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Five theoretical processes that link values and behavior were identified: value congruence, value-behavior consistency, behavioral modeling, value internalization, and descriptive norms. A values questionnaire was administered to 219 employees and their managers. Values for preventive safety procedures and time urgency were linked to safety behavior of employees in the hairdressing industry. Hairdressers are frequently exposed to hazardous chemicals, and the safety behavior measured was wearing protective gloves. Results support value internalization (linking manager’s and employee’s values) and behavioral modeling (linking manager’s and employee’s behavior). Employee time urgency values were also negatively related to safety behavior (value-behavior consistency). Descriptive norms and value congruence were not supported. Strategies to align values within organizations and the management of safety at work are considered.

Values derive from individual belief systems about desired end states (Rokeach, 1973). In organizations, values describe what is important for individual employees and for the organization as a whole (Kabanoff, Walderssee, & Cohen, 1995). Values for customer service, team cooperation, and safety are examples of values that have recently received the attention of both researchers and organizations. Values influence a wide range of behaviors at work (Meglin, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989) and underlie structure, function, and change in organizations (Rousseau, 1990; Trice & Beyer, 1993). The alignment of values across an organization can influence a wide range of individual and business outcomes (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Wiener, 1988), and many organizations have actively adopted strategies of value alignment as a way of achieving effectiveness and sustainability. For example, Disney, Boeing, Hewlett-Packard, IBM (Collins, 1995), and Bank of America (Beck, 1987) have implemented programs to increase the consistency of values and behavior across their organizations.

Despite the importance of value alignment within organizations, little research has addressed the processes through which values are generated, expressed, and enacted throughout an organization (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayon, & Sanders, 1990). Although value differences among employees at different levels are frequently assessed, few studies have investigated the processes that link values and behavior at different levels of an organization. The present study investigated the processes through which managers’ values and safety behavior were linked to employees’ values and safety behavior in the hairdressing industry.

We first describe alternative theoretical processes linking values and behavior at one hierarchical level with values and behavior at another hierarchical level of an organization. It is known that values can influence a wide range of behaviors in the workplace (Meglin et al., 1989; Rokeach, 1973), and there is some evidence that a supervisor’s values can influence a subordinate’s performance (Adkins & Russell, 1997). However, no research has systematically assessed the alternative processes through which values of managers are linked to specific employee behaviors. We introduce safety as a relevant area for investigating this process because of the importance of employee safety and because employee safety behavior is likely to be influenced by values in an organi-
zation. Finally, we describe our specific study that investigates the way managers’ values and safety behavior are linked to employees’ values and safety behavior.

**Linking Values and Behavior Across Hierarchical Levels**

Processes of influence across hierarchical levels are not straightforward (Griffin & Mathieu, 1997; Likert, 1967) and require theories that span multiple levels of analysis (Klein, Tosi, & Cannella, 1999). Figure 1 provides a schematic representation of five possible linkages among values and safety behavior across hierarchical levels. The model distinguishes between the values and behavior of employees and their managers. The major theoretical basis for each potential path of influence is outlined below.

**Pathway A—Managers’ Values and Employees’ Values: Value Congruence**

Value congruence is a theoretical mechanism through which managers’ values may indirectly relate to employee behavior (Pathway A). Congruence theories describe the way an individual’s characteristics combine with the characteristics of the situation to influence affective or behavioral response in that situation (Chatman & Barsade, 1995). Results from person–situation fit studies have shown that, in instances in which a person’s characteristics match those of the situation, a person is likely to be happier, to have increased effectiveness, and to be more likely to seek out such a situation in the future (Diener, Larsen, & Emmons, 1984).

