Individual Values and Job Satisfaction as Work Engagement Predictors: Example from Croatia

Danica Bakotić [*][+]
Antonela Alvir [**]

Abstract: *This paper examines the relationship between work engagement, employees' individual values, and job satisfaction. Specifically, it explores if job satisfaction and individual values can be considered as predictors of employees' engagement at work. The empirical research was carried out in 2023, involving a sample of 277 Croatian employees. The research hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analysis. Statistical analysis revealed that job satisfaction is the most significant predictor of work engagement. The findings suggested that individual values influence employee work engagement, but not all values contribute equally. Among the ten observed individual values, universalism, power, benevolence, and achievement were confirmed as statistically significant predictors of work engagement. Research results suggested that management should prioritize job satisfaction to improve employee engagement. In their attempts to enhance work engagement, management should also pay attention to employees' individual values since some have been confirmed as the determinant of work engagement.*

Keywords: individual values; job satisfaction; work engagement

JEL Classification: M12, M50, M59

Introduction

Engaged employees perform better (Karatepe, 2013; Cesário & Chambel, 2017; Bakker & Albercht, 2018), which can be attributed to their positive emotions, better

---

[*] University of Split, Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Split, Croatia.

[+] Danica Bakotić is corresponding author. E-mail: danica.bakotic@efst.hr

[**] PhD student at University of Split, Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Split, Croatia.

health, and the development of work and personal resources, along with their ability to share their engagement with others (Schaufeli, 2021). According to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004; 2010), work engagement is a state of mind which is positive and fulfilling in relation to one's work. It is demonstrated when employees have elevated levels of energy and enthusiasm towards their jobs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Considering that work engagement creates positive outcomes both for employees and the company, it requires management attention. In order to stimulate work engagement, management should invest in developing an inspiring work environment (Naidoo & Martinis, 2014; Breevaart *et al*., 2015) and provide sufficient and adequate resources to their employees (Xanthopoulou *et al*., 2009; Bakker, 2014). As a result, they can expect an increase in work engagement and overall performance enhancement.

According to earlier research, work engagement depends on managerial efforts but it is also influenced by various factors that are inherent to the individual. Findings from previous studies indicate that individual attributes, for example personality (Kim *et al*., 2009; Janssens *et al*., 2019), meaningfulness (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Meng *et al*., 2020), emotional intelligence (Akhtar *et al*., 2015), psychological ownership (Chai *et al*., 2020), and values (Dyląg *et al*., 2013; Ortiz-Gómez *et al*., 2020) are significant for developing employees' work engagement. Although a significant body of knowledge is available in this field, further research is still needed to explore this complex relationship between individual psychological factors and work engagement. In particular, researchers advocate for a more profound comprehension of how specific motivational objectives, such as individual values, impact employees' engagement at work (Coelho *et al*., 2023).

Individual values are broad and desirable goals which guide individuals' lives, motivating their actions and affecting their perception, cognition, and behavior (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2022). They serve as fundamental principles which steer individuals throughout their lives as they are essential to one's identity (Hitlin, 2003). Moreover, they shape an individual's attitudes (Boer & Fischer, 2013), actions (Sagiv *et al*., 2017), and behavior (Fritzsche & Oz, 2007).

Efforts to enhance work engagement have raised interest in exploring its dependence on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as the degree of satisfaction or contentment experienced by employees toward their jobs (Agho *et al*., 1993). However, it encompasses more than just emotional aspects, and it is defined as a combination of the employees' feelings (affect) and thoughts (cognition) towards different aspects of their job (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014). Although there may be some overlap between work engagement and job satisfaction (Wefald & Downey, 2009), they are distinct concepts, as highlighted by Schaufeli and Bakker (2010). While employee engagement concerns the emotional state of individuals within the workplace, their feelings toward their jobs, on the other hand, explain their level of satisfaction. Engagement implies enthusiasm, alertness, excitement, and elation, whereas job satisfaction implies contentment (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010).

Drawing on relevant literature, this paper investigates the relationship between work engagement, individual values, and job satisfaction. Although the significance of work engagement for both individuals and organizations is widely recognized in academia, a thorough understanding of this construct remains limited. This knowledge gap has prompted scholars to undertake further investigation into work engagement. Prior studies have suggested that both individual values and job satisfaction can significantly impact an employee's engagement. However, no research has previously examined this relationship using a common research model. Therefore, this research aims to address a gap in the current body of literature by examining the connection between observed variables in the Croatian setting.

This paper is comprised of six chapters. The first chapter is an introduction. The second chapter provides a theoretical framework which explains the variables and gives theoretical grounds to develop hypotheses. The third chapter describes the research goal and the characteristics of the sample. Furthermore, it explains the research instrument and the statistical methods employed. The research findings are presented in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter provides a discussion, while the sixth chapter concludes the paper by providing insight into the limitations of this research, giving suggestions for future research, and presenting theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretical framework

Work engagement

Work engagement is a multidimensional concept describing individuals who invest their personal resources into their work (Christian *et al*., 2011). Engaged employees are those who have a strong connection with their work and often believe that they can easily meet all job requirements (Schaufeli *et al*., 2002). When work engagement is present employees are active and participate positively in their jobs, which results in their greater commitment to the company (Hakanen *et al*., 2008), enhanced well-being at the workplace (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008) and improved performance (Anitha, 2014, Cesário & Chambel, 2017, Bhatti *et al*., 2018). Engaged employees also demonstrate greater proactivity (Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, 2008) and innovativeness (Gomes et al., 2015; Jakubik, 2022; Trabucchi *et al*., 2020) and can significantly lead to improved business outcomes (Saks & Gruman; 2014). Highly engaged employees show strong enthusiasm and have great energy levels about their jobs. They are proactive, take initiative, propose new ideas, go beyond their assigned tasks, and contribute to their organization.

