: Conservatism	.10 **	.01 **	.05 **
Step 4: Conservatism $\times$ Work Hours	-.06 *	.00 *	.05 *
Step 3: Harmony	.03 **	.00 **	.04 **
Step 4: Harmony $\times$ Work Hours	-.06 *	.00 *	.04 *
Step 3: Hierarchy	.03 **	.00 **	.04 **
Step 4: Hierarchy $\times$ Work Hours	.04	.00	.04
Step 3: Mastery	-.02 *	.00 *	.04 *
Step 4: Mastery $\times$ Work Hours	.03	.00	.04
Step 3: Affective Autonomy	-.12 **	.01 **	.05 **
Step 4: Affective Autonomy $\times$ Work Hours	.06 *	.00 *	.05 *
Step 3: Intellectual Autonomy	-.08 **	.01 **	.05 **
Step 4: Intellectual Autonomy $\times$ Work Hours	.02	.00	.05
Step 3: Egalitarianism	-.04 **	.00 **	.04 **
Step 4: Egalitarianism $\times$ Work Hours	.04	.00	.04

Note. Results for Step 3 and Step 4 were obtained from separate regression analyses.

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$.

DISCUSSION

This study examined differences in work centrality across European countries with a special focus on differences between old (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom) and new (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia) member countries in the EU. With an absence of research connecting Schwartz's (1992) cultural value theory with work attitudes a particular goal was to determine if cultural values could explain country differences in work centrality.

First, work centrality differed between countries, and was generally higher for new EU member countries than for old EU member countries. Several of the old member countries (including Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom) had mean scores for work centrality that indicated leisure was more important than work. In other old EU-countries (including France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Portugal) work was more important than leisure. Mean scores for the new member countries (including Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia) also showed work to be more important than leisure. Differences in work attitudes might be better grouped into geographical North/West vs. South/Central/East regions. Countries participating in the survey who are not members of the EU (Israel, Norway, and Switzerland) showed the same North/South pattern; in Norway leisure was more important than work, whereas in Switzerland and Israel work was more important than leisure.

In the context of migration in Europe these results indicate that immigrants from new EU member countries might feel more aligned with local work values in the Southern and Central part of the “old” EU than in Scandinavia, the Netherlands, or the United Kingdom. Inferring from Frieze et al. (2004), that people who choose to immigrate might have even higher work centrality than the population in general, the old EU countries should expect that immigrants from Eastern Europe would participate fully in the workforce.

Hypothesis 1, proposing a positive correlation between work centrality and work hours, was partially supported as work centrality was positively and significantly correlated with work hours in 17 of the 22 countries (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom). This shows that earlier Israeli findings (Harpaz & Snir, 2003; Snir & Harpaz, 2002b, 2004), that people with high work centrality work more than people with low work centrality, can be generalized across most countries. However, significant differences in size of the correlations show that some caution should be applied when interpreting these data.

Homogeneity of employment arrangements might logically influence the relationship between work centrality and work hours. If most jobs are full-time positions even people with low work centrality are forced to work full time – or not at all. Consequently, a low correlation between work centrality and work hours could be expected. For countries where people with low work centrality can arrange to work as little as suits them, a higher correlation should be expected. However, the United

Kingdom and Greece both have 15 hours standard deviation on work hours, but the correlation between work hours and work centrality in United Kingdom is significantly stronger than in Greece. If everybody works more or less the same number of hours, a person who regularly works overtime might perceive him or herself as a person for whom work is very important. If the labor market is diverse, a person who works in a field where part-time work is prevalent, might also get that impression if he or she works overtime, even if he or she does not work as much as somebody in another field where full-time is the norm. Netherlands and Ireland illustrate this dilemma. In both countries the mean for Importance of Work is 7.6, but where the mean of weekly work hours in the Netherlands is 34.7 hours, the mean in Ireland is 41.8 hours – the equivalent of the Irish working one full day more per week than the Dutch.