Values are one of the most common characteristics investigated in person–situation fit literature (Kristoff, 1996). The degree to which organizational values reflect the values of the individual determines the fit of the person and the organization. Affective reactions associated with value congruence include job satisfaction (Chatman, 1989; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; George & Jones, 1996; Meglino et al., 1989; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), organizational commitment (Harris & Mossholder, 1996; Knoop, 1994; Meglino et al., 1989; O’Reilly et al., 1991), positive work attitudes (Posner, 1992), optimism about the organization’s future (Harris & Mossholder, 1996), turnover intentions, and newcomer adjustment (Chatman, 1989).

Individuals who share the same values are thought to share similar aspects of cognitive functioning because they classify and interpret events in a similar way and have a common system of communication (Schein, 1985). They also have clearer role expectations and an ability to more easily predict others’ behavior (Kluckhohn, 1951). Value congruence can facilitate successful interpersonal interactions in the workplace and, therefore, can enhance performance. Empirical research has shown that sharing the same values as one’s organization can increase supervisor ratings of work performance (Becker, Billings,
Evelth, & Gilbert, 1996), participation in prosocial behaviors (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), self-reported teamwork (Posner, 1992), tendencies toward ethical behavior (Posner, Kouzes, & Schmidt, 1985), and staying in the organization (Meglino et al., 1989; O'Reilly et al., 1991).

Pathway B—Individuals' Values and Their Own Behavior: Value–Behavior Consistency

Pathway B proposes a direct link between values and behavior. That is, the values held by a manager are related to the manager's behavior, and the values held by an employee are related to the employee's behavior. This link is fundamental to the impact of values on work outcomes in organizations and is often intrinsic to the definition of values. For example, O'Reilly et al. (1991) described values as "internalized normative beliefs that can guide behavior" (p. 492). Normative beliefs are personally, and often socially, sanctioned beliefs that make up part of the cognitive representation of values.

Despite the importance of this relationship, empirical evidence for the relationship is mixed. One of the reasons the link between cognitive beliefs and behavior has been difficult to establish is that these beliefs are only one of many potential influences on behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). For example, the degree of control a person has over a behavior (Ajzen, 1991) or whether the behavior is performed in public or private (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998) may prevent a person acting on their values. In addition, certain types of values are more likely to influence behavior directly. For example, functional values related to goals and styles of conduct, such as the value of cooperation, are more likely to guide members' behavior than elitist values concerned with status and superiority, such as the value of coming first (Wiener, 1988). Finally, a lack of direct behavioral measures in applied settings may also have contributed to the difficulty in finding value–behavior links (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998).

Although it is difficult to establish clearly an overall relationship between values and behaviors, several studies have shown a link between values and specific behaviors. Chatman and Barsade (1995) found that MBA students' value of cooperation influenced their cooperative behavior in a simulation. In a multidisciplinary work team, the value of power was found to guide performance and influence interpretation of rules and procedures (Pone & Myhre, 1996). Similarly, an employee’s value of collectivism has been related to citizenship behavior in a financial services organization (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). A supervisor’s value of fairness has been associated with the severity of disciplinary decisions in nonacademic departments of a university (Judge & Martocchio, 1995). These examples support a process of influence based on value–behavior consistency.

Pathway C—Managers’ Values and Employees’ Values: Value Internalization

Despite research examining the impact of having similar values to one’s manager, the link between a manager’s values and an employee’s values has received little attention. Pathway C denotes the process through which a manager’s values are related to an employee’s values. Despite the relative stability of values, in certain situations, people are susceptible to influences that may change their beliefs. People's values are, in part, influenced by experience. In organizations, managers can be powerful role models with substantial influence on their subordinates. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) described the process of value internalization in which employees take on the values of their organization. In this process, organizations are conceptualized as strong situations providing information that can cause employees to cognitively restructure their values. Supervisors can play an important role in this process by explicitly stating desired values, reinforcing the values through reward and recognition, and demonstrating value-consistent behavior (Kouzes & Posner, 1995; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Pathway D—Managers' Behavior and Employees' Behavior: Behavioral Modeling

Pathway D shows a relationship between a manager's behavior and an employee's behavior. The most relevant theoretical mechanism for this process of influence is behavioral modeling (Bandura, 1971). Behavioral modeling is more widely researched in relation to child and counseling psychology than in relation to work behavior. However, there is some evidence that behavioral modeling between superiors and subordinates in the workplace can influence employee behavior. In the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1971), a person watching another receive a reward perceives the link between the behavior and the reward and is influenced to participate in the same behavior. In instances in which the behavior of the individual is not directly followed by a reward, other
cues such as status or power, as evidence of previous reward in the past, are inferred (Bandura, 1971).