The importance of employee engagement for various organizational outcomes motivates academia to get a more comprehensive grasp of this variable and its underlying factors. In their review of work engagement, Bailey *et al*. (2017) found that lead-

ership plays a crucial role among numerous antecedents of work engagement. Saks (2019) provided another perspective, suggesting that job characteristics, especially skill variety, are the leading predictors of engagement at work. Bakker (2014) pointed out that job resources rank as the preeminent factor among others in predicting engagement at work. They have an inherent motivational quality, sparking employees' energy and engagement which leads to better outcomes (Schaufeli, 2017). However, some authors believe that the most significant factor for developing engagement at work is personal resources. This perspective can be explained by personal resources' ability to provide the motivation and energy needed for work engagement to happen (Sonnentag, 2017; Contreras *et al*., 2020). Sortheix *et al*. (2013) explained the difference between job and personal resources and their contribution to work engagement. According to them, job resources include autonomy, feedback, supportive elements, and a social atmosphere that promotes engagement in the workplace, while personal resources include self-efficacy and confidence. The latter also relates to other factors that enable individuals to maintain a feeling of mastery and control and provide them with the power needed to impact their surroundings in an effective manner. However, work engagement is a complex concept shaped by other factors outside the work environment. For example, different personal characteristics of employees also play a significant role in developing engagement at work. Several earlier studies have demonstrated that personality (Kim *et al*., 2009; Stephen & Juilitta 2013; Martos Martínez *et al*., 2021) and emotional intelligence (Brunetto *et al*. 2012; Barreiro & Treglown, 2020) are also important factors in predicting employee work engagement.

Findings from previous research confirmed that work engagement creates favorable outcomes not only for companies but also for their employees. According to Hakanen & Schaufeli (2012), highly engaged individuals have less preposition for depression and are more likely to be satisfied with their lives. Work engagement is beneficial on a personal front since it promotes positive feelings for employees and helps them manage a balanced work-life (Culbertson *et al*., 2012). The authors suggested that work engagement can positively impact an individual's personal life, particularly their family life. However, George (2011) suggested that a state of high work engagement, which is often perceived as a positive experience, may only sometimes yield favorable outcomes and, therefore, requires more attention to better understand associated costs. The study performed by Halbesleben *et al*. (2009) revealed similar findings. According to the authors high interference of work into family life is present with the individuals who demonstrate high engagement. This broadens the understanding of work engagement and indicates that it may also create negative consequences on employees' overall well-being.

Individual values and work engagement

Individual values are developed through social interactions with role models and are considered learned beliefs. They function as guiding principles dictating appropriate behavior for individuals (Parks & Guay, 2009). Individual values are crucial in shaping human behavior (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003) and should be observed as motivators which steer individuals to behaviors aligned with their values and hence facilitate the achievement of their underlying objectives (Arieli *et al*., 2020).

Schwartz's theory of basic human values is widely recognized, used, and extensively developed among value theories (Parks & Guay, 2009). The theory provides the conceptual definition of values and proposes that the primary content aspect of a value is the motivational goal or motivational concern that it expresses (Schwartz, 1992). It is comprised of ten value orientations, namely power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. According to Schwartz (2017), all values are interconnected in a circular motivational spectrum. In this spectrum, each value is ranked compared to other values. The distance present between two values in the values' spectrum indicates their similarity or dissimilarity.

Individual values become particularly interesting to researchers who explore their role in different behavior outcomes in the work environment. For example, previous studies demonstrated the significant influence that values have on performance (Parks & Guay, 2012), innovative work behavior (Purc & Laguna, 2019; Wang *et al*., 2021), and organizational commitment (Finegan, 2000; Abbot *et al*., 2005; Afshari *et al*., 2020).

While several studies have explored the correlation between values and work engagement, their relevance is constrained. Firstly, previous studies have mostly concentrated their attention on distinct categories of values, for example work values, which are separate constructs (Ismail *et al*., 2019). Moreover, the studies were conducted on narrow and specific sample sizes, such as police officers, academia, religious organizations, etc. Furthermore, earlier studies have explored if the congruence between organizational and individual values contributes to work engagement. However, this paper will not study the congruence of the values. It will explore the relationship between an employee's individual values and the engagement they express at work, specifically examining which values predict work engagement the most. These research gaps hinder the generalization and application of findings to broader contexts. The first hypothesis is formulated as:

Hypothesis 1 (H1) Individual values positively affect work engagement.

Job satisfaction and work engagement

As per Giauque *et al*. (2014), the definition of job satisfaction proposed by Locke, which refers to a "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" is the widely accepted interpretation of this variable in the literature. Building on the previous work, Hirschfeld (2000) defines it as the extent to which individuals enjoy their jobs. According to Buitendach & De Witte (2005) the concept of job satisfaction is characterized by an affective or emotional response to one's work.