In five countries (Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom) correlations between work centrality and work hours differed significantly between men and women. For those five countries the correlation was stronger for men than for women, supporting Hypothesis 2. It was not expected that Denmark, Sweden and United Kingdom would show significant differences between men and women in the relationship between work centrality and work hours. The theoretical foundation for Hypotheses 3 was built on findings that women from these countries were *less* ambivalent about their work role than women in other countries (Christensen & Christensen, 2004), and although the correlation between work centrality and work hours for Danish women was positive and significant, the correlations for both Sweden and United Kingdom were not significant. A common factor for all five countries with

significant differences between men and women was that out of the total population in the ESS dataset, the samples from these countries had the lowest proportion of people not working (from 35% in Denmark and Switzerland to 45% in United Kingdom). In comparison, non-working participants accounted for 57% and 58% of the total sample in Poland and Greece, respectively. There might be a different attitude towards work in countries where more people work compared to countries where there is either a higher level of unemployment or where a bigger part of the adult population does not seek employment.

As proposed in Hypothesis 3, there were significant differences between some countries on correlations between work centrality and work hours. The strongest significant correlations were found in Denmark and Finland; non-significant correlations were found in Czech Republic, Poland, and Spain. It appears that work centrality was generally higher for people in Southern/Eastern/Central European countries than for people in most Northern/Western European countries, and correlations between work hours and work centrality were generally weaker in the latter countries.

Bishop's (2004) findings of long work hours in the agricultural and fishing industries suggest that differences in relationships between work hours and work centrality might be linked to structural differences in the various countries' economies. In manufacturing industries, work and thus work hours are often defined by being at a work place (England & Harpaz, 1990); for agriculture and fishing such distinctions are harder to make. Is it considered work when one has dinner at sea? The proportion of

populations working in agriculture, fishing, mining, and foresting differs from 1% in France to 18% in Greece and 19% in Poland (The Economist, 2005); the correlations between work centrality and work hours are not significant in Greece and Poland.

Social desirability bias might have also influenced participants' responses (particularly as ESS survey was conducted in interview format). Snir and Harpaz (2002a), who also conducted interviews, but who used two formulations of some questions, found differences in response patterns that likely could be attributed to bias leading to over-reporting the importance of work. For the present study, such bias might result in reporting work as more important or leisure as less important than the participant really feels. Smith (2004) found that bias was more likely to occur in cultures that endorsed Hierarchy and Conservatism values. Among countries in the ESS, stronger correlations between work centrality and work hours were found for countries low on Conservatism values. This raises the question if some of the differences in strength of correlations could be caused by over-reporting the importance of work (or under-reporting importance of leisure) in countries high on Conservatism values.

Hypothesis 4, that Mastery and Hierarchy values were positively related to work centrality, was not supported. The lack of support for this hypothesis could indicate that Schwartz's (1999) rationale, focusing on the work domain as a place for achieving power and wealth, might not be what Europeans have in mind when they answer how important work and leisure are in their lives. Perhaps they just do what is expected of them or want to have a steady income (both ideas reflect Conservatism values), or they

want to do as they please (which reflects Autonomy values). An analysis into individual level values might reveal more about priorities of the present sample of Europeans.

Hypothesis 5 was partially supported, as work centrality correlated negatively with Egalitarianism values. This intuitively makes sense. Egalitarianism values emphasize equality. In countries high on Egalitarianism values people accept a higher level of redistribution of wealth, diminishing the economic incentive to work more. Moreover, *post hoc* analyses revealed that there was a positive correlation between Conservatism values and work centrality, and for each of Intellectual and Affective Autonomy values there were negative correlations with work centrality. For countries high in Conservatism values there is an emphasis on following the norm, and - at least for men - the norm is to work. Autonomy values oppose Conservatism values and in countries high on Autonomy values the culture leaves more room for people to do and feel as they please when it comes to planning their work life.

Thus, the present study generally found weak support for the Schwartz's (1999) propositions regarding compatibility and conflict between cultural values and work centrality. The selection of countries used in his study might contribute to the differences in findings. Schwartz tested his hypothesis on only three culturally different countries (USA, Japan, and Germany). Although there are measurable differences in values among the countries, the European countries, sharing much of the same history, are culturally closer to one another than are USA, Japan, and Germany to each other.

