HKUST SPD - INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY

Title

Authors

Source

Version

DOI

Publisher

Copyright

This version is available at HKUST SPD - Institutional Repository (<https://repository.ust.hk/ir>)

If it is the author's pre-published version, changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published version.

A Cultural Orientation Approach to Work Orientation:
Mongolian Workers' Jobs, Careers, and Callings

Jiyoung Park¹, Yeeun Choi², Melody M. Chao³, Uurtsaikh Beejinkhuu⁴, Young Woo Sohn⁴

1st submission: February 19, 2021

2nd submission: July 13, 2021

3rd submission: July 21, 2021

2021. *Journal of Career Development*

Published version can be accessed here:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/08948453211040811?journalCode=jcldb>

¹Psychological Department, Duksung Women's University, Seoul, Korea. ²Department of Psychology, University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA. ³Department of Management, Department of Management, School of Business and Management, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Kowloon, Hong Kong. ⁴Department of Psychology, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jiyoung Park, 33 Samyang-ro 144-gil, Duksung Women's University, Seoul, South Korea, 06974, jiyoungpark@duksung.ac.kr

The authors declare no competing interests.

Note. This is the authors' final copy before publication but may not exactly replicate the final published version. It is not the copy of record.

ABSTRACT

Culturally held beliefs about the self and its relations with others affect the way individuals view their work. In this study, we examined the associations between individualism-collectivism and the three work orientations (i.e., viewing work as a job, a career, or a calling). We also investigated whether the positive effects of a calling orientation can be generalized to a developing eastern country, Mongolia. Using a sample of 352 Mongolian workers, we found that those endorsing horizontal collectivism tended to view their work as a calling more than as a job or a career. Mongolians with a calling orientation reported having better satisfaction with job, salary, and life, more work meaningfulness, and less turnover intention than those viewing work as a job or a career. The results suggest that cultural orientations and work orientations are intertwined, and positive roles of a calling orientation are generalizable to Mongolia.

Keywords: work orientation, individualism-collectivism, calling orientation, Mongolia, satisfaction

A Cultural Orientation Approach to Work Orientation:

Mongolian Workers' Jobs, Careers, and Callings

Introduction

People have different orientations toward work: as a job, a career, or a calling (Bellah et al., 1985; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Some view their work as a *job*, or a necessity to support life. Some view their work as a *career*, or an opportunity for growth. Others view their work as a *calling*, or as a means of fulfilling higher values and meaning in life (Bellah et al., 1985; Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Although viewing work as a calling rather than a job or a career has been considered beneficial across cultures (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), work orientations that capture beliefs about the role of work in life (Rosso et al., 2010; Wrzesniewski, 2012) are affected by cultures (Baumeister, 1991; Wrzesniewski, 2012).

The Work as Calling Theory (WCT) was the first integrative theory that captures the process in which calling affects job outcomes and suggests the roles of cultures on the process. According to the theory, those who view their work as a calling enter into an environment that matches them well and these fit perceptions lead to better work-related well-being and job performance via more work meaningfulness and more chances to live out their callings. Culture is suggested to influence the fit perceptions such that certain cultural orientations might match better for calling (Duffy et al., 2018). In particular, individualism-collectivism that refers to how one construes the self in relation to the others in the society (Triandis et al., 1990) can shape values toward work, self, and society (Cross et al., 2011), and the cultural orientation contributes to fit perceptions toward certain work orientations (Duffy et al., 2018). Some studies found subtle cultural differences in strength and nature of

calling between collectivistic and individualistic cultures (Douglass et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2015), but how individualism-collectivism relates to work orientation has yet been examined. Investigating how individualism-collectivism relates to a calling orientation would extend the WCT by specifying cultural influences on the endorsement of work orientations. .

The Sociocultural Context of Mongolia

The literature on work orientations to date has been conducted in WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; Henrich et al., 2010) cultures, in which a calling orientation is socially desirable. Studying calling in Mongolian context contributes to understanding whether the impacts of calling is generalizable beyond WEIRD settings, as Mongolia possesses attributes that might counter the positive effects of a calling orientation found in the existing literature.