There have been few studies that have investigated behavioral modeling between superiors and subordinates in the workplace. Weiss (1977) found that individuals developed work behavior patterns by observing the behavior of their supervisors. Subordinates' perception of their supervisor's success and competence increased superior-subordinate behavioral similarity. Birkenbach, Kamfer, and Morshuizen (1985) found that behavior modeling interventions for first-line managers improved supervisory skills. These studies provide some evidence that supervisors influence the behavior of their subordinates directly through their own behavior (Kristoff, 1996).

Pathway E—Managers’ Behavior and Employees’ Values: Descriptive Norms

Pathway E represents a direct relationship between a manager's behavior and an employee's values. The theoretical mechanism most closely associated with this pathway concerns descriptive norms. A descriptive norm describes what people do, in effect, what is considered normal (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990). The following example is provided to clarify the distinction between this path and behavior modeling (Pathway D). Subordinates observing their manager wearing correct safety equipment at all times may be influenced to do the same because they think it will impress their manager. In this case, the subordinates are modeling their manager's behavior in the hope of reward and without increasing their own value for safe behavior (behavioral modeling). Alternatively, subordinates may come to believe that wearing safety equipment is important because the manager engages in the behavior (value internalization). The internalization of values does not necessarily translate into safety-related behavior as discussed in relation to Pathway A above.

The process of value internalization is particularly important for the process of value alignment in organizations. If the espoused values of the organization do not match the behavior of managers, then it is unlikely the espoused values will have a direct impact on the beliefs of employees. Despite the potential importance of this pathway for organizational change strategies, studies that have assessed the impact of manager behaviors on employees' values are absent from the research literature.

Importance of Safety Behavior

Safety is an important outcome because occupational injuries are costly to the individual, the organization they work for, and the wider economy. In Australia the cost of occupational injury and disease is estimated at between $15 and $20 billion annually, with around 650,000 people suffering injury or illness as a result of their work (Emmett, 1996). Safety at work can be influenced by a range of organizational factors, including objective factors such as the way work is designed and perceptual processes such as the organizational climate for safety (Hofmann & Stettler, 1996; Zohar, 1980). Values within an organization are an important aspect of perceptual processes that influence behaviors related to safety.

In the hairdressing industry, employees face a range of safety hazards from ergonomic injuries associated with continuous standing, bending, and the use of handheld, vibrating, or hot tools. Furthermore, hairdressers' arms and hands come into daily contact with a variety of different chemicals, many of which are known or suspected allergens, mutagens, or carcinogens (Winder, 1993; Workplace Health and Safety, 1995). A range of health problems have been associated with hairdressing, such as occupational skin disease (Rosen & Freeman, 1992; Wall & Gebauer, 1991; Winder, 1993), cancers (Garfinkel, Selvin, & Brown, 1977; Giles, Lickiss, Baikie, Lowenthal, & Panton, 1984; Kato, Tominaga, & Ikari, 1990; Milham, 1983; Neuberger, Brownson, Morantz, & Chin, 1991; Pukkala, Nakso-Koivisto, & Roponen, 1992; Skov et al., 1990; Spinelli, Gallagher, Band, & Threlfall, 1984), respiratory problems such as asthma (Schwartz, 1989), digestive disorders (Lob, 1983), menstrual disorders in women (Blatter & Zellhuis, 1993), and other reproductive effects including infertility and early pregnancy failure (Baker, 1985).

