This study examines the relationship between individual-level values, using Schwartz’s theory, and organizational and occupational commitment among Israeli Arabs. The sample includes 369 Arab teachers working in 14 schools in Arab communities in the north of Israel, with a response rate of 65%. The findings show a significant effect of 2 values—benevolence and conformity—on most organizational and occupational commitment dimensions, above and beyond the effect of demographic variables. The specific relationships found here are attributed to the characteristics of the sample. Implications of the findings for continuing research on this issue are emphasized.

Recent years have evidenced growing recognition that employees in the workplace are simultaneously exposed to more than one object of commitment: not only the organization, but also the work group, the occupation, work in general, and one’s particular job (Cohen, 1993, 1999, 2003, 2007; Morrow, 1993; Randall & Cote, 1991). This recognition, in turn, has spurred efforts to better understand the origin, development, and magnitude of these commitments via research that examines commitment foci other than or in addition to organizational commitment.

There are several reasons for this interest. First, as the workforce becomes more educated, sophisticated, and flexible, one can no longer assume that organizational commitment—rather than, for instance, occupational considerations—will be the driving force behind an employee’s decision to keep or leave a job (Cohen, 2003). Second, the multiple commitment approach has been shown to predict important work outcomes, such as withdrawal, performance, absenteeism, and tardiness better than a single-commitment outlook (e.g., Blau, 1986; Cohen, 1993, 1999, 2003; Randall & Cote, 1991).
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The present study explores two foci of commitment: the organization, traditionally the sole focus of attention, and one that continues to be elucidated; and the occupation, a new focus that has also been examined extensively in recent years because of its relevance to growing segments in the workforce. I chose to focus on occupation over the profession or career because the occupation can be generalized to a larger group of employees, nonprofessionals as well as professionals (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000).

As noted, organizational commitment is strongly represented in the literature. Arguing that organizational commitment can be better understood as a multidimensional concept, Meyer and Allen (1984) proposed a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment. They called their first dimension affective commitment, which is defined as “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to, and involvement in the work organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1984, p. 375). The second dimension was termed continuance commitment, which is defined as “the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving (e.g., investments or lack of attractive alternatives)” (Meyer & Allen, 1984, p. 375). Later, Allen and Meyer (1990) added a third dimension, normative commitment, which is defined as employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization.

The three-component model of organizational commitment was later extended to occupational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) using similar definitions, albeit with some changes in the scales. As a result, the three-component approach has not only dominated the study of organizational commitment, as demonstrated in the extensive meta-analysis conducted by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002), but has also affected the study of occupational commitment.

Because of the similar dimensionality of the two concepts, it is obvious that the basic difference between the two commitments lies in their focus: the organization in the one case, and the occupation in the other. From the individual point of view, organizationally committed employees demonstrate a strong belief and acceptance of an organization’s goals and values, a readiness to exert considerable effort for the organization, and a strong desire to remain an organization member. Individuals with high occupational commitment should be more likely to participate in skill development, devote great energy to furthering their careers, do more to advance their occupations, and be less likely to leave their occupations (Hackett & Lapierre, 2001).

Perhaps because these two foci share the three-component model, most recent studies on occupational commitment have focused on the dimensionality of the concept (e.g., Blau, 2003; Chang, Chi, & Miao, 2007; Snape & Redman, 2003), rather than comparing correlates of organizational and
occupational commitment. Among those who have taken a comparative approach, some have concluded that occupational commitment is less affected by individual correlates than is organizational commitment (Lee et al., 2000). However, Meyer et al. (1993) found that affective and normative occupational and organizational commitment have a similar pattern in their relationship to work correlates, including outcomes.

Despite numerous findings that have emerged from studies on commitment in the workplace (Cohen, 2003; Meyer et al., 2002), one area of investigation has generally been overlooked; namely, the relationship between commitment in the workplace and individual values. The need for research that would test commitment in relation to values was strongly advocated by Becker (1960), who asserted, “In short, to understand commitment fully, we must discover the systems of value within which the mechanisms and processes described earlier operate” (p. 39). Studies of the nature and implications of individual value differences have seen a renaissance in recent years (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). These studies reveal a great deal of variation in the value priorities of individuals within societies, as well as groups across nations. This growing interest in individual values has very slowly spilled over to management and organizational behavior research in general (Ang, Van Dyne, & Begley, 2003; Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007) and to commitment research in particular (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Cohen, 2007).