Mongolia is neither grouped as individualism nor collectivism. Studies revealed beneficial roles of viewing work as a calling in Asian countries, such as South Korea (Park et al., 2016) and China (Zhang et al., 2015). These countries traditionally belong to farming and agricultural communities that value collectivism (Triandis, 1996), which overlaps with a prosocial component of a calling orientation (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Although Mongolia is geographically proximal to China and South Korea, Mongolia's long-standing herding activities do not require much conformity or cooperation, but encourage individualistic values such as independence (Uskul et al., 2008). Farming communities emphasize social compliance, but herding societies tend to be more individualistic rather than collectivistic (Uskul et al., 2008). In addition, Mongolian nomadic social relations are based on egalitarianism (Seeberg, 2018). Thus, it is unclear whether the findings from South Korean and Chinese can be generalized to Mongolian cultures despite their geographic proximity.

Industrialization and democratization might also shape the impacts of work

orientations. Although Mongolia is experiencing industrialization, Mongolian industrialization has evolved over time. Mongolians have adopted diverse economic practices, and contemporary Mongolian society has both capitalists' and noncapitalists' economic features (Ichinkhorloo, 2018). Capitalism tends to increase societal emphasis on individual pursuit of success at work (Kim & Park, 2013) and relates to national cultures high in hierarchy and mastery (Schwartz, 2007). Thus, arguably, those with a career orientation would feel more congruent with such cultures, but viewing work as a calling might be less beneficial due to its conflicts with the societal values (Duffy et al., 2018). Accordingly, people with a career orientation would thrive in an increasingly competitive environment characterized by industrialization; however, those with a calling orientation might feel frustrated (Gandal et al., 2005). Additionally, although the society is democratic in nature, it is also seen as clan-based due to its historical connections with nomadism, clans, and soviet rules (Seeberg, 2018). In a democratic society characterized by more occupational choices and mobility, the perceived capacity to choose occupation might increase the positive effects of a calling orientation (Duffy et al., 2018).

Adding to the complexity, religion such as Christianity (Baumeister, 1991; Thompson & Bunderson, 2019) and historical background (Kim & Park, 2003) such as Confucianism idealize commitment to labor. These may lead calling to be construed as a virtue. However, Mongolia's historical and religious background differs from such cultures as the majority of Mongolians practice Buddhism (The World Bank, 2013). Taken together, Mongolia's socio-cultural features offer a context that presents a mixed desirability of work orientations, thus providing an ideal context to examine the associations between cultural orientation and calling orientation, and the impacts of a calling orientation.

Individualism-Collectivism and Work Orientations

To investigate the effects of individualism-collectivism on work orientations, four types of

individual-level individualism-collectivism (i.e., horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism, and vertical collectivism; (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) were used. People espousing horizontal individualism (HI) want to be unique and distinct from other groups, but they are not interested in acquiring status, while people espousing vertical individualism (VI) wish to be distinct from others and want to obtain higher status in competing with others (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). People with horizontal collectivism (HC) emphasize common goals and interdependence and do not submit to authority, while people espousing vertical collectivism (VC) underline the integrity of the in-group and subject to the will of authorities of the in-group (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

HV would be positively related to the likelihood of a calling orientation while it would be negatively related to the likelihood of having a job orientation. Collectivists pay more attention to others and take others' perspectives in decision making, and experience socially engaging emotions (Cross et al., 2011). Such cognitive and affective consequences of collectivism may influence the development of a calling orientation (Bellah et al., 1985; Douglass et al., 2016). Among two types of collectivism, we expect that HC would be particularly relevant to a calling orientation. The prosocial nature of a calling orientation (Dik & Duffy, 2009) is more aligned with HC, which emphasizes equality, as opposed to vertical collectivism, which emphasizes hierarchy among group members (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Those with a calling orientation do not necessarily obey the authorities of the in-group and submit their personal goals for the sake of in-group goals, which is a characteristic of VC. Also, a study with racially diverse college students ascertained HC was more strongly and positively related to interconnectedness (Hartung et al., 2010).

On the contrary, those with a job orientation focus on the material benefits of their work. However, they are neither interested in advancing their careers (Gandal et al., 2005) nor zestful for their work (Peterson et al., 2009). For them, work is just a means to earn

money (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Researchers theorized and found a calling and a job orientations are statistically opposite on the ends of one continuum (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Those who do not value their work tend to feel less attached to their organization and people around them (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), which contradicts HC. Workers with a job orientation are loosely tied with their work physically and mentally (Webster & Edwards, 2019; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), and these attitudes would be negatively associated with HC. Based on these findings, we expected that HC would be positively related to the likelihood of having a calling orientation while it would negatively be related to the likelihood of having a job orientation.