Another difference between Schwartz's (1999) analysis and this paper lies in the measurement of work centrality. Schwartz used data from the MOW study that prodded deeper into work attitudes than the ESS did. Compared to the 1980's, where data for the MOW (1987) study were collected, data in the ESS showed a remarkable drop in work centrality. For Belgium, Great Britain, and the Netherlands work ranged second in importance in the MOW study, with only family being more important, whereas in the present study negative values in Table 2 indicate that work is also less important than leisure in the ESS data. The ESS data for Germany shows that work is more important than leisure, also contrasting with the results from the MOW study. Caution is warranted, however, in making such comparisons. Cullen and Parboteeah (2005) showed that relative work centrality scores across countries differ significantly depending on which study the data were taken from. Noteworthy is that for two of the countries Schwartz used, Japan is positioned as having more than twice as strong work centrality as Germany in one study and at the same level as Germany in another study.

Finally, moderated regression analyses revealed that certain cultural values might explain the correlation between work centrality and work hours. For example, Harmony values, which were not found to correlate with work centrality, explained when work hours related to work centrality, that is, when countries' Harmony values were low the relationship between work hours and work centrality was more positive than when Harmony values were high. For countries high on Harmony values there may be less willingness to stand out from the group and either assert oneself or openly show lack of interest in work. Moreover, both Affective Autonomy values and

Conservatism values moderated the relationship between work hours and work centrality. For countries high on Conservatism values higher levels of work centrality was seen regardless of hours worked. Research has shown that working is seen as such an important activity that people will work even if they do not have a financial need to do so (Harpaz, 1989; Snir & Harpaz, 2002a). In cultures high on Conservatism values there is a focus on following this norm. If work is defined as important by the culture, people will feel that it *is* important, regardless if they personally work a lot or not. For Affective Autonomy values – opposing Conservatism values - opposite results were found. There is *not* a need to follow the norm in cultures high on Affective Autonomy values; people might work a lot, but it does not impact work centrality to the same extent as in countries low on Autonomy values. The interaction results should be read with the caution as they were based on dichotomized data with no discernable variance. With the large sample size, these results might be spurious.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. First, although it is always preferred to assess variables from the focal sample, such as cultural values in the present study, this could not be done due to unforeseen problems with the shortened PVQ version. However, because analyses pertaining to cultural values and work centrality were analyzed at the culture level, archival data from the same author of the PVQ (i.e., Schwartz) were obtained. Second, the concept of work centrality itself might be ambiguous. Asking “how important are each of these things in your life” – family, friends, work, leisure, politics, religion, volunteering – does not indicate whether the

question relates to how much effort is spent on each domain or how much of the person's identity comes from the role as a worker, a spouse, or a friend. Third, it is also not obvious from the questionnaire if unpaid work (e.g., house keeping, child rearing) is included in leisure, family, or work. Fourth, the questions related to work hours only included the participants' main job. That could create a problem in countries where holding more than one job is common. If people high on work centrality only report work hours for their primary occupation, but work more hours in a secondary occupation, their reported work hours will not reflect their total work effort, and consequently the relationship between work centrality and work hours will be misrepresented. Fifth, work hours for occupations, in which it is common to work in intervals of many hours followed by periods of not working (e.g., working on an oil-rig) might not be correctly represented. Likewise, fieldwork took place during the winter in most countries (ESS, 2004), which might have influenced work time related answers, for example, for people in tourism or agricultural occupations. Finally, that higher work centrality in the Southern/Eastern/ Central European countries was as much a function of lower importance of leisure as of higher importance of work compared to Northern and Western countries raises the question of whether the meanings of work and leisure differ between countries to an extent that they are not conceptually equivalent.

Future Directions

This study analyzed culture level values in relation to work centrality. Additional research into the relationship between individual level values and work attitudes across nations is needed to fully understand various rationales for working.

Although data for this study come from only European countries and Israel, significant positive correlations between work centrality and Conservatism values and negative correlations between work centrality and Autonomy values were found. Nonetheless, that the European nations are culturally homogeneous (Schwartz, 1996) suggests that a more diverse set of nations needs to be studied. Also, further studies on datasets including more culturally diverse countries might find other or stronger relationships between cultural values and work centrality than could be found based on the ESS sample of countries. Likewise, cultural analyses on subgroups within the European countries might shed light on differences – or lack of differences – in work attitudes, as there are often more variations within groups than between groups (Hofstede 1984b).

Nørregård-Nielsen and Østergaard (2004) showed that in Denmark, Sweden, West and East Germany, Great Britain, Estonia, and Poland importance of work differed significantly between working and non-working respondents in some, but not all, countries. ESS data provides an opportunity to investigate these differences in a much greater sample of countries.