Values are supposed to play a functional role in work-related processes and outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work performance. They are assumed to be predictors or moderators of these processes and criteria. Furthermore, they are ascribed a central role in determining the fit between the individual and the employment organization. The underlying assumption is that people will be happier and more motivated, satisfied, and committed when their values are congruent with those emphasized in the organization or vocational group (Berings, De Fruyt, & Bouwen, 2004). There is general agreement in the literature that values do not influence people’s activity directly, but rather indirectly, through attitudes and goals. Although people’s activity in the work domain is likely to depend more on work values than on general values, the role of general values should not be overlooked (Roe & Ester, 1999).

As the role of personality traits in work-related behaviors and values has received renewed interest over the past decade (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaosis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005), studies have begun to examine the effect of values on commitment (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Pearson & Chong, 1997; Wasti, 2003) and on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and performance (Ang et al., 2003; Farh et al., 2007). However, this research is still in its early stages because relatively few studies have examined
individual values in light of their relationship to commitment. Most have applied Hofstede’s (1980) framework, arguing that each of his value dimensions varies widely across individuals within a society and that these individual differences have main effects on many outcomes (Farh et al., 2007). For example, Clugston et al. (2000), looking at American employees, found that power distance was related to normative commitment to the organization, the supervisor, and the work group. Uncertainty avoidance was related to continuance commitment to the organization, the supervisor, and the work group; and collectivism was related to affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the work group. Cohen (2007) examined five groups of Israeli teachers who were assumed to represent different cultural groups (secular Jews, orthodox Jews, kibbutz members, Druze, and Arabs). Cohen found that all of the values were related to forms of commitment and added to the variance already explained by the dummy variable of membership in a given cultural group.

Fewer studies have applied Schwartz’s (1992, 1996) human values theory to examine relationships to commitment. Glazer, Daniel, and Short (2004) used Schwartz’s (1992) Values Survey to examine the relationship between values and affective and continuance organizational commitment among hospital nurses in Hungary, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Glazer et al. found that openness to change was negatively related to affective commitment in three countries: the U.S., Hungary, and Italy. Conservative values were positively related to continuance commitment in the Italian sample. The other higher-order values were not significant in the regressions. In a survey of German and British employees, Fischer and Smith (2006) found that conservatism and openness to change had no direct effect on affective organizational commitment. They concluded that other forms of commitment, as well as other values must be examined to further clarify the relationship between values and commitment.

The present study advances the stream of research outlined previously by applying Schwartz’s (1992) theory of cultural values, rather than that of Hofstede (1980) to individual cultural values. Several reasons led to this decision. First, there is some criticism of Hofstede’s theory. The basis for this criticism was presented by Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson (2006), who argued that Hofstede’s work reduced culture to an overly simplistic four- or five-dimension conceptualization. Furthermore, Hofstede limited his sample to a single multinational corporation, failed to capture the malleability of culture over time, and ignored within-country cultural heterogeneity (Sivakumar & Nakata, 2001). Other researchers (Spector, Cooper, & Sparks, 2001) have criticized Hofstede’s measurement techniques. Kirkman et al. noted that in spite of the criticism, researchers have favored this five-dimension framework because of its clarity, parsimony, and resonance with managers.
The controversy regarding Hofstede’s (1980) theory is also demonstrated in several papers presented in a 2006 volume (Issue 5) of the *Journal of International Business Studies*, which made itself a forum for debate between supporters and opponents of Hofstede’s versus the GLOBE Study approach (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Earley (2006), in responding to the debate, concluded that it may well be time that the traditional large-scale, multi-country survey be set aside for the development of alternative midrange theories that offer a more direct look at organizational phenomena in a cultural and national context. It is argued here that perhaps Schwartz’s (1992, 1999) theory, in addition to its other advantages outlined later, represents such an approach.

The goal of the present study is to contribute to this new and important research agenda by examining the relationship between individual values using Schwartz’s (1992, 1996) theory and organizational and occupational commitment in a sample of Arab teachers in Israel. The study has several potential contributions. First, it applies a theory of values (Schwartz, 1992) rarely used at the individual level in management and industrial psychology, particularly in commitment research. Second, examining the relationship between values and commitment in a culture much different from those of North America or Europe will enhance our understanding of this relationship. This contribution is important in light of the cultural self-presenting theory, which suggests that values can account for differences in employees’ reactions to managerial interventions (Erez & Earley, 1993). Accordingly, individual values may have different relationships with commitment across different cultures, such as the individualistic culture of North America versus the collectivistic culture of the Arab world (Hofstede, 1980).