The concept of job satisfaction has been extensively examined by scholars specialized in human resource management and other related fields since it has been confirmed that individuals who experience satisfaction with their work also tend to exhibit enhanced performance (Riketta, 2008; Rich *et al*., 2010; Ziegler *et al*., 2012; Jalagat, 2016). However, past studies implied that the effects of employee satisfaction go beyond individual performance. Empirical findings indicate that employees' job satisfaction can determine customer satisfaction (Jeon & Choi, 2012; Kurdi *et al*., 2020) and, hence, indirectly impacts the overall performance of the company (Chi & Gursoy, 2009; Pang & Lu, 2018). Therefore, the presence of satisfied employees is essential to creating and preserving a devoted customer base and generating favorable financial outcomes. Furthermore, when employees are highly satisfied with their jobs, they also demonstrate greater commitment (Valaei & Rezaei, 2016). Additionally, they are less prone to absenteeism (Siu, 2002; Wegge *et al*., 2007; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017), and exhibit lower rates of turnover (Brough & Frame, 2004; Samad, 2006; Singh & Loncar, 2010; Lin & Huang, 2021).

According to the previous research, employees' work engagement is a significant determinant of their job satisfaction (Saks, 2006; Karatepe & Aga, 2012; Bayona *et al*., 2020; Rai & Maheshwari, 2020). More engaged employees demonstrate higher levels of job satisfaction because they tend to have better relationships with their employer, which leads to positive attitudes, attention, and behaviours. (Saks, 2006). Additionally, employees with a strong sense of a connection with their company are also more engaged at their work. They demonstrate higher enthusiasm and commitment which ultimately increases their job satisfaction (Karanika *et al*., 2015).

However, in addition to the abovementioned studies confirming that work engagement predicts job satisfaction, some studies suggested the reverse relationship (Salanova *et al*., 2011; Yalabik *et al*., 2017). Organizations which place a high priority on meeting their duties towards employees and have satisfied employees are more likely also to have engaged employees (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014). In such organizations, it is likely that employees will express greater work engagement. For instance, greater satisfaction with colleagues at work leads to higher work engagement (Avery *et al*., 2007). According to Barnes and Collier (2013) employees who experience a positive service climate and express job satisfaction also have a strong commitment to their company and are inclined to be engaged in their work.

This ambiguous and understudied relationship that is present between work engagement and job satisfaction provides an opportunity to investigate it further to get a better understanding of their connection (Bakker *et al.*, 2008). This paper is conceptualized on the premise that job satisfaction determines work engagement. According to Yalabik *et al.* (2013), work engagement is more influenced by job satisfaction rather than the reverse. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is set up as:

Hypothesis 2 (H2) Job satisfaction positively impacts on work engagement.

Methodology

Aim of the research

This research aims to clarify the relationship between work engagement, individual values, and job satisfaction, specifically to discover whether employees' individual values and job satisfaction predict their work engagement.

Research sample and procedure

The online empirical research was carried out at the beginning of 2023 on a sample of 277 Croatian employees. In this research, a convenience sampling method was used. Selected sampling method enabled the inclusion of individuals who were available at the time of the research and also were willing to contribute to the research. Therefore, the participants joined this research voluntarily and anonymously, and they were aware that they could withdraw at any point.

Table 1: Sample characteristics

Characteristic	Respondents	
	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	133	48.0
Female	144	52.0
Total	277	100.00
Age		
18-27	63	22.7
28-37	52	18.8
38-47	57	20.6
48-57	64	23.1
58-67	41	14.8
Total	277	100.00
Education		

Characteristic	Respondents	
	Frequency	Percentage
Primary education	13	4.7
Secondary education	116	41.9
College education	33	11.9
University education	96	34.7
Master's degree or doctoral degree	19	6.9
Total	277	100.00
Tenure in organization		
Less than 9 years	108	39.0
10-19	63	22.7
20-29	66	23.8
30-39	27	9.7
40 and more	13	4.7
Total	277	100.00
Marital status		
Single	112	40.4
Married	139	50.2
Divorced	16	5.8
Widowed	10	3.6
Total	277	100.00

The majority of research participants were women (52.0%), participants who were between 48 and 57 years old (23.1%), followed very closely by those who were between 18 and 27 (22.7%). In terms of experience, 39.0% of the participants had less than 9 years of experience. Additionally, 50.2% of participants were married.

Research instrument

This empirical research was conducted by a four-part questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire included questions about the demographic attributes of the participants, including their gender, age, education level, duration of employment within the organization, and marital status.

The second part of the questionnaire was related to work engagement. Work engagement was explored using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale created by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003). This scale includes 17 statements. The participants used a 7-point Likert scale for rating their levels of work engagement, where 0 meant "never" and 6 meant "always (every day)". The overall score of work engagement was determined as the average value of the responses given by the participants on those 17 statements.