Given the severity of potential harm, safety in the workplace is crucial in the hairdressing industry. Recommended safety measures include ergonomic design of workspace and tools, good ventilation, and the use of gloves when working with chemicals (Workplace Health and Safety, 1995). The present study investigated the use of protective gloves as a key safety behavior that protects employees from serious chemical hazards.

The Present Study

The aim of the present study was to examine the effect of manager and employee organizational val-
ues on safe work behaviors in the hairdressing industry. The specific work behavior examined was the use of gloves when working with hair dyes and lighteners. The values were derived from content analysis of interviews conducted with a selection of hairdressers (described in more detail below). Alternative theoretical mechanisms for describing the relationship between values and safety behavior were investigated using two values derived from the interview process: the value of prevention and the value of time urgency. The value of prevention describes the importance of taking actions that reduce the chance of injury in either the short or long term. The value of time urgency in the workplace refers to the importance of completing the most amount of work in the shortest amount of time. The development of these specific measures is described in the Method section below. The hypothetical model that was assessed using these specific constructs is depicted in Figure 2. All paths in Figure 1 are also depicted in Figure 2 except for the process of value congruence (Pathway A). Analysis of this relationship requires assessment of a composite measure comprising the multiplication of manager values and employee values. Because this analysis was conducted separately, the pathway was not included in the overall model depicted in Figure 2. The following are alternative hypotheses derived from the above review.

**Hypothesis 1:** Consistent with value congruence (Pathway A), the similarity between employees’ and managers’ values will be related to the employees’ behavior. Employees’ and managers’ prevention values will interact to increase safety behavior, and employees’ and managers’ time urgency values will interact to decrease safety behavior.

**Hypothesis 2:** Consistent with value–behavior consistency (Pathway B), we predicted that the employees’ safety behavior will be positively related to their prevention values and negatively related to their time urgency values. Managers’ behavior will be similarly related to their own values.

**Hypothesis 3:** Consistent with value internalization (Pathway C), managers’ prevention values will be positively related to employees’ prevention values, and managers’ time urgency values will be positively related to employees’ time urgency values.

**Hypothesis 4:** Consistent with modeling theory (Pathway D), employees’ safety behavior will be positively related to the safety behavior of their manager.

**Hypothesis 5:** Consistent with a process of descriptive norms (Pathway E), we predicted that managers’ safety behavior will be directly and positively related to employees’ prevention values and negatively related to employees’ time urgency values.

**Method**

**Design**

This study was part of a larger study examining the health and well-being of hairdressers. The larger research study collected data on a wide range of physical and mental health issues encountered by employees in the hairdressing industry. The present study consisted of two stages. The first stage developed a values measure using information gained through interviews with hairdressers. The second stage involved a questionnaire that was sent to hairdressers throughout an Australian state.
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*Figure 2. Hypothetical model for specific constructs used in the study. B = value–behavior consistency; C = value internalization; D = behavioral modeling; and E = descriptive norm.*
Development of Values Scale

Ethnographic research is often suggested as the appropriate method to assess values in organizations (Van Maanen, 1982). Therefore, values were identified, and value scales were developed using a sequence of unstructured interviews, semistructured interviews, content analysis, and item screening. Each of these steps is described below.

Unstructured interviews. Unstructured individual interviews were held with 5 female hairdressers. The participants were established in the hairdressing industry with between 7 and 34 years experience ($M = 17.5$ years). Participants were encouraged to talk freely about any issue related to hairdressing, such as what they found rewarding about the industry and what they enjoyed most and least in their job. Content analysis of transcripts from the preliminary interviews identified common topics discussed. Similar issues were grouped together and then categorized. Important issues were identified by the frequency and duration of time they were discussed. For example, the differences that exist between market sectors that salons worked in was a commonly discussed issue. Other issues included health, well-being, business issues, stock, attraction to the industry, and gender differences.