Third, the present study assumes that the concept of commitment has its roots in traditional societies, so examining this idea in the context of such a society will deepen our understanding of it and will, in any case, offer a starting point for further research comparing traditional cultures to less traditional ones. Fourth, studies that have examined the relationship between commitment and values at the national level (e.g., Gelade, Dobson, & Gilbert, 2006) have found no effect of individual values on organizational commitment. Considering that a relationship has been found between values and commitment at the individual level (Clugston et al., 2000; Cohen, 2007; Glazer et al., 2004), it is important to explore this question further to determine whether the effect of individual values on commitment can be captured only at the individual level of analysis. Fifth, this research also responds to recent criticism that efforts to explain value differences are too narrow and focus almost exclusively on individualism–collectivism (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). This study examines 10 values simultaneously in their relationship to commitment.
Conceptual Framework

Schwartz’s Individual Values Model

Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) defined human values as desirable, trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives. The crucial content aspect that distinguishes these values from one another is the type of motivational goal they express. Schwartz (1992, 1996) derived a typology of the different content of values by reasoning that values represent, in the form of conscious goals, three universal requirements of human existence: biological needs, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and demands of group functioning. Groups and individuals represent these requirements cognitively as specific values about which they communicate. Values occupy a central position in a person’s cognitive system, and for this reason, values influence our attitudes, decision-making processes, and all human behaviors in general.

Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) derived 10 distinct motivational types of values from the three universal requirements. These 10 value types are listed in the Appendix, each defined in terms of its central goal and followed, in parentheses, by specific values that most represent it.

Figure 1 presents the patterns of conflict and compatibility that structure the value system, as conceived by Schwartz and Sagiv (1995). Competing value types emanate in opposing directions from the center; compatible types appear in close proximity around the circle. As shown in Figure 1, these dimensions are composed of higher-order value types that combine the standard types. Evidence for this theoretical structure has been found in samples from 67 nations (Schwartz, 1992, 2005; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995), as well as in recent data from 38 countries (Fontaine, Poortinga, Delbeke, & Schwartz, 2008). The findings provide substantial support for both the content and structure postulates of the theory, and for the claim that 10 motivationally distinct value types are recognized across cultures and are used to express value priorities.

Values and Commitment

Schwartz (1996) described several possible processes that might link people’s value priorities to their attitudes and behaviors. High-priority values are enduring goals that guide people to look for and pay attention to value-relevant aspects of a situation (Schwartz, Sagiv, & Boehnke, 2000). Values can influence the attention given to, the perception of, and the interpretation of various situations; these, in turn, can affect attitudes, such as commitment.
Schwartz (1996) argued that to develop specific hypotheses regarding the relationship between values and attitudes and behaviors, one should closely analyze the consequences of a behavior or attitude for the expression or attainment of the motivational goals of the value types, leading to the identification of the most relevant type.

Lydon (1996) advanced an explanation as to why values should be related to commitment. He contended that people feel especially committed to goals, projects, and life tasks that express their core values, as well as their beliefs and identities. Lydon explained this relationship by arguing that core values define who we are in an important way. They serve as a bridge from the self to life experiences by informing us about the meaning that life experiences

Figure 1. Theoretical model of relations among 10 motivational types of values.
have for us. Meaning may fulfill epistemic concerns about life experiences, but meaning then seeks expression in a motivational process of commitment that energizes the person to pursue a goal in the face of adversity. Thus, we are most committed to goals that affirm who we are; goals that give meaning to our lives.

Lydon’s (1996) explanation is somewhat general and bears some resemblance to the theory of person–organization fit (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Furnham et al. (2005) also referred to the relationship between values and work attitudes in a way that is more relevant to commitment. First, it may be that affective disposition has a pervasive influence on how people view the world, including their jobs. Second, it is possible that dispositions influence job-related choices, whereby people with a negative outlook seek or accept less appealing jobs than do those with a positive disposition. In other words, it is possible that people with different personalities sort themselves into different jobs. Another explanation is that individuals with different personalities may react to different aspects of their work environment. According to this explanation, there is considerable variability among people in the same work environment, although it is uncertain whether this reflects personality or demographic differences, or some combination of the two (Furnham et al., 2005).

The Setting

The hypotheses presented here are based on the specific sample examined in this study: Arab teachers employed in Arab schools operating in Arab-populated cities or villages in Israel. The Arabs, representing about one sixth of Israel’s population, are a permanent, nonassimilating minority, clearly distinguished from Jews in place of residence and in culture, speaking their own language and adhering to their own traditions (Cohen, 1999). Israeli Arabs have been described as a traditional collectivistic culture. The collectivistic orientation is expressed in ideals such as solidarity, cooperation, commitment, mutual trust, support, and a sense of belonging that are believed to be present in the Arab nuclear and extended family, and in the community (Pines & Zaidman, 2003; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Yishai & Cohen, 1997).

