

On the importance of congruence between personal and work values – How value incongruence affects job satisfaction: A multiple mediation model

Nils Hossli · Martin Natter · René Algesheimer

Supplementary Material 1

Table S1a. *The ten main values according to Schwartz*

	Value	Defining goals
Self-Transcendence	Universalism	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and nature.
	Benevolence	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.
Conservation	Conformity	Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms
	Tradition	Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion provides.
	Security	Safety, harmony, and stability of society, relationships, and self.
Self-Enhance-	Power	Social status and prestige and control or dominance over people and resources.
	Achievement	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
	Hedonism	Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself.
Openness to change	Stimulation	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
	Self-Direction	Independent thought and action—choosing, creating, and exploring.

Note. The ten main values according to Schwartz (1992) and their defining goals.

Supplementary Material 2

S2. Pre-Study

Before establishing our framework and the three hypotheses, we conducted a pre-study to test whether there is evidence for value incongruence. First, we directly measured values using the widespread Schwartz value survey for personal values and their adaptation for work values. Second, we indirectly measured values, as a robustness test, through a choice experiment in which we observe hotel choice for a private and a workplace consumption situation, while all available hotel alternatives trigger different values.

S2.1 Data collection

For the pre-study, we recruited 304 participants located in the United States (US) aged 18 or older with more than 100 HITs approved and at least a 95% approval rate on Amazon MTurk. We excluded 67 participants who either rushed through the survey, i.e., who read a description of 335 words in less than 50 seconds,¹ or failed at least one of two attention checks, resulting in a final dataset of 237 participants. To assure that participants can imagine the two situations of the choice experiment, we only included participants that already stayed at a 4-star hotel, already booked a hotel for a private trip, have been on a business trip or expect to go on a business trip within the next five years and have an annual household income of at least \$25,000. All individuals registered on Amazon Mechanical Turk as workers who met the specified criteria were eligible to participate in the survey until the requested number of responses was reached. Participants were compensated for their participation in the study. Among the participants, 54% identified as male. Regarding education level, 7% had completed high school, 66% had attended college, and 27% had pursued graduate studies. Age distribution among participants was as follows: 41% were aged 18-34, 42% were aged 35-54, and 17% were aged 55 or above. According to the United States Census Bureau (2022), our sample does not accurately represent the US population in terms of education level (26% completed high school; 50% attended some college or earned a bachelor's degree; 14% pursued a graduate or professional degree; 10% have less than a high school education for the population over 25) and age distribution of individuals in the US aged between 18 and 75, i.e., potential employees (18-34: 32%; 35-54: 36%; 55-74: 32%). The discrepancies in age and education distribution between our sample and the general U.S. population may be attributed to the specific recruitment criteria and the use of Amazon Mechanical Turk. Our inclusion criteria likely skewed the sample towards individuals with higher education and income levels, as they required a minimum income, experience with 4-star hotels, and business trips. Additionally, Amazon Mechanical Turk tends to attract younger individuals.

The study was approved by the ethics board of the authors' university.

S.2.2 Procedure value surveys

Personal and work values were measured as outlined in the Theoretical Background section of the main text.

¹ Good readers with college education typically read 200-400 words per minute, according to Rayner et al. (2016)

S.2.3 Results value surveys

The value surveys provide evidence for value incongruence. Value incongruence is calculated as the average absolute difference between personal and work values for all ten Schwartz values. Thus, the participants' value incongruence lies between 0 and 5, where 0 signifies no value incongruence at all. Table 1 in the main document shows the mean importance rating for all personal and work values. The average value incongruence across all values is 0.62 (95% CI [.52, .68]), providing evidence that average value incongruence is significantly different from 0, $t(236) = 28.03$, $p < .001$. Value scores further indicate that benevolence, hedonism, and self-direction are personal values that participants want to be significantly less associated with at work. Conformity, in contrast, is a value that they would want to be significantly more associated with at work than what personal values indicate ($p < .05$).