The third part of the questionnaire included the Portrait Value Questionnaire, which was developed by Schwartz (2003) and is widely regarded as one of the most used value models. This model was chosen due to its extensive implementation in nu-

merous previous studies, which confirms its validity and reliability and provides the opportunity to compare the findings. This questionnaire contains 21 statements and explores 10 dominant individual values: self-direction, power, universalism, achievement, security, stimulation, conformity, tradition, hedonism, and benevolence. In this questionnaire, each individual value was explored by two statements, except universalism, which was explored by three statements. The participants' responses were measured by using a 6-point Likert scale whereby 1 meant "not like me at all" and 6 meant "very much like me". The overall score of each individual value was determined by averaging the value of the participant's responses on statements related to that individual value.

The fourth part of the questionnaire explored job satisfaction. This paper observed job satisfaction as a global feeling about the job and hence was explored with only one question. The participants used a 5-point Likert scale to examine their overall job satisfaction, where 1 meant "very dissatisfied" and 5 meant "very satisfied".

Data analysis

The data that were collected underwent analysis using SPSS 23, which stands for Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Statistical procedures which have been conducted are descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis.

Results

The research results will be presented starting with the results of descriptive statistics. Namely, the mean value of work engagement was 4.23, suggesting a relatively high level of participants' work engagement. The conclusions drawn from the median value, and especially the mode value, were found to be identical. Furthermore, the mean values of the most individual values were considerably higher than 4.00. Only in the case of power the mean value was slightly under 4.00 (M = 3.98). On the other hand, universalism and benevolence have a mean value higher than 5.00 (M = 5.16; M = 5.26). The values of median and mode were in accordance with the mean values. The values of mode regarding all observed individual values implied the high level of all individual values except for power. The mean value of job satisfaction, as well as the values of median and mode, were 4.00, which is relatively high and implies that job satisfaction is present among respondents.

Since focus of this research is the relationship between work engagement, individual values and job satisfaction, correlation analysis was selected as one of the statistical methods for data analysis. This method corresponds to the research objectives since it enables to determine if correlation between selected variables is pres-

ent and provides insight whether these relations have negative or positive impact. Correlation coefficients suggest that work engagement, all individual values, and job satisfaction were statistically significant to each other. The correlations between work engagement and all individual values were the correlations of weak intensity (r < .4), while the correlation between work engagement and job satisfaction was correlation of moderate intensity (r = .582).

Additionally, the hierarchical regression analysis, which was conducted in two steps, was used to interpret research findings and help determine the predictive power of observed variables. This method was also used to determine the order of influence among the variables. Table 2 presents the findings of the conducted hierarchical regression analysis.

Table 2: Hierarchical regression analysis

	Variables		β	R		Adj.	ΔR	F Tolerance	Collinearity Statistics	
									VIF	
Step 1	Individual values	Self-direction	.182**						.689	1.452
		Power	-.136*						.594	1.684
		Universalism	.228***						.569	1.757
		Achievement	.129						.568	1.761
		Security	-.087						.686	1.457
		Stimulation	.037						.596	1.678
		Conformity	.205**						.619	1.616
		Tradition	-.095						.695	1.439
		Hedonism	.074						.597	1.676
		Benevolence	.166**						.608.	1.645
				.533	.284	.257	.284	10.543***		
Step 2	Individual values	Self-direction	.082						.664	1.507
		Power	-.139**						.594	1.684
		Universalism	.194***						.567	1.763
		Achievement	.130**						.568	1.761
		Security	-.044						.682	1.467
		Stimulation	.079						.593	1.687
		Conformity	.112						.602	1.662
		Tradition	-.082						.695	1.439
		Hedonism	-.010						.583	1.714
		Benevolence	.132**						.606	1.651
	Job satisfaction		.468***						.839	1.191
				.684	.468	.446	.184	21.161***		

Note: *** p ≤. 001; ** p < .01; * p ≤ .05

To explore the relationship between work engagement, which was dependent variable in the research, job satisfaction and individual values, hierarchical regression

analysis was conducted. It was carried out in two steps in order to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the dependent variable. In the initial stage of the analysis individual vales were introduced, while job satisfaction was included in step two.

It has been determined that individual values account for 28.4% of the variable in work engagement as indicated by the results of hierarchical regression, $F (10, 266) = 10.543, p \leq .001$. Adding job satisfaction variable in stage two explained an additional 18.4% of the variance in work engagement, $F (1, 265) = 91.477, p \leq .001$.

Conducted hierarchical regression analysis suggested that job satisfaction was the most important predictor of work engagement.

As per individual values, universalism, power, benevolence, and achievement were found to be the predictors of work engagement.

When observed collectively, variables explained 46.8% of the variance in work engagement, $F (11, 265) = 21.161, p \leq .001$.

Discussion

This study examined whether individual values and job satisfaction can serve as work engagement predictors. Empirical research findings revealed that job satisfaction was the strongest predictor of work engagement. The results align with the previous research, which confirmed job satisfaction as the predecessor of work engagement (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014; Yalabik *et al*., 2017). Moreover, the research outcomes implied that individual values predicted employee work engagement, although not all values contributed equally. Of the ten individual values observed in this research, results showed that universalism, power, benevolence, and achievement were statistically significant predictors of engagement at work. These results correspond to earlier studies, which assert that individual values shape human behavior, actions, and perspectives and can serve as a mean to predict employees' level of engagement at work. For example, in the context of universalism and benevolence, previous studies have indicated that those who are more engaged at work put great importance on social support and workplace relationships (Freeney & Fellenz, 2013; Bakker, 2022). Therefore, the employees who prioritize these two values tend to exhibit heightened prosocial behavior (Sanderson & McQuilkin, 2017). This offers insights into the predictability of work engagement for the individuals who place importance on these two values.