In traditional societies, commitment is a complex attitude influenced by the norms, sanctions, and pressures of the small group, family, and community (Pines & Zaidman, 2003). Values prized in such groups include a preference for more personal ties to supervisors, acceptance of more paternalistic treatment, and a sense that power relationships should be hierarchical. These factors may influence the attitudes of employees who are members of
traditional societies, resulting in greater commitment to the firm and to the occupation.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses presented here expect that commitment forms, regardless of the dimension of commitment, will demonstrate a strong relationship with the values of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. They will demonstrate no relationship or a weak relationship with the values of achievement, stimulation, power, hedonism, and self-direction. It should be emphasized that while we do not formulate specific hypotheses regarding the different dimensions of commitment, our expectation is that the relationships we uncover will hold true for all three dimensions. This is based on previous findings showing similarities in the relationships between correlates and both normative and affective organizational and occupational commitment (Meyer et al., 1993), and on findings showing that continuance organizational commitment is also related to Schwartz’s values (Glazer et al., 2004).

In general, the specific rationale for the values–commitment relationship follows Schwartz’s (1996, 1999) typology described previously. Accordingly, the first dimension—Openness to Change Versus Conservatism—juxtaposes values emphasizing independent thought and action and favoring change (self-direction, hedonism, and stimulation) with those emphasizing submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices, and protection of stability (security, conformity, and tradition). The second group, representing traditional values, is expected to be related to commitment more strongly than the first group. This makes sense, as commitment implies development of a long-term relationship, a goal also inherent in values such as conformity and security. Likewise, commitment implies concern for the collective, a goal incompatible with hedonism and self-direction.

The second dimension—Self-Enhancement Versus Self-Transcendence—juxtaposes values emphasizing acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare (universalism and benevolence) with those emphasizing the pursuit of personal success and dominance over others (achievement and power). Here, the first group, also representing more traditional values, is expected to be related more strongly to commitment than is the second group. Again, the reasons are self-evident. People with higher levels of achievement are likely to invest less in helping their colleagues or others in the organization or field, a tendency suggesting low commitment. By the same token, the pursuit of power and dominance suggests an elevation of the individual over the collective and, therefore, low commitment to the larger
group. Finally, the basic expectation is that the relationships between values and commitment will be similar for the two commitment foci: the organization and the occupation.

Hypothesis 1a. Affective organizational commitment will be positively related to higher levels of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. It will have a weak or negative relationship with hedonism, stimulation, achievement, power, and self-direction.

Hypothesis 1b. Normative organizational commitment will be positively related to higher levels of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. It will have a weak or negative relationship with hedonism, stimulation, achievement, power, and self-direction.

Hypothesis 2a. Affective occupational commitment will be positively related to higher levels of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. It will have a weak or negative relationship with hedonism, stimulation, achievement, power, and self-direction.

Hypothesis 2b. Continuance occupational commitment will be positively related to higher levels of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. It will have a weak or negative relationship with hedonism, stimulation, achievement, power, and self-direction.

Hypothesis 2c. Normative occupational commitment will be positively related to higher levels of tradition, conformity, security, benevolence, and universalism. It will have a weak or negative relationship with hedonism, stimulation, achievement, power, and self-direction.

Up to this point, I have not distinguished among particular types of commitment. However, some differences in the relationships between the independent variables and the two commitment foci can be expected. Lawler’s (1992) principle of proximal rules may help us find an answer to that question, as it explains why “actors develop stronger affective ties to subgroups within a social system rather than to the social system, to local communities rather than to states, to work organizations, and so forth” (p. 334). Interpersonal attachment produces a stronger commitment to subgroups than to the larger group because the credit for positive results from interpersonal bonds is likely to be attributed to the proximal subgroups,
while the blame for negative effects is likely to be attributed to the large group (Lawler, 1992). This logic can explain why one will develop a stronger personal attachment to one’s organization, which is a proximal target in terms of providing one’s immediate work unit, than to one’s occupation, which is a much more distant target.

Gregerson (1993) and Mueller and Lawler (1999) argued that proximal variables exert the most significant influence on employees’ actions because proximity provides more opportunities for exchange relationships. The basic argument here is that in the workplace context, values will be more strongly related to commitment foci that provide more opportunities for exchange relationships. The exchange provides more opportunities for the attainment of motivational goals, as argued by Schwartz (1996). According to Gregerson, individuals may come to identify strongly with and become significantly attached to proximal and potentially influential foci.

Gregerson’s (1993) argument can easily be applied to the relationships between values and the two commitment forms. The organization is a more proximal focus, as it provides the immediate work setting. This offers room for more intensive exchange relationships, so it is expected to have stronger relationships with individual values. Occupational commitment is less proximal in terms of its relationships to the work setting; therefore, the effect of values is expected to be weaker.