For those with a career orientation, the value of work is contingent on the quantified benefits, and their success is calculated by corporate position and span of control (Bellah et al., 1985). Career orientations relates to characteristics of individualism such as independence and competitiveness, as people with a career orientation strive for limited resources such as status (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) and emphasize achievement values (Gandal et al., 2005). Among the two dimensions of individualism, VI may be more closely related to a career orientation than HI. Whereas VI was positively related to status striving (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) and power (Torelli & Shavitt, 2010), HI was characterized as self-direction, freedom, and independence (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). VI also has shown positive associations with work preferences for prestige and management (Hartung et al., 2010), which characterizes a career orientation. Thus, we expect VI would be positively related to the likelihood that an individual will view their work as a career orientation.

Hypothesis 1: HC would be positively related to the likelihood that an individual will endorse a calling orientation than a job and a career orientations and would be negatively related to the likelihood that an individual will endorse a job orientation than a calling orientation (H1a), and VI would be positively related to the likelihood that an individual will

endorse a career orientation than a calling orientation (H1b).

Work Orientations and Life and Work Attitudes

According to the WCT, one key element that perceiving a calling leads to positive outcomes is work meaningfulness (Duffy et al., 2018). Work meaningfulness refers to the amount of personal significance people attach to their work (Steger et al., 2012). Although work meaningfulness and a calling are related, they are distinct and a calling is suggested to precede work meaningfulness (Duffy et al., 2018; Hirschi, 2012). Certain job characteristics such as task complexity affect work meaningfulness, but perceiving a calling is independent of job types and job characteristics (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Those with a calling derive meaning and purpose from their work (Duffy et al., 2018), and they believe their work ties closely to their life meaning, which of them may lead to more work meaningfulness. In contrast, those with a career orientation primarily focus on their self-interest, and their level of work meaningfulness is limited due to a lack of interest for others. Individuals with a job orientation tend to find their meaning outside the work setting (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), which may result in lower work meaningfulness.

Hypothesis 2: People with a calling orientation would report a higher level of work meaningfulness than those with a job and a career orientation.

Intentions are statements regarding specific behavior of interests, and individuals' intention to leave has been found a major predictor of actual turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993). The WCT suggests that those with a calling orientation tend to seek a job and organization that supports their calling, and would feel more congruent with their job and organization (Duffy et al., 2018). These congruent and satisfying states tend to decrease employees' intention to leave their organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Also, those who perceive work as a calling try to carry out obligations for the family, organization, and society (Zhang et al., 2015), and these intentions motivate them to persist in challenging situations and decrease

their turnover intention (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). However, those with a career orientation are motivated to achieve higher ranks to satisfy their needs for achievement and power (Baumeister, 1991), but opportunities to advance up the organizational hierarchy are limited. Due to external constraints, they derive less meaning from work (Duffy et al., 2018) and more likely to leave their organization than those with a calling orientation (Mantler et al., 2021). Based on these, we expect those with a calling orientation would report lower turnover intention than those with a job or a career orientation.

Hypothesis 3: People with a calling orientation would report a lower level of intention to leave than those with a job and a career orientation.

Viewing work as a calling enables individuals to focus on goals and carry out their calling, which ultimately leads to satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2018; Hall & Chandler, 2005). Those with a calling feel that their work contributes to the greater good and the sense of fulfillment increases satisfaction in diverse domains such as job, life, and even salary (Douglass et al., 2016; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). The positive effects of endorsing a calling on diverse types of satisfaction have been supported across cultures and occupations (Douglass et al., 2016; Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Based on these, we expect more satisfaction job, salary, and life would be reported by Mongolian workers with a calling than those with a career or a job orientation.

Hypothesis 4: People with a calling orientation would report more satisfaction with life, work, and salary than those with a job and a career orientation.

Method

Participants and procedures

We recruited participants using a nonprofit research institute in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. The institute aims to spread psychology knowledge in Mongolian society by conducting survey and share the results. The institute has built their own social network in diverse organizations.