Furthermore, those striving for achievement are expected to be more engaged in work. According to Bakker (2011), employees who are committed to achieving their work-related goals are fully engaged, as they are immersed in their work and are willing to put in extra effort.

Unlike universalism, benevolence, and achievement, power was identified as the value that negatively impacts work engagement. This can be explained by the attri-

butes of individuals who place a high value on power. For instance, people who possess a significant amount of power are often characterized by decreased empathy and a lack of social engagement (Magee & Smith, 2013). They are focused on maintaining control and influence over others, as well as persevering in their positions of power and authority (Guinote, 2017). This behavior contradicts the behavioral patterns demonstrated by persons who are completely immersed in their work and display an elevated degree of work engagement.

Conclusion

This paper is focused on exploring the relationship between work engagement, individual values, and job satisfaction. Its findings demonstrate that job satisfaction and individual values are significant predictors of work engagement. Although both variables are confirmed as work engagement predictors, research results imply that some distinctions between them are present. First, the analysis revealed that job satisfaction is the strongest predictor of work engagement. Furthermore, the results imply individual values also predict work engagement although not all ten observed values impact work engagement. According to the research universalism, power, benevolence, and achievement are confirmed as values that predict work engagement.

This research provides valuable theoretical implications crucial for a better understanding of the complex relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction. First, it demonstrates that job satisfaction is not only the predecessor of work engagement but also its strongest predictor. This novelty provides fresh insights and additional arguments to the stream of research according to which work engagement should be observed as an outcome of job satisfaction. Although previous research confirmed that individual values have a critical role in determining an individual's behavior and attitudes at work, only a limited number of authors analyzed the connection between individual values and engagement at work (Leier, 2008; Dyląg *et al*., 2013; Sortheix *et al*., 2013; Ariza-Montes *et al*., 2018; Ortiz-Gómez *et al*., 2020; Coelho *et al*., 2023). In this study, the present literature gap is addressed, and new insights, particularly in the Croatian context, are proposed. It confirms that not all observed values are predictors of work engagement. Among the ten observed values, only four have been confirmed as predictors of work engagement. According to the findings, a positive relationship exists between universalism, benevolence, achievement, and work engagement, while power is a value with a negative impact on work engagement.

Several practical implications can be drawn from this research. First, it indicates that those individuals who demonstrate high levels of job satisfaction are more likely to be more engaged at work. Therefore, managers can boost work engagement by enhancing job satisfaction, and by doing so, they can ultimately create favorable

outcomes for both individuals and organizations. Furthermore, when hiring employees and delegating tasks, managers should consider the individual values of their employees and take into account that not all individual values impact the engagement of their employees. In this regard, managers should prioritize employees who demonstrate universalism and benevolence over other values, since these two values encourage positive work relations at work setting and lead to greater work engagement. By providing opportunities to those who strive for achievement managers can stimulate individuals to put additional effort at work and consequently increase their work engagement. However, managers should be cautious to prevent negative implications when stimulating work engagement among those individuals who have a high inclination for power because such behavioral patterns are confirmed to hinder engagement at work. This complex relationship between work engagement, individual values, and job satisfaction using a common research model has never been explored before in this manner, which provides a unique and fresh practical implication for managers. For example, when creating a working environment that should stimulate work engagement, managers need to prioritize job satisfaction since it impacts work engagement the most. Furthermore, they also need to consider individual values, but not treat all individual values equally since this paper revealed the existence of the order of influence among them.

Several limitations are identified for this research. Firstly, it has a small and narrow sample size of 277 employees. The findings of this study are specific to the Croatian context and cannot be generalized, as cultural factors might change how values are associated with individuals' actions or behaviors (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2022; Schwartz, 1992). Results generalization is additionally limited by the selected convenience sampling procedure. Furthermore, the study was cross-sectional, which limits the ability to conclude long-term trends or changes over time. Therefore, future studies should broaden the scope of the sample size and employ a longitudinal design to capture potential changes better. Lastly, self-reported measures about work engagement, individual values, and job satisfaction were applied in the study. Therefore, future research could consider alternative, more objective measurement scales to strengthen the validity of the results. Additionally, future studies could include managers' inputs to complement employee responses and improve the overall accuracy of the findings.