*Hypothesis 3.* Individual values will be related to organizational commitment more strongly than to occupational commitment. This will be demonstrated in higher explained variance of organizational commitment by individual values and by more values related to organizational commitment than to occupational commitment.

**Research Design**

*Participants and Procedure*

The population of the present study was Arab teachers working in schools in Arab communities in the north of Israel. I focused on this particular group in order to minimize variations that might be caused by including members of other, less homogeneous groups, such as Jewish teachers. Participating educational institutions included 14 such Arab schools. There were 369 usable questionnaires (254 females, 115 males) that were returned, which represents a response rate of 65%. The questionnaire was in Hebrew.

As for the final sample’s demographic characteristics, their average age was 35.8 years, and their average tenure in the occupation and in the school
were 12.9 years and 9.1 years, respectively. The data show that 87.5% of the respondents were married, and 80.8% had one or more children under 18 years. With regard to religion, 78.9% of the teachers were Muslims and about 17.6% were Christians. Regarding education, about 74.7% had a university degree.

**Predictor Measures**

*Commitment foci.* Organizational and occupational commitments were measured using Meyer et al.’s (1993) scales. These scales are based on three dimensions for each of the commitment foci: affective, continuance, and normative. The scales include six items for each. All of the commitment constructs were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

*Individual values.* The Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ; Schwartz, 2005; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, & Harris, 2001) was applied to measure 10 basic values. The PVQ is comprised of short verbal portraits of 40 different people, gender-matched with the respondent. Each portrait highlights aspirations or wishes that point implicitly to a particular value. The verbal portraits describe each person in terms of what is important to him or her. Thus, they capture the person’s values without explicitly identifying values as the topic of investigation. The number of portraits for each value ranges from three (stimulation, hedonism, and power) to six (universalism), reflecting the conceptual breadth of the values. The score for the importance of each value is the average rating given to these items, all of which were designated a priori as markers of a value. All of the value items have demonstrated near equivalence of meaning across cultures in analyses using multidimensional scaling (Schwartz, 2005).

As recommended by Schwartz (2003) in his scoring key for the PVQ and in his questionnaire development package, internal reliabilities for the values were calculated based on raw scores. However, another recommendation of Schwartz (2003), ipsatization of the values and use of the ipsatized values for the analyses, was only partly followed because of recent criticism of this process. It should be noted first that ipsatization has several advantages (Cheung, 2006). Ipsative data are effective in minimizing response bias and social desirability. Even if response biases are present in the raw data, transforming raw data into ipsative measures reduces the response bias substantially. Moreover, ipsative measures are forced choices by nature, making respondents less likely to fake responses. Ipsative measures are person-centered, as opposed to the usual normative scores, which are population-centered.
Despite these advantages, studies that have examined the implications of ipsatization have raised certain concerns. Fischer (2004) argued that ipsative scores are not comparable across individuals, and may be used only for intra-individual comparisons. In his view, research so far has suggested that correlational analyses (e.g., factor analysis, regression) based on ipsative scores produce ambiguous results. This problem is aggravated if the scales used for ipsatization are highly intercorrelated. Likewise, Chan (2003) and Cheung (2006) pointed out that although ipsatized data are appealing to researchers, information on inter-individual differences is removed after transforming the raw data into ipsatized data, thus making many researchers wary of using ipsatized data as normative data in personality tests, for example, or to predict a given criterion, such as job performance.

Considering all of the aforementioned arguments, together with the recommendations of Schwartz (2010) in his scoring key, I decided to use the following strategy in analyzing the current data. The correlation matrix based on the raw data showed only one negative and nonsignificant correlation among the 10 values, with all other correlations being positive. This demonstrated response bias in the data because Schwartz’s theory does argue that negative relationships between contradictory values should be expected. Therefore, in the case of the correlation matrix, I decided to follow Schwartz’s suggestion in the scoring key:

In publications, it is advisable to provide a table with the correlations between the centered values and the dependent variables in addition to any regression. These correlations will aid in understanding results and reduce confusion due to either multicollinearity or to intercorrelations among the values. (Schwartz, 2010, p. 3)

As for the regression analyses, I decided to use the raw data. In light of the argument that with ipsatization, information on inter-individual differences is lost (Chan, 2003; Cheung, 2006; Fischer, 2004), it is extremely difficult to produce interpretable regression equations with ipsatized data. The fact that only one of the raw intercorrelations exceeded .60 (.61 between benevolence and universalism) reduces the risk of multicollinearity in the raw data.