For this study, the institute sent emails that include survey links and the purpose of the research to the HR Team of their partner organizations. The HR team forwarded the emails to the employees of the corresponding organizations. We recruited a total of 255 participants online. All these participants had bachelor's degrees, which partly reflects societal characteristics: Mongolia's higher education enrollment rate is approaching 80% (Postiglione, 2015), and Mongolians with higher education are more accessible through online platforms (The World Bank, 2013). To include more diverse workers with a wider range of social and economic backgrounds, we also conducted another survey. After obtaining permission from three organizations—the National Police Academy, the Air Force, and a private bank—we recruited workers in relatively low occupational statuses such as building cleaners, chauffeurs, and cooks and conducted paper-and-pencil surveys. A research assistant who is fluent in Mongolian visited each organization, explained the purpose of the study, and administered the surveys using the face-to-face method. Ninety-seven participants complete the paper-and-pencil surveys, and they consist of 76 building cleaners, 12 company car drivers, and nine cooks. We obtained informed consent from all the participants, maintained the confidentiality of the survey results, and all the respondents participated in the surveys voluntarily. Furthermore, when conducting the pen-and-pencil survey, we tried to protect the participants from possible adverse consequences of declining the survey and explained the meaning of the consent form one by one.

Taken together, a total of 352 Mongolian workers participated in this study. Eighteen participants (5.11%) did not report demographic variables although they completed all the other items. According to Little's Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test, there were no systematic patterns found in the missing data, $X^2(36) = 30.03, p = .748$. Of the 337 participants, there was 64.1% of female and ranged in age from 17 to 62 years ($M = 33.45, SD = 8.67$). The average tenure was 4.97 years ($SD = 4.61$). The percentages of participants

in monthly income groups were as follows: 25.0% below MNT (Mongolian tögrög) 500,000 (approximately \$200); 51.4% MNT 500,000–1,000,000 (approximately \$200–\$410); 12.8% MNT 1,000,000–1,500,000 (approximately \$410–\$620); 4.0% MNT 1,500,000–2,000,000 (approximately \$620–\$830); and 2.6% over MNT 2,000,000 (\$830). 69.3% bachelor's degree or above, 15.2% vocational college degree, 5.4% high school degree, and 10.1% elementary school degree.

When comparing demographic factors between the two subsamples (i.e., online survey, offline survey), workers collected through the online survey are younger (online: $M = 31.63$, $SD = 7.66$; offline: $M = 37.77$, $SD = 9.45$), and more educated (online: $M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.37$; offline: $M = 2.22$, $SD = .95$). Also, the offline group shows a higher male ratio (61.9%) than the offline group (25.4%), $X^2(1) = 41.16$, $p < .001$, and tenure and working hours did not differ between the two groups. Given that the two subsamples differ in several demographic characteristics, we have controlled for the effects of the subsamples in the following analyses. The results with and without using sample as a control were similar.

Measures

We applied a back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1970) with complementary translation techniques such as qualitative feedback from potential research participants (Sperber, 2004). English version of the measures was first translated into Mongolian by a qualified bilingual expert (Cha et al., 2007), a native Mongolian professor in the English language department of a Mongolian university. Then, a Mongolian graduate student in the psychology department back-translated the measures (Brislin, 1970). After reviewing and comparing the translated version of the measures with back-translated items by the research team, the Mongolian professor and the Mongolian graduate student revised and finalized the survey. Before conducting the survey, we received qualitative feedback from ten Mongolian workers, who were from the same population as the potential research participants (Sperber, 2004), who

worked in the research institute, but did not participate in the actual study.

Work orientations. Three paragraphs that describe Job, Career, and Calling (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) were used to measure the work orientations. Participants were asked to score how much they are similar with each description with a scale ranging from “very much,” “somewhat,” “a little,” and “not at all like me” (scored 3-0). As in previous studies (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), the respondents were divided into one of the three groups (i.e., Job, Career, and Calling) based on the highest scores of the three. The scale had been used with workers across social statuses and occupations, and was a valid predictor of career satisfaction (Mantler et al., 2021), job satisfaction, and life satisfaction (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

Individualism-collectivism. Individualism-collectivism was measured with an established 16 item measure (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Each cultural dimension includes four items and we used the 16 items. Sample items include, “I’d rather depend on myself than others (HI),” “Winning is everything (VI),” “If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud (HC),” and “Parents and children must stay together as much as possible (VC).” The items were measured with 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Prior research found the scale was reliable across cultures (α = .66 ~ .88 in Torelli & Shavitt, 2010) and a valid predictor of career aspiration (Sawitri & Creed, 2017). The reliabilities of the scale in this study were .60, .70, .77, and .81 for HI, VI, HC, and VC respectively.

Work meaningfulness. Work meaningfulness was measured with a 10-item measure developed by Steger and colleagues (2012). Prior research found the scale was reliable (α = .90 in Hirschi, 2012) and a valid predictor of work engagement (Hirschi, 2012) and organizational commitment (Steger et al., 2012). We used the 10 items and the items were rated on 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) and a sample item includes, “I understand how my work contributes to my life’s meaning” and. The reliability

for this measure in this study was .90.