S2.4 Procedure choice experiment

We conducted the choice experiment before the value surveys, in order not to draw the participants' attention to values. To start, the participants had to make two successive decisions. In the *first situation*, we asked them to imagine that their supervisor sent them on a business trip to London. Their supervisor asked them to book an accommodation. After they booked an accommodation, they informed their supervisor about their hotel choice. In the *second situation*, we asked them to imagine that they planned to spend a weekend in London by themselves. For both situations, the participants had to choose one out of eight hotels. Figure S2b shows the choice set. The choice set was identical for all the participants and for both situations. Pictures of real hotels were included based on our expectation that they triggered certain values and were combined with a short story that underscored the value concerned. The hotels were randomly presented. We stated that the participants had to choose one of those hotels as they were the only available alternatives with free rooms that matched their criteria on their travel dates (Four-star hotels, well located for their stay). The price per night was the same at all the hotels. We asked the participants to carefully consider all available information (picture and text). Following the two decisions, we asked the participants to reimagine the first situation. For each hotel we asked them whether they associate this hotel with any (and which) of the ten Schwartz values.

S2.5 Results choice experiment

To evaluate the choice experiment, we first checked whether the participants systematically associated different values with different hotels. As expected, they did. Table S2b shows the share of participants who associated a value with a corresponding hotel. We performed one-sided t-tests to compare the share of participants who associated a value with the hotel concerned between the value most often and second-most often associated with the hotel. This allowed us to evaluate whether a hotel was clearly and significantly ($p < .05$) associated with one single value more than with any other. In cases in which we did not find a significant difference between the value most often and second-most often associated with the hotel, we performed t-tests between the value most often and the value third-most often, as well as between the value second-most often and the value third-most often associated with the hotel. In these cases, we applied a Bonferroni adjustment to correct for multiple testing. Our results confirm that the participants associated one or two values more than any other with each hotel, hence a hotel clearly represented one or two values. For example, 61% of the participants associated universalism with Hotel 2, while 32% associated benevolence, the value second-most associated, with this hotel, $t(464) = 6.7$, $p < .001$. Hotel 2 is described as follows: "This hotel prides itself on its sustainable

Table S2a. All Hotels (Stimuli) – Study 1

	<p>Hotel 1. Cool, individual and very creative – live like a true hipster! With a funky urban lodge style and an unbeatable buzzy atmosphere, this much-loved hotel epitomizes the trendy urban cool of the area itself.</p>
	<p>Hotel 2. This hotel prides itself on its sustainable initiatives. The hotel strives to optimize eco-conscious operations within its city setting. It has developed a robust composting and recycling program.</p>
	<p>Hotel 3. Fine food should be paired with fine wines. With its large wine cellar and fine food restaurant, this hotel is the perfect place for foodies and wine lovers.</p>
	<p>Hotel 4. At this hotel, you will enjoy individual character, a wealth of history, and local tradition. The hotel mixes traditional British charm with modern comforts.</p>
	<p>Hotel 5. Customers highly appreciate this hotel. As an established hotel with an enviable reputation for comfort and hospitality to uphold, guest-room security is something this hotel takes very seriously.</p>
	<p>Hotel 6. One hotel, one family! If you're looking to support family-owned businesses whilst enjoying London, this is the hotel to pick. Today the hotel is managed by the 11th generation.</p>
	<p>Hotel 7. Home to 269 bedrooms, this hotel is perfect for those who are looking for a four-star hotel at affordable prices in central London. Many customers choose this hotel when attending a convention.</p>
	<p>Hotel 8. Feel an unparalleled connection to London. This hotel is located in Western Europe's tallest building – an architectural icon.</p>

Note. References: Hotel 1 (Dayuse.ch, n.d.), Hotel 2 (HospitalityNet, 2018), Hotel 3 (My Boutique Hotel, n.d.), Hotel 4 (Travelcircus.ch, n.d.), Hotel 5 (Facebook, 2018), Hotel 6 (Momondo.ch, n.d.), Hotel 7 (Hotels of London, n.d.), Hotel 8 (My Boutique Hotel, n.d.).

initiatives. The hotel strives to optimize eco-conscious operations within its city setting. It has developed a robust composting and recycling program.”