It should be noted that our findings based on the raw data appear to be far more reliable, interpretable, and meaningful with the strategy outlined previously than with any alternative strategy. The ipsatized correlation matrix does aid in understanding the relationships among the individual values, as asserted by Schwartz (2010), and the regression analyses based on raw data provide valid and interpretable results regarding the relationship between the values and commitment forms. This provides additional support for the decision taken here.
Data Analysis

Correlation analysis was applied first to present the interrelationships among the research variables and to examine the possibility of multicollinearity. Regression analysis was used to test the other hypotheses. The regression was performed in two steps. In the first step, three control variables were regressed: gender, tenure in school, and religiosity. Given earlier findings (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002), it was anticipated that gender (males) and tenure (more tenured) would be related to commitment. Religiosity was expected to be related to commitment, as it is a variable that represents tradition and conformity, values that should be important to the target population examined here. In the second step, the individual values were entered.

Results

Table 1 presents the basic statistics of the variables and the intercorrelations among them. The results show acceptable reliabilities of the research variables following DeVellis’ (1991) criterion of .60 and above as acceptable. It should be noted that the survey included all items of the original scales for individual values and commitment dimensions. As for individual values, Table 1 shows that the reliabilities for three values (tradition, self-direction, and stimulation) were below .60. In that regard, Schwartz et al. (2001) argued that there are two reasons not to expect high internal reliabilities for the values. First, the indexes include only a few items. Second, many values have conceptually broad definitions, encompassing multiple components. As Schwartz et al. themselves noted, reliabilities below .60 are not very unusual in their studies. Therefore, I decided not to omit any items from the scales in order to increase reliability, as doing so might affect the generalizability of Schwartz’s scales.

In the commitment measures, one item each was omitted from affective organizational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment to increase the reliabilities of these scales. In the case of continuance organizational commitment, reliability was very low (< .20), and no omission of any item or factor analysis was able to increase the reliability of this scale to any acceptable level. This failure is attributed to cultural factors in the target population. As a result, this scale was not used in the correlation or regression analyses in the present study.

Correlations among the independent variables were not high and preclude the possibility of multicollinearity. To establish further the discriminant validity of the commitment scales applied here, several procedures
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations Among Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure in school</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religiosity</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual cultural values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conformity</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tradition</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Benevolence</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Universalism</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-direction</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stimulation</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hedonism</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Achievement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Security</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Affective ORC</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Normative ORC</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Affective OCC</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Continuance OCC</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Normative OCC</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Reliabilities appear in parentheses. Gender: 1 = female. N = 320–369 as a result of missing values. ORC = organizational commitment; OCC = occupational commitment. Correlations ≥ .11 significant at .05. Correlations ≥ .14 significant at .01. Correlations ≥ .19 significant at .001.
recommended by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) were applied. First, confirmatory factor analysis was performed using the AMOS structural equation modeling program. In this analysis, I compared the fit of a five-factor model for the five commitment dimensions to the alternative fit of a single, one-factor model. The results for the five-factor model (the model incorporating the five commitment dimension scales) reveal the following fit indexes: \( \chi^2(314) = 921.93; \) \( \chi^2/df = 2.94; \) comparative fit index (CFI) = .83; incremental fit index (IFI) = .83; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .072. In the second model tested, all commitment form items were loaded onto a single factor, \( \chi^2(324) = 1693.08; \) \( \chi^2/df = 5.23; \) CFI = .62; IFI = .62; RMSEA = .11. The findings thus support the superiority of the five-factor model over the one-factor model. To examine this contention further, a chi-square difference test was conducted. The chi-square difference test indicates that the five-factor oblique model fit significantly better than did the one-factor model, \( \chi^2_{\text{difference}}(10) = 771.15, p \leq .000. \)

To test for common method variance, a Harman’s (1967) one-factor test was performed (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). All of the commitment items were entered into a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. According to this technique, if a single factor emerges from the factor analysis, or one general factor accounts for most of the variance, common method variance is deemed present. However, the results of the analysis reveal seven factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, and only one factor accounting for more than 15% of the variance (15.8%). These results are consistent with the absence of common method variance. In short, two tests were performed for a deeper examination of the commitment scales applied here. The findings show that the respondents were able to differentiate among the different dimensions of commitment and that the data were not inflated with common method errors.

Table 2 presents the results of a hierarchical regression analysis of the control variables (Step 1) and the individual values (Step 2) on the two organizational commitment dimensions. Hypotheses 1a and 1b, which predicted an effect of values representing self-transcendence and conservatism on affective and normative organizational commitment, were generally supported by the data. Table 2 shows that a higher level of benevolence was related to a higher level of both affective and normative organizational commitment. In further support of Hypothesis 1a, the findings also show that a lower level of power was related to affective organizational commitment. It should be noted that the values, particularly benevolence, added 8% (affective organizational commitment) and 9% (normative organizational commitment) to the variance already explained by the control variables.