Declarations

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Availability of Data and materials

This paper reports the results of an original survey conducted specifically for this research. The data supporting the results of this research are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Code Availability

Not applicable

Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Authors' Contributions

Danica Bakotić: Conceptualization, Methodology, Empirical research, Review
Antonela Alvir: Literature review, Writing – original draft, Editing, Administration

REFERENCES

Abbott, G. N., White, F. A., & Charles, M. A. (2005). Linking values and organizational commitment: A correlational and experimental investigation in two organizations. Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 78(4), 531-551. DOI: 10.1348/096317905X26174

Afshari, L., Young, S., Gibson, P., & Karimi, L. (2020). Organizational commitment: exploring the role of identity. Personnel Review, 49(3), 774-790. DOI: 10.1108/PR-04-2019-0148

Agho, A. O., Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. Human relations, 46(8), 1007-1027. DOI: 10.1177/001872679304600806

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. International journal of productivity and performance management, 63(3), 308-323. DOI: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008

Arieli, S., Sagiv, L., & Roccas, S. (2020). Values at work: The impact of personal values in organisations. Applied Psychology, 69(2), 230-275. DOI: 10.1111/apps.12181

Ariza-Montes, A., Molina-Sánchez, H., Ramirez-Sobrino, J., & Giorgi, G. (2018). Work engagement and flourishing at work among nuns: The moderating role of human values. Frontiers in psychology, 9, 1874. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01874

Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with coworkers, and employee engagement. Journal of applied psychology, 92(6), 1542. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1542

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. International journal of management reviews, 19(1), 31-53. DOI:10.1111/ijmr.12077

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. Current directions in psychological science, 20(4), 265-269. DOI:10.1177/0963721411414534

Bakker, A. B. (2014). Daily fluctuations in work engagement. European Psychologist, 19, 227–236. DOI:10.1027/1016-9040/a000160

Bakker, A. B. (2022). The social psychology of work engagement: state of the field. Career Development International, 27(1), 36-53. DOI:10.1108/CDI-08-2021-0213

Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: current trends. Career development international, 23(1), 4-11. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. Career development international, 13(3), 209-223. DOI:10.1108/13620430810870476

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. Work & stress, 22(3), 187-200. DOI: 10.1080/02678370802393649

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. Personality and social psychology bulletin, 29(10), 1207-1220. DOI: 10.1177/0146167203254602

Barreiro, C. A., & Treglown, L. (2020). What makes an engaged employee? A facet-level approach to trait emotional intelligence as a predictor of employee engagement. Personality and Individual Differences, 159, 109892. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.109892

Bayona, J. A., Caballer, A., & Peiró, J. M. (2020). The relationship between knowledge characteristics' fit and job satisfaction and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. Sustainability, 12(6), 2336. DOI: 10.3390/su12062336

Bhatti, M. A., Alshagawi, M., & Juhari, A. S. (2018). Mediating the role of work engagement between personal resources (self-efficacy, the big five model) and nurses' job performance. International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare, 11(3), 176-191. DOI: 10.1108/IJHRH-10-2017-0056

Boer, D., & Fischer, R. (2013). How and when do personal values guide our attitudes and sociality? Explaining cross-cultural variability in attitude–value linkages. Psychological bulletin, 139(5), 1113. DOI: 10.1037/a0031347

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Van Den Heuvel, M. (2015). Leader-member exchange, work engagement, and job performance. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30(7), 754-770. DOI: 10.1108/JMP-03-2013-0088

Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organisational variables. New Zealand journal of psychology, 33(1), 8-18.

Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. Human Resource Management Journal, 22(4), 428-441. DOI: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00198.x

Buitendach, J. H., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastatal. South African Journal of Business Management, 36(2), 27-37. DOI: 10.4102/sajbm.v36i2.625

C. Barnes, D., & E. Collier, J. (2013). Investigating work engagement in the service environment. Journal of Services Marketing, 27(6), 485-499. DOI: 10.1108/JSM-01-2012-0021

Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organizational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. Knowledge and Process Management, 24(2), 152-158. DOI: 10.1002/kpm.1542

Chai, D. S., Song, J. H., & You, Y. M. (2020). Psychological ownership and openness to change: The mediating effects of work engagement, and knowledge creation. Performance improvement quarterly, 33(3), 305-326. DOI: 10.1002/piq.21326

Chi, C. G., & Gursoy, D. (2009). Employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and financial performance: An empirical examination. International journal of hospitality management, 28(2), 245-253. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.08.003

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. Personnel psychology, 64(1), 89-136. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x

Coelho, G. L. D. H., da Fonsêca, P. N., Vilar, R., de Carvalho Mendes, L. A., & Gouveia, V. V. (2023). How can human values influence work engagement among teachers? an exploratory study. Trends in Psychology, 1-14. DOI: 10.1007/s43076-023-00258-y

Contreras, F., Espinosa, J. C., & Esguerra, G. A. (2020). Could personal resources influence work engagement and burnout? A study in a group of nursing staff. Sage Open, 10(1), 2158244019900563. DOI: 10.1177/2158244019900563

Culbertson, S. S., Mills, M. J., & Fullagar, C. J. (2012). Work engagement and work-family facilitation: Making homes happier through positive affective spillover. Human relations, 65(9), 1155-1177. DOI: 10.1177/0018726712440295

Dyląg, A., Jaworek, M., Karwowski, W., Kożusznik, M., & Marek, T. (2013). Discrepancy between individual and organizational values: Occupational burnout and work engagement among white-collar workers. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 43(3), 225-231. DOI: 10.1016/j.ergon.2013.01.002

Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(2), 149-169. DOI: 10.1348/096317900166958

Freeney, Y., & Fellenz, M. R. (2013). Work engagement, job design and the role of the social context at work: Exploring antecedents from a relational perspective. Human Relations, 66(11), 1427-1445. DOI: 10.1177/0018726713478245