Intention to leave. The degree to which people want to leave their organization was measured with an established 4-item measure (Bamber & Iyer, 2002; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Prior studies found that the scale was reliable ($\alpha = .90$ in Bamber & Iyer, 2002) and had significant correlations with person-organization fit and job satisfaction (O'Reilly et al., 1991). A sample item is, "To what extent would you prefer another more ideal job than the one you now work in?". Respondents were asked to respond each item on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*). The reliability of the scale was .81.

Satisfaction with life, job, and salary. We used three general items to measure satisfaction with life ("I am satisfied with my life"), job ("I am satisfied with my work"), and salary ("I am satisfied with my salary") (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Prior research found that these scales were reliable (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) and a single-item of life satisfaction had associations with overall and mental health (Cheung & Lucas, 2014) and a single-item of job satisfaction had a positive correlation with job performance (Yousef, 2000). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*).

Demographical variables. Based on prior research (Peterson et al., 2009; Vianello et al., 2020; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) that showed relationships between work orientations and demographics, we measured age, gender, tenure, and educational level.

Results

All the analyses in this study were conducted using SPSS 25. We first conducted the bivariate correlations among the study variables (Table 1). Although we treat the work orientations as categorical variables in this study, we present bivariate correlations using the Likert values of work orientations for ease of comparison with previous studies conducted in western cultures (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Among the three work orientations, there was no significant association between a job and a calling orientations, but a negative

correlation between a career and a calling orientations was found in this study. The results are inconsistent with American workers' association between calling and job ($r = -.52$, in Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). The correlations between cultural orientations and work orientations showed that HC had a positive correlation with a calling, but a negative correlation with a job. VI was positively correlated with a career orientation. The other correlations between cultural orientations and work orientations were not significant.

To examine differences among work orientations, we divided participants into three groups ($n = 20$ for Job, $n = 165$ for Career, $n = 95$ for Calling), in accordance with participants' highest ratings of each orientation (Mantler et al., 2021; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). The results showed that 58.9% of Mongolian respondents saw themselves as having a career orientation, and 34.0% of them had a calling orientation, and only 7.1% saw themselves as having a job orientation. Similar to prior studies (Mantler et al., 2021; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), we found that a small portion of participants indicated that the same scores for more than one orientation.

Individualism-Collectivism and Work Orientations

To examine Hypotheses 1a and 1b, we conducted a multinomial logistic regression using forward entry (Albert & Anderson, 1984). The predicting variables include four types of individualism-collectivism (i.e., HI, VI, HC, VC), and demographical variables. The dependent variables were the three work orientations, which were treated as categorical variables according to the participant's highest ratings on the work orientation. Those who rated two or more orientations the same were excluded from multinomial analysis and subsequent ANCOVA analyses, thus we used data based on 280 participants in the two analyses. Among 280 participants, 264 participants reported the demographic variables, resulting in the total number of participants ranges from 264 to 280. We set the calling orientation group as a reference group to see whether people select a calling orientation over

a job or a career orientation based on individualism-collectivism and demographic attributions.

Table 2 shows the results of multinomial logistic regression to indicate the predictive role of cultural orientation and demographic variables on work orientations. The coefficients represent log odds of having a job or career orientation relative to having a calling orientation. That is, a calling orientation was used as the reference group. HC was found to relate to the work orientation. Specifically, when calling is set as a reference group, HC was negatively associated with participants' selection of a job orientation over a calling orientation ($b = -1.97, p < .000$). Furthermore, HC negatively associated with individuals' selection of a career orientation over a calling orientation ($b = -.86, p = .004$). The results indicate that Mongolian workers with HC were likely to endorse a calling more than a job and a career, supporting Hypothesis 1a. However, VI did not significantly relate to the likelihood that an employee will endorse a career orientation compared to a calling ($b = .04, p = .835$), thus Hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Work Orientations and Life and Work Attitudes