The association of self-transcendence and conservatism with occupational commitment was also supported by the data, as shown in Table 2.
### Table 2

**Hierarchical Regression Results of Control Variable Cultural Values on Dimensions of Organizational and Occupational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Affective ORC</th>
<th>Normative ORC</th>
<th>Affective OCC</th>
<th>Continuance OCC</th>
<th>Normative OCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure in school</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religiosity</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual cultural values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conformity</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tradition</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Benevolence</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Universalism</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-direction</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stimulation</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hedonism</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Security</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.04 (.03)</td>
<td>.12 (.09)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.09 (.06)</td>
<td>.03 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>4.50**</td>
<td>3.20***</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.77***</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for $\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>4.04***</td>
<td>2.53**</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.68***</td>
<td>3.68***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$. 
Conformity had a positive and consistent effect on two forms of occupational commitment, continuance and normative, as predicted in Hypotheses 2b and 2c. Security had a positive effect on affective occupational commitment, as predicted by Hypothesis 2a. The inverse relationship of stimulation with continuance occupational commitment also supported Hypothesis 2b. It should be noted, however, that the positive relationship of achievement with continuance organizational commitment was not anticipated by Hypothesis 2b. The individual values added between 8% and 14% to the variance of affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment above and beyond the variance already explained by the control variables. In general, the findings presented in Table 2 provide support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b, as well as for Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c.

Hypothesis 3, which predicted a stronger effect of values on organizational commitment than on occupational commitment, was not supported by the data. None of the analyses suggest that values explained more variation for organizational commitment than for occupational commitment. The findings also failed to show that more values were related to organizational commitment than to occupational commitment.

It should be noted that to increase our confidence in the data, regression analyses were performed without the three variables whose reliabilities were less than .60. In all of the equations except one, the effect of the values was the same as when all 10 values were included. Only in one equation, for continuance occupational commitment was a difference apparent. In the 10-value equation, conformity, stimulation, and achievement were related to this commitment form. In the reduced equation, conformity (stronger effect) and hedonism (negatively related) were related to this commitment. It seems that in this equation, hedonism replaced the effect of stimulation that was removed from the equation. These two are quite similar values in terms of what they represent. Thus, it can be concluded that the pattern of results is quite similar in the 10-value and in the 7-value equations.

Discussion

This study continues an important research agenda that has begun only recently; namely, examining the effect of individual values on employees’ attitudes and behaviors at the individual level (Ang et al., 2003; Clugston et al., 2000; Cohen, 2007; Farh et al., 2007). The study is perhaps one of the few attempts to relate Schwartz’s (1992, 1999) theory to established commitment theory and measurements, and its findings are quite encouraging regarding the application of Schwartz’s theory to a better understanding of work attitudes, such as commitment. Our findings, together with previous findings
based on Hofstede’s (1980) theory (Clugston et al., 2000; Cohen, 2007), support the importance of this relatively new research agenda.

As noted, the importance of this study lies partly in its showing the merit of Schwartz’s (1992) framework in contributing to a better understanding of employees’ work commitment in one particular culture and setting. Our findings show that individual values are related to commitment, even when their effect is controlled for by gender, tenure, and religiosity. The magnitude of this contribution is modest in terms of the explained variance, but still this is a contribution that should not be overlooked.

The significance of the present findings should be viewed in comparison to those of Palich, Hom, and Griffeth (1995), who found at the national level that individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity accounted for only 2.7% of the variance in employee commitment. The present findings show a much stronger effect of individual values, particularly on occupational commitment (8–14% of the variance above and beyond the effect of the control variables), but also on organizational commitment (8–9% of the variance above and beyond the effect of the control variables). Replication of the present findings in other settings is warranted to provide further support for the findings here.

More specifically, the present findings show that values that represent self-transcendence (benevolence) and conservatism (conformity) are positively related to organizational and occupational commitment. Put differently, in a society emphasizing submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices, protection of stability, and concern for other people’s welfare, such values are also important in affecting attitudes in the workplace. Indeed, strong group affiliation was found to characterize Israeli Arabs. Members of the group expect and are expected to share responsibilities and rewards. The benevolence/collectivistic orientation is expressed in ideals such as solidarity, cooperation, commitment, mutual trust, support, and a sense of belonging that are believed to be present in the Arab nuclear and extended family and community (Haj Yahia, 1997).