Fritzsche, D. J., & Oz, E. (2007). 'Personal Values' influence on the ethical dimension of decision making. Journal of Business Ethics, 75(4), 335–343. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-006-9256-5

George, J. M. (2011). The wider context, costs, and benefits of work engagement. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20(1), 53-59. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2010.509924

Giauque, D., Resenterra, F., & Siggen, M. (2014). Antecedents of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and stress in a public hospital: a PE fit perspective. Public Organization Review, 14, 201-228. DOI: 10.1007/s11115-012-0215-6

Gomes, C., Curral, L., & Caetano, A. (2015). The mediating effect of work engagement on the relationship between self-leadership and individual innovation. International Journal of Innovation Management, 19(01), 1550009. DOI: 10.1142/S1363919615500097

Guinote, A. (2017). How power affects people: Activating, wanting, and goal seeking. Annual review of psychology, 68, 353-381. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044153

Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. Journal of affective disorders, 141(2-3), 415-424. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.02.043

Hakanen, J. J., Schaufeli, W. B., & Ahola, K. (2008). The Job Demands-Resources model: A three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work engagement. Work & stress, 22(3), 224-241. DOI: 10.1080/02678370802379432

Halbesleben, J. R., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. Journal of applied psychology, 94(6), 1452. DOI: 10.1037/a0017595

Hewlin, P. F., Dumas, T. L., & Burnett, M. F. (2017). To thine own self be true? Facades of conformity, values incongruence, and the moderating impact of leader integrity. Academy of Management Journal, 60(1), 178-199. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2013.0404

Hirschfeld, R. R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference?. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60(2), 255-270. DOI: 10.1177/00131640021970493

Hitlin, S. (2003). Values as the core of personal identity: Drawing links between two theories of self. Social psychology quarterly, 118-137. DOI: 10.2307/1519843

Ismail, H. N., Karkoulian, S., & Kertechian, S. K. (2019). Which personal values matter most? Job performance and job satisfaction across job categories. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 27(1), 109-124. DOI: 10.1108/IJOA-11-2017-1275

Jakubik, M. (2022). Work Engagement-Gateway to Creativity. In Technology, Innovation and Creativity in Digital Society: XXI Professional Culture of the Specialist of the Future (pp. 11-21). Springer International Publishing, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-89708-6_2

Jalagat, R. (2016). Job performance, job satisfaction, and motivation: A critical review of their relationship. International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics, 5(6), 36-42.

Janssens, H., De Zutter, P., Geens, T., Vogt, G., & Braeckman, L. (2019). Do personality traits determine work engagement? Results from a Belgian study. Journal of occupational and environmental medicine, 61(1), 29-34. DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000001458

Jeon, H., & Choi, B. (2012). The relationship between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction. Journal of Services Marketing, 26(5), 332-341. DOI: 10.1108/08876041211245236

Karanika-Murray, M., Duncan, N., Pontes, H. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Organizational identification, work engagement, and job satisfaction. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30(8), 1019-1033. DOI: 10.1108/JMP-11-2013-0359

Karatepe, O. M. (2013). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 32, 132-140. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.05.003

Karatepe, O.M., and Aga, M. (2012), 'Work Engagement as a Mediator of the Effects of Personality Traits on Job Outcomes: A Study of Frontline Employees. Services Marketing Quarterly, 33, 343 – 362. DOI: 10.1080/15332969.2012.715053

Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H., & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28(1), 96-104., DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.001

Kurdi, B., Alshurideh, M., & Alnaser, A. (2020). The impact of employee satisfaction on customer satisfaction: Theoretical and empirical underpinning. Management Science Letters, 10(15), 3561-3570. DOI: 10.5267/j.msl.2020.6.038

Lin, C. Y., & Huang, C. K. (2021). Employee turnover intentions and job performance from a planned change: the effects of an organizational learning culture and job satisfaction. International Journal of Manpower, 42(3), 409-423. DOI: 10.1108/IJM-08-2018-0281

Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. Personality and social psychology review, 17(2), 158-186. DOI: 10.1177/1088868312472732

Martos Martínez, Á., Perez-Fuentes, M. D. C., Molero Jurado, M. D. M., Simon Marquez, M. D. M., Barragán Martín, A. B., & Gázquez Linares, J. J. (2021). Empathy, affect and personality as predictors of engagement in nursing professionals. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(8), 4110. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18084110

Naidoo, P., & Martins, N. (2014). Investigating the relationship between organizational culture and work engagement. Problems and perspectives in Management, (12, Iss. 4 (spec. iss.)), 433-441.