To examine Hypotheses 2~4, we conducted one-way, between-subjects ANCOVAs and compared the differences in life and work attitudes among the work orientations after controlling for the effects of survey type (Table 3). Results showed that calling respondents had significantly higher work meaningfulness than job ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.68$) and career ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.70$) respondents, which supports Hypothesis 2. Career respondents also perceived more work meaningfulness than job respondents ($p = .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.92$). Career respondents also perceived more work meaningfulness than job respondents ($p = .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.92$). Similarly, calling respondents reported lower intention to leave than those with a job ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.31$) and a career orientation ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.04$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Regarding Hypothesis 4, calling respondents had significantly higher job satisfaction compared to job ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 1.04$) and career respondents ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = .73$). Although income levels between a career and a calling orientation did not differ ($p = .244$), calling respondents were more satisfied with their salary than those with a career orientation ($p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.52$), but calling respondents' salary satisfaction did not differ from those with a job ($p = .061$). People with a calling were also more satisfied with their life than those with a job ($p = .007$, Cohen's $d = 0.67$) and a career orientations ($p = .029$, Cohen's $d = 0.34$). Due to results of salary satisfaction, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

Discussion

This study extends the WCT by connecting individualism-collectivism and work orientations, and examining the roles of work orientations in the Mongolian context. This is the first study to explore the role of individualism-collectivism on work orientations. Linking cultural orientations and the WCT, the findings showed that cultural orientations can be incorporated in the WCT as possible antecedents of work orientations. As expected, those endorsing HC is more likely to view their work as a calling, and less likely to view work as a job. For those with HC, concerns for others and contributing to a greater good beyond the self might be more accessible, viewing work as a calling. Unexpectedly, the association between VI and a career orientation was not supported. This may be partly due to HC's relatively stronger effect on calling versus other orientations and the significant bivariate correlations among the cultural orientations. In addition, this might also be due to how status and power are interpreted depending on cultural orientations: HC is associated with power with prosocial goals of helping others whereas VI is associated with power with personal goals of advancing one's status and prestige (Torelli & Shavitt, 2010). The results suggest that HC as well as VI might affect a career versus calling endorsement, and what distinguishes a career from a calling might be more influenced by HC than VI.

Regarding work meaningfulness, we found that those with a calling perceive their work more meaningful than those with a job and a career. The differences in work meaningfulness were particularly distinct depending on work orientations: calling being the highest, career being in the middle, and job being the lowest. The WCT posits work meaningfulness is a critical pathway in which perceiving a calling promotes well-being and performance. Although research has found that the positive effects of calling on work attitudes are explained by increased work meaningfulness (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Hirschi, 2012), little research has examined why a job and a career orientation are related to less positive outcomes. Lower work meaningfulness may account for the differences. However, unlike previous findings (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), the participants were not evenly distributed across the three work orientations in this study. Thus, findings on the differences in work meaningfulness and its effect sizes require cautious interpretations.

Viewing work as a calling rather than a job or a career also relates to less turnover intention. The findings suggest that a calling orientation relates not only to attitudes toward work, but attitudes toward an organization, in line with previous findings (Cardador et al., 2011; Mantler et al., 2021). As the WCT argues, those with a calling orientation seek environment that matches with their values and increases likelihood of living out calling in their current organization, which may result in lower intention to leave. In developing countries such as Mongolia, retaining employees is a critical factor for organizational success (Suifan et al., 2017; Tumwesigye, 2010). Existing studies in developing countries so far have focused on how the perceptions about an organization (Suifan et al., 2017) and attitudes toward organization such as organizational commitment (Tumwesigye, 2010) are related to turnover intention. In this study, focusing on individuals' view toward work, viewing work as a calling rather than a job or a career can be one factor that affects turnover intention.

Consistent with prior findings (Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), those

with a calling orientation are more satisfied with job, salary, and life than those with a career or a job orientation, which suggests that the WCT can be applied in Mongolian culture. Some researchers note that financial barriers may weaken the positive effects of viewing work as a calling (Douglass et al., 2016). However, in Mongolia, despite the potential financial barriers individuals might face in a developing country, viewing work as a calling relates to more satisfaction with their job and life.

Our investigation of the three work orientations also provides insights into culture-specific aspects of the three work orientations. Unlike previous findings using American workers (Mantler et al., 2021; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), the difference between a job and a career orientation is not as stark as the differences between a calling and the other orientations in this study. The findings may be partly due to cultural differences and uneven number of participants in each group. In this study, the largest group was a career orientation group. The rapid social and economy transition might have led Mongolians to rank career goals as top priorities (Pearson & Chatterjee, 1999) and this background might affect more endorsement of a career orientation. Endorsing a career orientation would be more likely in contexts where opportunities to advance their status exist and achieving these is desirable. The existing studies also found that young workers (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997) and economic students who value power and achievement (Gandal et al., 2005) tend to view work as a career more than a job or a calling. In this study, a job orientation respondent group is the smallest group. The small percentage of a job orientation and the adverse repercussions of viewing work as a job may be attributed to the role of interpersonal relatedness in a collectivistic society. Although we cannot be certain, the correlations among the four types of cultural orientations among Mongolian workers are similar to those participants from collectivistic cultures (Chiou, 2001). Because collectivist individuals place emphasis on values that promote the welfare of in-group (Triadis et al., 1990), explicit endorsement of a

job orientation may not be viewed as socially desirable.