Years of education has been shown to correlate negatively with work centrality in USA, Japan, Germany, and Israel (Harpaz & Fu, 1997), and as a control variable it showed a significant relationship with work centrality in this thesis (see Table 4). It does not necessarily follow that countries for which the mean length of education is longer has lower work centrality than countries for which the mean length of education

is shorter. The within-group and between-group relationships of education and work centrality is another area for exploration.

Schwartz (1999) hypothesized relationships between cultural values and work centrality as well as societal norms (entitlement and obligation) and work goals. This paper examined his first proposition; Schwartz's invitation to test the other propositions is still open.

REFERENCES

- Addae, H. M., & Johns, G. (2002). *National culture and perceptions of absence legitimacy*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Ali, A. J., Al-Shakhis, M., & Nataraj, S. (1991). Work centrality and individualism: A cross-national perspective. *International Journal of Manpower*, 12, 30-38.
- Arvey, R. D., Harpaz, I., & Liao, H. (2004). Work centrality and post-award behavior of lottery winners. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138, 404-430.
- Bishop, K. (2004). Working time patterns in the UK, France, Denmark and Sweden. *Labour Market trends*, 112, 113-122.
- Christensen, G. L., & Christensen, P. V. (2004). Kvinder og arbejde [Women and work]. In P. Gundelach (Eds.): *Danskernes Særpræg* (pp. 197-219). Copenhagen, Denmark: Reitels Forlag.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J. : L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cullen, J. B., & Parboteeah, K. P. (2005). *Multinational Management: A Strategic Approach* (3rd ed.), Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern College.
- Dubin, R., Champoux, J. E., & Porter, L. W. (1975). Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 411-421.
- The Economist. (2005). *Pocket World in Figures* (p. 23). London: Profile Books.
- England, G. W. (1991). The meaning of working in the USA: Recent changes. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 111-124.
- England, G.W., & Harpaz, I. (1983). Some methodological and analytical considerations in cross-national research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 49-59.
- England, G. W., & Harpaz, I. (1990). How working is defined: National contexts and demographic and organizational role influences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 252-266.
- European Social Survey (2004). *ESS Documentation Report 2002/2003, Edition 4.1 February 2004*. Retrieved May 18, 2004, from http://ess.nsd.uib.no/2003/ESS1DataDocReport_e04_1.doc

- European Values Survey (1999). Questionnaire 1999. Retrieved May 18, 2004, from <http://spitswww.uvt.nl/web/fsw/evs/documents/Ques1999.pdf>
- Franzoi, S. L. (2000). *Social Psychology* (p.155). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Frieze, I. H., Boneva, B. S., Šarlija, N., Horvat, J., Ferligoj, A., Kogovšek, T., et al. (2004). Psychological differences in stayers and leavers: Emigration desires in Central and Eastern European university students. *European Psychologist*, 9, 15-23.
- Harpaz, I. (1989). Non-financial employment commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 147-150.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). The importance of work goals: An international perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21, 75-93.
- Harpaz, I., & Fu, X. (1997). Work centrality in Germany, Israel, Japan and the United States. *Cross Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*, 31, 171-200.
- Harpaz, I., & Fu, X. (2002). The structure of the meaning of work: A relative stability amidst change. *Human Relations*, 55, 639-667.
- Harpaz, I., Honig, B., & Coetsier, P. (2002). A cross-cultural longitudinal analysis of the meaning of work and the socialization process of career starters. *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 37, pp. 230-244.
- Harpaz, I., & Snir, R. (2003). Workaholism: Its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, 56, 291-319.
- Heller, F. (1991). Reassessing the work ethic: A new look at work and other activities. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 147-160.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Field, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 789-800.
- Hofstede, G. (1983a). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 75-89.
- Hofstede, G. (1983b). National cultures in four dimensions. A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 8, 46-74.