Semistructured interviews. Following the preliminary interviews, semistructured interviews were held with 40 female and 10 male hairdressers. Male hairdressers represented a small proportion of hairdressers; a larger proportion of male hairdressers were selected in the sample to ensure any issues relevant to male hairdressers would be discussed. To ensure that a broad range of concerns would be discussed, we chose the participants to cover important demographic variables identified in the preliminary interviews. The interviewees included owners, managers, senior hairdressers, and apprentice hairdressers and came from salons of varying size. The interviews took place in the participant’s salon and lasted 20 to 30 min.

Content analysis. Content analysis was carried out on transcripts of the semistructured interviews using computer program NUD.IST (non-numerical, unstructured data indexing, searching and theorizing; see Richards & Richards, 1991, for a review). Categorizing sections of each transcript on the basis of topic and grouping similar topics together enabled common themes discussed by participants to emerge. Several themes were identified from which two values important to hairdressers were identified: the importance of time urgency and prevention practices in the workplace. These values were chosen because pressure to complete work and practices that support safe working were likely to be related to safe working practices in salons. Examination of instances in which each of the values was discussed produced a list of issues pertaining to each value. By using language from the text, each of the issues discussed became an item to rate the importance of each value to hairdressers. For example, preventive measures discussed included correct footwear and posture, as well as ergonomic tools and furniture, each of which became an item.

Item screening. Item screening was conducted in two steps. First, individual interviews were conducted in which 1 male and 4 female hairdressers reviewed the items developed from the content analysis. Each of these hairdressers had more than 10 years experience in the hairdressing industry and did not participate in the initial interviews. A Q-sort procedure was used in which respondents systematically sorted the items into categories on the basis of importance. Participants were then asked to identify any items that were redundant, irrelevant, or difficult to understand. Items that were not clearly categorized were discarded. Of the 12 items originally included, 8 were retained.

Next, 10 former hairdressers (mean age = 39 years; mean industry experience = 20 years) completed a pilot questionnaire, imagining an average week in the time they worked as a hairdresser. After completing the questionnaire, the participants were invited to comment on the questionnaire, which led to rewording three items for improved clarity.

Industry Survey

Sample

All hairdressing salons listed in the telephone directory for an Australian state ($N = 2,245$) were contacted and asked to participate in the research. A total of 1,841 salons (response rate = 82%) agreed to participate in the survey and were forwarded copies sufficient for all staff in the salon. Reminders were sent 2 weeks after the initial mailout. Surveys were returned from 842 salons (response rate = 46%), involving a total of 1,475 individual hairdressers. An accurate response rate for individuals was not available because there were no accurate records of the number of employees in each salon. The majority of the participants were women (1,372 women, 103 men).

Owners, owner-managers, and salon managers were grouped together and referred to as managers for this study. There were 114 salons staffed by a single person, and these respondents were excluded from the study. Employees were matched to managers, resulting in a final sample of 436 individuals in which a single manager was matched to a single employee (218 pairs). All analyses were conducted using the 218 pairs of managers and employees. There were no significant differences in the study means between the 436 individuals included in the study and the unmatched responses.

Measures

Values of prevention and time urgency. Employee and manager values concerning preventive safety procedures and time urgency at work were each measured using four items. Participants were asked to indicate how important each statement was to on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 7 (absolutely essential) with the midpoint 4 labeled important. This midpoint was chosen to maximize the variance of the measures, given that all values were expected to be important to some extent. Kristof (1996) recommended extending the positive end of scales assessing values as a method to separate responses that are subject to social desirability. Alpha reliability for prevention values was .65 for managers and .69 for employees. Alpha reliability for time urgency values was .70 for both managers and employees.

Safety behavior. Two items assessed glove use by asking how frequently gloves were worn when coming into contact with hair lighteners and hair dyes. Each item required a response on a 7-point scale from 1 (never) to 7
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(always). The alpha reliability was .70 for managers and .75 for employees.