Our findings suggest practical implications. First, individual HC is associated with seeing work as a calling, which ultimately leads to more work meaningfulness, satisfaction, and less turnover intention. In a context that encourages a calling orientation, promoting endorsement of HC throughout the selection and training process might contribute positively to organizational outcome. Second, career counselors and HR managers should take applicants' work orientations into consideration to understand their well-being, work meaningfulness, and retention in Mongolian cultures. When counseling with clients with a career or a job orientation, helping them identify their view toward work and discern the concept of a calling orientation through workshops (e.g., Dik & Steger, 2008) might be useful in enhancing job satisfaction, work meaningfulness, and turnover intention.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The results of this study should be considered in light of its limitations. First, although we adopted a stringent translation procedure to ensure accuracy, the scales used in this study had yet to be validated in Mongolian. Future research should validate the constructs used in this study and investigate how Mongolians define work orientations. In particular, we should note that HI showed low reliability in this study; thus, findings related to HI need to be interpreted with caution and the effects of cultural orientations on work orientation might not be generalized to other cultural contexts. Although we found HC had the same effects on work orientations even after excluding HI, we encourage more research on how HI is interpreted to Mongolian workers and whether the effects of individualism-collectivism on work orientations would be found among other cultural and occupational groups.

Second, we used single-item measures of satisfaction with life, job, and salary. Although one-item measures are less preferable for many researchers, research indicates that single instruments are as valid as those with multiple items (Cheng & Lucas, 2014; Yousef,

2000), and our measures are adopted from prior research that we aimed to compare. Despite that, research that includes multiple items of satisfaction would be helpful in better understanding work orientations and their relations with different facets of well-being.

Lastly, although we used Mongolian workers with diverse backgrounds, we did not measure specific occupations and the (non)response rates of particular occupation type. Even within the same organization, occupations and job characteristics can differ, and these can affect work orientations. Lacking information about (non)response rates hinder us from understanding the potential impact of social desirability of the respondents, as respondents in certain occupation might be more (or less) reluctant to respond to questions related to work orientation questions. Future research that provides more details of respondents would aid a better understanding of work orientations in Mongolian cultures.

Conclusion

Why do people have different views toward work, and are these views universal? To date, theory and research on the three work orientations have been generated and tested mainly in developed countries and cultural factors that affect the endorsement of work orientations have been rarely explored. This research shows that the way people see themselves concerning others impacts the way they view their work. Mongolian workers who value interpersonal harmony tend to view their work as a calling rather than a job and a career. Consistent with previous findings, viewing work as a calling rather than viewing work as a career and a job is more beneficial to workers in this study. This research illustrates the role of individuals' cultural orientations and the beneficial roles of a calling orientation that could be generalized to Mongolia.

References

- Albert, A., & Anderson, J. A. (1984). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates in logistic regression models. *Biometrika*, 71(1), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/71.1.1>
- Bamber, E. M., & Iyer, V. M. (2002). Big 5 auditors' professional and organizational identification: Consistency or conflict? *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 21(2), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.2308/aud.2002.21.2.21>
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Meanings of life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. University of California Press Berkeley.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135910457000100301>
- Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(1), 32–57. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2009.54.1.32>
- Cardador, M. T., Dane, E., & Pratt, M. G. (2011). Linking calling orientations to organizational attachment via organizational instrumentality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 367–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.009>
- Cha, E.-S., Kim, K. H., & Erlen, J. A. (2007). Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: Issues and techniques. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 58(4), 386–395.
<https://doi.org/10/d7ghqk>
- Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2014). Assessing the validity of single-item life satisfaction measures: Results from three large samples. *Quality of Life Research*, 23(10), 2809–2818. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0726-4>