- Hofstede, G. (1984a). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 389-398.
- Hofstede, G. (1984b). *Cultures Consequences. International differences in Work-Related Values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jowell, R. and the Central Coordinating Team (2003). *European Social Survey 2002/2003: Technical Report*, London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University. Retrieved May 16, 2004 from http://naticent02.uuhost.uk.uu.net/archive/tech_report.htm
- Krieger, H. (2004). *Migration trends in an enlarged Europe*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Retrieved June 12, 2005 from <http://www.eurofound.eu.int/publications/files/EF03109EN.pdf>
- Kulik, L. (2001). Impact of length of unemployment and age on jobless men and women: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 38, 15-28.
- LeBor, A. (2004, April 29). Happy to stay at home. *Times online*. Retrieved August 23, 2004 from <http://www.timesonline.co.uk>
- 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, 1537-1563.
- Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, Summer, 83-92.
- MOW-International Research Team. (1987). *The Meaning of Work. An International View*. London: Academic Press.
- Now that we are all bundled inside, let's shut the door. (2005, April 30). *The Economist*, 352, 21-23.
- Nørregård-Nielsen, E., & Østergaard, J. (2004). Unge og arbejde [Young people and work]. In P. Gundelach (Eds.): *Danskernes Særpræg* (pp. 220-244). Copenhagen, Denmark: Reitels Forlag.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2004). *Employment outlook*. Retrieved April 16, 2005 from http://www.oecd.org/document/13/0,2340,en_2649_201185_31781197_1_1_1_1,00.html

- Parboteeah, K. P., & Cullen, J. B. (2003). Social institutions and work centrality: Exploration beyond National culture. *Organization Science*, 14, 137-148.
- Paullay, I. M., Allinger, G. M. & 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.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P., & Obdrzalek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 1-26.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H., & Surkiss, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48 (1), 49-71.
- Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1991). Introduction: The meaning of work. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 81-89.
- Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & England, G. W. (1996). How working is defined: Structure and stability. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 515-541.
- Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Wilbert, B. (1991). Are work meanings changing? *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 1, 91-109.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). *Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries*. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1996). *Beyond Individualism/Collectivism, new cultural dimensions of values*. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied psychology: An international review*, 48, 23-47.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2002). A proposal for measuring value orientations across nations. In *Questionnaire Development Report, Chapter 7*. ESS. Retrieved May 18, 2004, from <http://naticent02.uuhost.uk.uu.net/questionnaire/index.htm>

- Smith, P. B. (2004). Acquiescent response bias as an aspect of cultural communication style. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 50-61.
- Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2002a). To work or not to work: Nonfinancial employment commitment and the social desirability bias. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 635-644.
- Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2002b). Work-leisure relations: Leisure orientation and the meaning of work. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34, 178-203.
- Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2004). Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 520-536.
- Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Sanchez, J. I., O'Driscoll, M., Sparks, K., Bernin, P., et al. (2001). Do national levels of individualism and internal locus of control relate to well-being: An ecological level international study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 815-832.

APPENDIX A

Human Subjects - Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

Office of the Academic
Vice President
Academic Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research

One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95191-1175
Phone: (408) 283-7511
Fax: (408) 924-2480
E-mail: gradstudies@sjstate.edu

To: Charlotte Wittenkamp
1013 Mondclair Way
Los Altos, CA 94024

From: Pam Stacks,
Interim AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: November 8, 2004

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request for exemption from human subjects review under category "D" in the study entitled:

"Values and Work Centrality."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project or the subject's data collected for the research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project and concerning all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must immediately notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted. This approval is granted for a one-year period and data collection beyond November 8, 2005 requires an extension request.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

cc: Dr. Sharon Glazer

The California State University
System
Office of the President
University Center
San Jose, CA 95191-1175
Phone: (408) 283-7511
Fax: (408) 924-2480
E-mail: gradstudies@sjstate.edu

Office of the Academic
Vice President
**Academic Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research**
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0320
Voice: 408-934-2480
Fax: 408-924-2477
E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjstate.edu>

To: Charlotte Wittenkamp
1013 Montclair Way
Los Altos, Ca 94024

From: Pam Stacks
AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: January 12, 2006

This letter acknowledges that the Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has received the request for extension of the following study:

"Values and Work Centrality"

Since there are no major changes to the protocol, the Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has granted this project a one-year extension effective from the date of this letter. Data collection beyond January 12, 2007 requires an extension request.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (408) 924-2480.

Cc: Sharon Glazer

The California State University,
Chico State Office
Bismarck, California 95926-1200
Bismarck, ND 58501-1200
Folsom, CA 95630-1200
Los Angeles, California 90032-1200
Modesto, CA 95230-1200
Sacramento, CA 95811-1200
San Diego, CA 92161-1200
San Francisco, CA 94132-1200
San Jose, CA 95192-1200

APPENDIX B

Questions from the European Social Survey

Questions from the European Social Survey

C20 Were you born in [country]?

Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	8

Looking at this card, how important is each of these things in your life.
 Firstly.... **READ OUT**

	Extremely unimportant										Extremely Important	(Don't Know)
E13 ...family?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E14 ...friends?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E15 ...leisuretime?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E16 ...politics?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E17 ...work?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E18 ...religion?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88
E19 ...voluntary ... organisations?	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	88

E29 Can I just check, are you currently ... **READ OUT**

... employed

1

...self-employed

2

or, not in paid work?

3

(Don't know)

8

F2 CODE SEX

ASK ALL

F7 How many years of full-time education have you completed?

[To be reported in full-time equivalents, including compulsory/mandatory years of schooling]

WRITE IN:

--	--

(Don't know) 88

F19 What are/were your total 'basic' or contracted hours

each week (in your main job), excluding any paid and

unpaid overtime?

WRITE IN HOURS:

--	--	--

(Don't know) 888

F20 Regardless of your basic or contracted hours, how many hours

do/did you *normally work* a week (in your main job), including

any paid or unpaid overtime.

WRITE IN HOURS:

--	--	--

(Don't know) 888

PVQ

GS1 MALE RESPONDENTS (Female respondents are asked with feminine form “she; her”)

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description tick the box on each

line that shows how much each person is or is not like you.

Very much like me / Like Me / Somewhat like me / A little like me / Not like me / Not like me at all

01

02

03

04

05

06

A Thinking up new ideas₁ and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.

B It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive₂ things.

C He thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.

D It's important to him to show₃ his abilities. He wants people to admire₄ what he does.

E It is important to him to live in secure₅ surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety.

F He likes surprises and is always looking for new things to do. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life₆.

G He believes that people should do what they're told₇. He thinks people should follow rules₈ at all times, even when no-one is watching.

H It is important to him to listen to people who are different₉ from him. Even when he disagrees with them, he still wants to understand them.

I It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself.

J Having a good time is important to him. He likes to “spoil”₁₀ himself.

K It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free and not depend₁₁ on others.

L It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for₁₂ their well-being.

M Being very successful is important to him. He hopes people will recognize his achievements.

N It is important to him that the government ensures₁₃ his safety against all threats. He wants the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.

O He looks for adventures and likes to take risks. He wants to have an exciting₁₄ life.

P It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

Q It is important to him to get₁₅ respect from others. He wants people to do what he says.

R It is important to him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote₁₆ himself to people close to him.

S He strongly believes that people should care for₁₇ nature. Looking after the environment is important to him.

R Tradition is important to him. He tries to follow the customs handed down by his religion or his family.

U He seeks every chance₁₈ he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.

1 Having new ideas, with an emphasis on the creative side of having them through generating them himself.

2 "Expensive": in the sense of costing a lot rather than their being 'luxury' items.

3 The idea is to show whatever abilities he has, with no assumption that he actually has great abilities. It is important to him to be perceived as being able.

4 He wants his actions to be admired, not his person.

5 In the sense of the surroundings actually being secure, and not that he feels secure.

6 Important for himself (his life) is the focus.

7 The idea here is that when someone else tells you what to do in actual interpersonal interaction, (implying also that the person has some authority), you should do it.

8 "Rules" in the sense of 'rules and regulations'.

9 "Different" in almost any way. The key idea is that he sees difference/diversity positively and as something worth learning about.

10 "Spoil himself": "treat himself" is another idiom. Strongly negative 'self-indulgence' is *not* intended.

- 11 In the sense of not to have to depend on people
- 12 “care for”: here in the sense of actively promote their well-being.
- 13 “Ensures” in the sense of ‘guarantees’.
- 14 “Exciting” more in the sense of ‘exhilarating’ than ‘dangerous’.
- 15 Get/have this respect, not deserve respect
- 16 “Devote”: is intended to convey deep concern for these people and readiness to invest his time, resources and energy in their welfare.
- 17 “care for”: look after, basically synonymous with ‘looking after’ in the second sentence.
- 18 Seeks: active pursuit rather than ‘taking every’ chance.