Factor analysis of items. An exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring with oblique rotation was used on the value and behavior items. Three internally consistent, well-defined factors with low intercorrelations were produced corresponding to the proposed factor structure. Table 1 reports the factor loadings for each item.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among all scales in the study are reported in Table 2. The mean scores indicate that both employees and managers reported relatively high levels of both values and safety behavior. There were statistically significant positive correlations between each manager measure and the corresponding employee measure. Manager behavior was significantly negatively correlated with employee time urgency values, and employee time urgency values were also significantly negatively correlated with employee safety behavior. No other correlations were statistically significant.

The alternative processes linking values and behavior were assessed using two sets of analyses. First, the relationship between value congruence on glove use was assessed using hierarchical moderated multiple regression. Congruence was assessed by adding a product term of managers’ values and employees’ values in the last step of the regression (Edwards, 1991). Separate hierarchical regression equations were assessed for both values. In the first equation, an employee’s value of time urgency and a manager’s value of time urgency were entered in the first step, and the product term of the same two variables was added in the second step. The addition of the product term did not result in a significant change in the variance explained, $\Delta R^2 = .006, F(3, 193) = 1.15, p > .05$. Similarly, the product of an employee’s and a manager’s value of prevention failed to explain additional variance in employee safety behavior, $\Delta R^2 = .004, F(3, 193) = 0.80, p > .05$. The results failed to support the value-congruence process proposed in Hypothesis 1.

Second, relationships among the measures depicted in Figure 2 were assessed using structural equation modeling (SEM). Each construct was assessed by using scale scores as single indicators in the SEM and analysis was conducted using the LISREL VIII program (Joreskog & Sörbom, 1993). We calculated the error variance of each construct by subtracting the scale reliability from one and multiplying this value by the scale variance. The hypothetical model depicted in Figure 2 provided a very good fit to the data, $\chi^2(4, N = 218) = 1.8, p > .05$, goodness-of-fit index = .99. This result suggested that potential paths excluded from the model were not indeed necessary. The estimated path coefficients from the hypothetical model are depicted in Figure 3.

Value–behavior consistency (Hypothesis 2, Pathway B) was supported by the negative link between employee time urgency values and employee behavior ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$). However, time urgency values were not related to behavior for managers, and prevention values were not re-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of time urgency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit in another client even when you are busy</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never turn away a client who walks in</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See as many clients as possible in a day</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always keep working, even through lunch</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior: glove use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing gloves when using hair dryers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing gloves when using hair straighteners</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use tools and appliances that are easy to grip</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have good posture</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a cutting stool</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear appropriate footwear</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations and Reliability Coefficients for Manager and Employee Measures (N = 218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manager prevention values</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manager time urgency values</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manager behavior</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employee prevention values</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee time urgency values</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-1.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee behavior</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values on the diagonal (underlined) represent the coefficient alpha values for each scale. Values below the diagonal are correlations obtained from scales. Values above the diagonal are corrected correlations for scale reliability using structural equation modeling.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

related to behavior for either managers or employees. Values internalization (Hypothesis 3, Pathway C) was supported. Manager prevention values were positively related to employee prevention values ($\beta = .34, p < .001$), and manager time urgency values were positively related to employee time urgency values ($\beta = .26, p < .01$). Behavioral modeling (Hypothesis 4, Pathway D) was supported. Manager safety behavior was significantly positively related to employee safety behavior ($\beta = .29, p < .001$). Descriptive norms (Hypothesis 5, Pathway E) was not supported. Manager behavior was not significantly related to either employee prevention values or employee time urgency values.

In summary, the results fully supported value internalization and behavioral modeling. There was some evidence for value-behavior consistency but only for the negative relationship between employee time urgency values and employee safety behavior. Processes of value congruence and descriptive norms were not supported.