Ortiz-Gómez, M., Ariza-Montes, A., & Molina-Sánchez, H. (2020). Human values and work engagement: the mediating role of authenticity among workers in a Spanish religious organization. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 507351. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00076

Pang, K., & Lu, C. S. (2018). Organizational motivation, employee job satisfaction and organizational performance: An empirical study of container shipping companies in Taiwan. Maritime Business Review, 3(1), 36-52. DOI: 10.1108/mabr-03-2018-0007

Parks, L., & Guay, R. P. (2009). Personality, values, and motivation. Personality and individual differences, 47(7), 675-684. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.002

Parks, L., & Guay, R. P. (2012). Can personal values predict performance? Evidence in an academic setting. Applied psychology, 61(1), 149-173. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00461.x

Purc, E., & Laguna, M. (2019). Personal values and innovative behavior of employees. Frontiers in psychology, 10, 865. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00865

Rai, A., & Maheshwari, S. (2020). Exploring the mediating role of work engagement between the linkages of job characteristics with organizational engagement and job satisfaction. Management Research Review, 44(1), 133-157. DOI: 10.1108/MRR-10-2019-0442

Rayton, B. A., & Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25(17), 2382-2400. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2013.876440

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. Academy of management journal, 53(3), 617-635. DOI: 10.5465/amj.2010.51468988

Riketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: a meta-analysis of panel studies. Journal of applied psychology, 93(2), 472. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.472

Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2022). Personal values across cultures. Annual review of psychology, 73, 517-546. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-020821-125100

Sagiv, L., Roccas, S., Cieciuch, J., & Schwartz, S. H. (2017). Personal values in human life. Nature human behaviour, 1(9), 630-639. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-017-0185-3

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of managerial psychology, 21(7), 600-619. DOI: 10.1108/02683940610690169

Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 6(1), 19-38. DOI: 10.1108/JO-EPP-06-2018-0034

Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement?. Human resource development quarterly, 25(2), 155-182. DOI: 10.1002/hrdq.21187

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. The international journal of human resource management, 19(1), 116-131. DOI: 10.1080/09585190701763982

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). "Yes, I can, I feel good, and I just do it!" On gain cycles and spirals of efficacy beliefs, affect, and engagement. Applied Psychology, 60(2), 255-285. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00435.x

Samad, S. (2006). The contribution of demographic variables: job characteristics and job satisfaction on turnover intentions. Journal of International Management Studies, 1(1).

Sanderson, R. & McQuilkin, J. (2017). Many Kinds of Kindness: The Relationship Between Values and Prosocial Behaviour. In Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (Eds.). Values and behavior: Taking a cross cultural perspective. Springer International Publishing. pp. 75.-96. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-56352-7_4

Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the job demands-resources model. Organizational dynamics, 2(46), 120-132. DOI: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25(3), 293-315. DOI: 10.1002/job.248

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research, 12, 10-24.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale-9. Educational and Psychological Measurement. DOI: 10.1037/t05561-000

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness studies, 3, 71-92. DOI: 10.1023/A:1015630930326

Schaumberg, R. L., & Flynn, F. J. (2017). Clarifying the link between job satisfaction and absenteeism: The role of guilt proneness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 102(6), 982. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000208

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). Academic Press. DOI: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Schwartz, S. H. (2003). A proposal for measuring value orientations across nations. Questionnaire package of the european social survey, 259(290), 261.

Schwartz, S.H. (2017). The Refined Theory of Basic Values. In Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (Eds.). Values and behavior: Taking a cross cultural perspective. Springer International Publishing. 51.-73. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-56352-7_3

Singh, P., & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover intent. Relations industrielles, 65(3), 470-490. DOI: 10.7202/044892ar

Siu, O. L. (2002). Predictors of job satisfaction and absenteeism in two samples of Hong Kong nurses. Journal of advanced nursing, 40(2), 218-229. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02364.x

Sonnentag, S. (2017). A task-level perspective on work engagement: A new approach that helps to differentiate the concepts of engagement and burnout. Burnout research, 5, 12-20. DOI: 10.1016/j.burn.2017.04.001

Sortheix, F. M., Dietrich, J., Chow, A., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). The role of career values for work engagement during the transition to working life. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83(3), 466-475. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.07.003

Stephen A. W. & Juilitta A. S. (2013). Personality and engagement at work: the mediating role of psychological meaningfulness. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43(11), 2203- 2210. DOI: 10.1111/jasp.12171

Trabucchi, D., Bellis, P., Di Marco, D., Buganza, T., & Verganti, R. (2020). Attitude vs involvement: a systematic literature review at the intersection between engagement and innovation. European Journal of Innovation Management, 24(5), 1730-1762. DOI: 10.1108/EJIM-05-2020-0171

Valaei, N., & Rezaei, S. (2016). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An empirical investigation among ICT-SMEs. Management Research Review, 39(12), 1663-1694. DOI: 10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0216

Wang, Z., Gao, M., & Panaccio, A. (2021). A Self-Determination Approach to Understanding Individual Values as an Interaction Condition on Employees' Innovative Work Behavior in the High-Tech Industry. The Journal of Creative Behavior, 55(1), 183-198. DOI: 10.1002/jocb.444

Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. The Journal of Psychology, 143(1), 91-112. DOI: 10.3200/JRLP.143.1.91-112

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K. H., Parkes, C., & Van Dick, R. (2007). Taking a sickie: Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization. Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 80(1), 77-89. DOI: 10.1348/096317906X99371

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. Journal of Vocational behavior, 74(3), 235-244. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003

Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(14), 2799-2823. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2013.763844

Yalabik, Z. Y., Rayton, B. A., & Rapti, A. (2017, December). Facets of job satisfaction and work engagement. In Evidence-based HRM: a global forum for empirical scholarship (Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 248-265). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Ziegler, R., Hagen, B., & Diehl, M. (2012). Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: Job ambivalence as a moderator. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42(8), 2019-2040. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00929.x