Using Schwartz’s (1999) terminology, the present findings support the notion that the Arabs represent a more communal and less egalitarian culture. They emphasize maintenance of the status quo, propriety, and restraint of actions or inclinations that might disrupt group solidarity or traditional values (the social order, respect for tradition, family closeness). They also emphasize the transcendence of selfish interests in favor of a voluntary commitment to promoting the welfare of others. The positive relationship between security and affective organizational commitment provides additional support for the contentions of this study. It also suggests that security might be an important value to Israeli Arabs, considering their status as a minority group.
The findings might also have some implication for commitment theory. What is clear here is that for traditional groups like Arab teachers, commitment, regardless of its foci and dimensions, is rooted in values that represent conservatism and strong attachment to other people in the same group. The fact that this was consistent across the two commitment foci and across their dimensions strengthens this finding. This raises the possibility that religion might be an important component for the understanding of culture and perhaps for the understanding of commitment.

Religion plays a much more important role in the lives of the Arabs, including Israeli Arabs, than it does for Western cultures. Since religious training is a major aspect of the socialization process, it should not surprise us that various religious groups hold quite different values. Future research on the relationship between culture and commitment should examine the role of religion in this relationship. A very interesting question might be whether this finding may be replicated in different groups; for example, more Westernized ones, such as those in North America. If not, one implication might be that commitment is rooted in different sets of values for different cultural groups. In this case, a relevant question might be whether commitment means the same thing for all cultures or is a different concept for different cultures.

This question is even more imperative, given the very low reliability found for continuance organizational commitment, which made it impossible to use the scale here. This finding raises an immediate question regarding the generalizability of continuance commitment. Is this concept culture-specific? It might be that more traditional groups do not perceive organizational commitment as a concept that has to do with turnover, turnover intentions, or alternative employment; phenomena that define the idea of continuance commitment.

Another possible explanation might be that the idea of continuance organizational commitment made no sense to the specific sample studied here because Israeli Arabs are not only a minority group, but a somewhat disadvantaged one, without real employment alternatives as teachers in the majority group schools. This might explain why in the case of occupational continuance commitment, the reliability was acceptable. Arab teachers can respond to the logic of continuance occupational commitment because they can change occupations in their own workforce market; namely, the Arab one. They have more limited employment opportunities as teachers, being able to work only in their own Arab schools, and having no more than one or two schools in each of their towns/cities. These important and interesting questions provide a stimulating future research agenda.

The present study has several limitations. First, the study relied on a “snapshot-in-time” survey design. Such a design consists of a single observation and has limited control over the effects of variables and no control
groups. Second, only one professional group (teachers) was examined here, and one should be cautious about generalizing the results to other occupational groups. Third, there were two reliabilities for the total sample that were below .60. The fact that this study was performed in a culture with different mores and traditions than in Europe or North America may explain the somewhat lower reliabilities of some of the variables. Despite its limitations, the present study’s findings demonstrate the importance of individual-level values in understanding commitment in the workplace, and add to the growing and relatively new stream of research that examines the relationship between individual values, attitudes, and behaviors at work at the individual level (Ang et al., 2003; Cohen, 2007; Farh et al., 2007; Kirkman et al., 2006; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001).

Finally, the study also makes practical contributions. Commitment is considered a valuable attitude, not only among scholars, but also among managers. Understanding the patterns of individual values that enhance commitment in the workplace might provide managers with more insights into the personal roots of commitment and increase their tolerance of individual variations in this area. This information can be used to increase individuals’ commitment through socialization, training, or selection processes. Naturally, more research is needed to examine more thoroughly the effect of values on commitment. Research into variables that mediate and moderate the relationship between individual values and commitment can make a particularly valuable contribution to the understanding of this relationship.
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**Appendix**

*Motivational Value Types Defined in Terms of Goals and the Single Values That Represent Them*

**Power.** Social status and prestige, control, or dominance over people and resources. (Social Power, Authority, Wealth) [Preserving My Public Image, Social Recognition]

**Achievement.** Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. (Successful, Capable, Ambitious, Influential) [Intelligent, Self-Respect]

**Hedonism.** Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself. (Pleasure, Enjoying Life)

**Stimulation.** Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life. (Daring, A Varied Life, An Exciting Life)

**Self-direction.** Independent thought and action—choosing, creating, exploring. (Creativity, Freedom, Independent, Curious, Choosing Own Goals) [Self-Respect]

**Universalism.** Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. (Broadminded, Wisdom, Social Justice, Equality, A World of Peace, A World of Beauty, Unity With Nature, Protecting the Environment)

**Benevolence.** Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact. (Helpful, Honest, Forgiving, Loyal, Responsible) [True Friendship, Mature Love]
*Tradition.* Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self. (Humble, Accepting My Portion in Life, Devout, Respect for Tradition, Moderate)

*Conformity.* Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. (Politeness, Obedient, Self-Discipline, Honoring Parents and Elders)


*Note.* Values in brackets were not used in computing indexes for value types.