Table S2b. Association hotels with values

	UN	BE	CO	TR	SE	PO	AC	HE	ST	SD
H1	19%	9%	13%	17%	24% °	15%	20%	18%	52% ***	53% ***
H2	61% ***	32% °	18%	18%	25%	11%	16%	14%	20%	30%
H3	11%	10%	16%	17%	18%	39% °	37%	55% ***	30%	21%
H4	15%	12%	21%	72% ***	22%	34% °	31%	20%	22%	18%
H5	16%	13%	35% °	13%	63% ***	19%	20%	10%	12%	16%
H6	21%	55% ***	19%	57% ***	28% °	14%	18%	9%	13%	18%
H7	24%	14%	42% ***	17%	30% °	17%	22%	13%	15%	27%
H8	13%	9%	16%	18%	22%	64% *	55% °	37%	46%	26%

Note. The figures show the share of participants who associate a hotel with the corresponding value. One-sided t-tests were conducted between the value most often and value second-most often associated with a hotel. In cases with no significant difference, one-sided t-tests between the value most often and value third-most often, as well as between the value second-most often and value third-most often associated with a hotel were conducted and a Bonferroni adjustment to correct for multiple testing was applied. The value(s) significantly most often associated with a specific hotel is (are) marked with *, ** or ***, while the value second- or third-most often associated with the hotel is marked with °. UN = Universalism, BE = Benevolence, CO = Conformity, TR = Tradition, SE = Security, PO = Power, AC = Achievement, HE = Hedonism, ST = Stimulation, and SD = Self-Direction. H1 – H8 = Hotel 1 – Hotel 8. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$ (N=237).

Table S2c shows the share of participants who chose a hotel for the workplace versus the private situation. Hotels with a significantly higher choice probability in the private situation include Hotels 1 and 3 ($p < .01$). The values most often associated with Hotel 1 are stimulation and self-direction, while hedonism is most associated with Hotel 3. Hotels with a significantly higher choice probability in the workplace situation include Hotels 7 ($p < .01$) and 8 ($p < .05$). The value most often associated with Hotel 7 is conformity, while power is most associated with Hotel 8. In line with the results of the two value surveys (Table 1), the values **self-direction** (Study 1 and 2) and **hedonism** (Study 1) are more important in the private context while **conformity** (Study 1 and 2) is more important in the work context.

We further find that hotel choice serves in accurately predicting the average value incongruence found with the value survey. First, we run regressions with all personal values as dependent variables, and the dummies for Hotel 1 to Hotel 7 that indicate whether the hotel was chosen for the private situation as independent variables (controlling for age, gender and education) and predict all personal values. Second, we run regressions with all work values as dependent variables, and the dummies for Hotel 1 to Hotel 7 that indicate whether the hotel was chosen for the work situation as independent variables (controlling for age, gender and education) and predict all work values. We calculate predicted value incongruence as the average


absolute difference between predicted personal and work values. Our results show that predicted value incongruence significantly positively correlates with actual value incongruence: $r(237) = .20, p < .001$.

Table S2c. Hotel choices for private and business trip


	Choice for Private Trip	Choice for Business Trip	Value(s) most often associated
Hotel 1	13%**	3%**	Self-Direction Stimulation
Hotel 2	15%	17%	Universalism
Hotel 3	14%**	6%**	Hedonism
Hotel 4	19%	16%	Tradition
Hotel 5	6%	8%	Security
Hotel 6	10%	7%	Tradition Benevolence
Hotel 7	4%**	18%**	Conformity
Hotel 8	18%*	25%*	Power

Note. The figures show the share of participants who chose specific hotels for the business and private trips. Significant differences between choice probability for private and business trips are marked. Column 4 shows the value(s) most often associated with the corresponding hotel (see also Table B.2). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$ ($N = 237$).