Discussion

Few studies have identified mechanisms necessary for the alignment of values and behavior within organizations. Our study found that managers' values and behavior played a significant role in the reported levels of protective glove use by employees in the hairdressing industry. Clear support was found for two of the processes hypothesized to explain the link.
between values and behavior across hierarchical levels. First, manager safety behavior was directly related to employee safety behavior. Employees used gloves in hazardous situations to a greater extent when their manager also used gloves. This result supported a behavioral modeling process and suggests that desired behaviors need to be enacted across levels of an organization (Hofstede et al., 1990; Schein, 1985). Behavioral modeling was also the strongest explanation of safety behavior, suggesting that this process is a particularly important influence across hierarchical levels.

The positive link between managers’ values and employees’ values supported a second process of value internalization. The results are consistent with a process through which employees adopt the values of managers in their work. However, alternative processes should also be considered. The relationship between managers’ values and employees’ values could be the result of managers selecting employees with values congruent to their own (Cable & Judge, 1997; Schneider, 1987). This selection process would also result in value consistency between managers and employees. The results also show that consistency of manager and employee values does not necessarily translate into safety behaviors. Safety behavior of employees was related only to their own values of time urgency (negatively) and not to their prevention values. Managers’ values were not related to their own safety behavior.

The relationship between managers’ and employees’ prevention values was statistically significant. However, this link did not translate into a relationship with safe behavior. In comparison, managers’ value of time urgency was related to employees’ value of time urgency and also showed a significant negative relationship with safety behavior. Time management values in the workplace appear to be more important for safe behavior than values concerning prevention. Practical initiatives to improve safety behavior often involve increasing awareness of unsafe behaviors and encouraging values for safety. The findings suggest these initiatives should include managers’ values and behavior. The results also suggest that issues beyond prevention should be included in these initiatives. The importance of time urgency values indicates that values other than safety can affect the safety behavior of individuals. General management issues such as the management of time and priorities should be considered when evaluating the impact of values on safety behavior.

The failure to find a link between values and behavior for managers indicates a need for further investigation of this issue. Future research should investigate other values and other factors that may promote or reduce the safety behaviors of managers. Although the methodology included intensive interview procedures to determine important values within the industry, it may be that other values, not assessed in this study, are more important factors in glove use. In addition, situational factors that constrain the link between values and behavior need to be investigated (Ajzen, 1991). Work unit characteristics, such as the availability of safety equipment, need to be incorporated into models of values and safety.

The study has a number of strengths that encourage further investigation of the link between values and safety behavior. The methodology for establishing the content of values was extensive. The study also used information from both managers and employees, thus minimizing response biases that can occur when all measures are obtained from a single source. The field setting of the study enabled assessment of the theoretical processes with managers and employees engaged in meaningful tasks in real business units.

Limitations of the present study that should be addressed in future research include the cross-sectional design of the study, which limits inferences that can be made about causal pathways in the hypothetical model. Longitudinal research will provide stronger evidence for the alternative processes identified in the present study. This study used values scales with extended positive tails to reduce ceiling effects, as suggested by Kristoff (1996). However, the response levels for both values remained relatively high, and these levels may have masked a potential relationship between values and behavior. The use of self-reports to measure behavior has the potential to inflate the relationship between measures of values and perceptions of behavior in the workplace. Although the use of multiple sources of data can help minimize this potential bias, it does not address the within-individual relationship between values and behavior. Future research should include alternative measures of safety behaviors.

The findings from the present study provide a framework for understanding alternative processes through which values and behavior are linked in organizations. Understanding this process is important for developing guidelines for the management of safety and for implementing interventions to increase safe behaviors. More broadly, the goal of value alignment in organizations requires greater understanding of the link between values and behavior across hier-
architectural levels of an organization. Evidence for importance of value internalization, value-behavior consistency, and modeling processes indicates the proposed framework is useful for understanding value alignment processes in organizations.
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