Figure S2a. Example of choice set – Study 1 (randomized order)




One hotel, one family! If you're looking to support family-owned businesses whilst enjoying London this is the hotel to pick. Today the hotel is managed by the 11th generation.



This hotel prides itself on its sustainable initiatives. The hotel strives to optimize eco-conscious operations within its city setting. It has developed a robust composting and recycling program.







At this hotel, you will enjoy individual character, a wealth of history, and local tradition. The hotel mixes traditional British charm with modern comforts.



Fine food should be paired with fine wines. With its large wine cellar and fine food restaurant, this hotel is the perfect place for foodies and wine lovers.

Figure S2a. Example of choice set – Study 1 (randomized order) (Cont.)

 <p>Customers highly appreciate this hotel. As an established hotel with an enviable reputation for comfort and hospitality to uphold, guest room security is something this hotel takes very seriously.</p>	 <p>Feel an unparalleled connection to London. This hotel is located in Western Europe's tallest building – an architectural icon.</p>
 <p>Home to 269 bedrooms this hotel is perfect for those who are looking for a four-star hotel at affordable prices in central London. Many customers choose this hotel when attending a convention.</p>	 <p>Cool, individual and very creative – live like a true hipster! With a funky urban lodge style and an unbeatable buzzy atmosphere, this much-loved hotel epitomizes the trendy urban cool of the area itself.</p>

Authors

Nils Hossli
URPP Social Networks, University of Zurich, Switzerland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1189-3815>
nils.hossli@business.uzh.ch

Martin Natter
Professor of Marketing, University of Zurich, Switzerland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3365-8197>

René Algesheimer
URPP Social Networks, University of Zurich, Switzerland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3293-7928>

Funding

This work was supported by the University Research Priority Program (URPP) «Social Networks» of the University of Zurich (Switzerland).

Conflict of interest statement

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions statement

Conceptualization: NH, MN, RA; Methodology: NH, MN, RA; Software: NH; Visualization: NH; Data Curation: NH; Project administration: NH; Formal analysis: NH, MN, RA; Supervision: MN, RA; Resources: MN, RA; Writing - Original Draft: NH; Writing - Review & Editing: NH, MN, RA.

Data availability statement

Data files are available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements

We want to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editor, Aaron Jarden, for their great guidance throughout the review process and the many useful recommendations.

Publishing Timeline

Received 23 February 2023

Revised version received 11 December 2023

Revised version received 25 May 2024

Accepted 22 June 2024

Published 1 October 2024

References

- Dayuse.ch. (n.d.). *The Hoxton Shoreditch*. <https://de.dayuse.ch/hotels/united-kingdom/thedfdd-hoxton-shoreditch>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- Facebook. (2018). *360 Pop Art Hotel*. <https://www.facebook.com/346677655754735/photos/a.346679032421264/598950750527423/?type=3>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- HospitalityNet. (2018). *Staybridge Suites London - Heathrow Bath Road Opens*. <https://www.hospitalitynet.org/announcement/41003783.html>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- Hotels of London. (n.d.). *Ibis Styles Excel*. <https://ibis-styles-excel.hotels-of-london.com/de/>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- My Boutique Hotel. (n.d.). *Sea Containers Formerly Mondrian London*. <https://www.myboutiquehotel.com/de/boutique-hotels-london/sea-containers-formerly-mondrian-london.html>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- My Boutique Hotel. (n.d.). *Shangri-La Hotel at The Shard, London*. <https://www.myboutiquehotel.com/de/boutique-hotels-london/shangri-la-hotel-at-the-shard-london.html>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- Momondo.ch. (n.d.). *Durrants Hotel*. <https://www.momondo.ch/hotels/london/Durrants-Hotel.mhd185597.ksp>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6)
- Travelcircus.ch. (n.d.). *The Chesterfield Mayfair London*. <https://www.travelcircus.ch/the-chesterfield-mayfair-london>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Selected Population Profile in the United States: 2022. <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSSPP1Y2022.S0201?t=-00>, last accessed: 24 May 2024.