- Chiou, J.-S. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(5), 667–678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600580>
- Cross, S. E., Hardin, E. E., & Gercek-Swing, B. (2011). The what, how, why, and where of self-construal. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(2), 142–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310373752>
- Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2009). Calling and vocation at work: Definitions and prospects for research and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(3), 424–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316430>
- Dik, B. J., & Steger, M. F. (2008). Randomized trial of a calling-infused career workshop incorporating counselor self-disclosure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(2), 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.04.001>
- Douglass, R. P., Duffy, R. D., & Autin, K. L. (2016). Living a calling, nationality, and life satisfaction: A moderated, multiple mediator model. *Journal of Career Assessment, 24*(2), 253–269. <https://doi.org/10/gf6dj9>
- Duffy, R. D., Dik, B. J., Douglass, R. P., England, J. W., & Velez, B. L. (2018). Work as a calling: A theoretical model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 65*(4), 423–439. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000276>
- Gandal, N., Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2005). Personal value priorities of economists. *Human Relations, 58*(10), 1227–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726705058911>
- Hall, D. T., & Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(2), 155–176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.301>
- Hartung, P. J., Fouad, N. A., Leong, F. T., & Hardin, E. E. (2010). Individualism-collectivism: Links to occupational plans and work values. *Journal of Career*

- Assessment*, 18(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072709340526>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hirschi, A. (2012). Callings and work engagement: Moderated mediation model of work meaningfulness, occupational identity, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(3), 479–485. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028949>
- Ichinkhorloo, B. (2018). Collaboration for survival in the age of the market: Diverse economic practices in postsocialist Mongolia. *Central Asian Survey*, 37(3), 386–402.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2018.1501347>
- Kim, A. E., & Park, G. (2003). Nationalism, Confucianism, work ethic and industrialization in South Korea. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 33(1), 37–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00472330380000041>
- Mantler, J., Campbell, B., & Dupré, K. E. (2021). Jobs, Careers, and Callings: Exploring Work Orientation at Mid-Career. *Journal of Career Development*,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453211022845>
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487–516. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256404>
- Park, J., Sohn, Y. W., & Ha, Y. J. (2016). South Korean salespersons' calling, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 24(3), 415–428.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715599354>
- Pearson, C. A., & Chatterjee, S. R. (1999). Work goals in a country in transition: A case study of Mongolian managers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(5), 324–334.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910286146>

Peterson, C., Park, N., Hall, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2009). Zest and work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.584>

Postiglione, G. (2015). Mongolia's challenge: Becoming Asian in higher education. *International Higher Education*, 60, 20-21. <https://doi.org/10/gf6d5s>

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001>

Sawitri, D. R., & Creed, P. A. (2017). Collectivism and perceived congruence with parents as antecedents to career aspirations: A social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Career Development*, 44(6), 530–543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316668576>

Seeberg, M. (2018). Democratization in clan-based societies: Explaining the Mongolian anomaly. *Democratization*, 25(5), 843–863. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1425294>

Sperber, A. D. (2004). Translation and validation of study instruments for cross-cultural research. *Gastroenterology*, 126, S124–S128. <https://doi.org/10/bhtjmt>

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(3), 322–337. <https://doi.org/10/gdj4wj>

Suifan, T. S., Diab, H., & Abdallah, A. B. (2017). Does organizational justice affect turnover-intention in a developing country? The mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(9), 1137–1148. <https://doi.org/10/gf6dkm>

Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural and individual value correlates of capitalism: A comparative analysis. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(1), 52-57.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701388963>

The World Bank (2013). *Social indicator sample survey*. Retrieved February 2019, from

<https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/2535>

Thompson, J. A., & Bunderson, J. S. (2019). Research on work as a calling... and how to make it matter. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 421–443. [http:// doi/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015140](http://doi/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015140).

Torelli, C. J., & Shavitt, S. (2010). Culture and concepts of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(4), 703-723. [http:// doi/10.1037/a0019973](http://doi/10.1037/a0019973)

Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist*, 51(4), 407-415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.4.407>

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 1006-1020. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.1006>

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118>

Tumwesigye, G. (2010). The relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of organisational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(6), 942–952. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM.9000626>

Uskul, A. K., Nisbett, R. E., & Kitayama, S. (2008). Ecoculture, social interdependence, and holistic cognition: Evidence from farming, fishing, and herding communities in Turkey. *Communicative & Integrative Biology*, 1(1), 40–41. <https://doi:10.4161/cib.1.1.6649>

Vianello, M., Galliani, E. M., Rosa, A. D., & Anselmi, P. (2020). The developmental

- trajectories of calling: Predictors and outcomes. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 28(1), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072719831276>
- Webster, B. D., & Edwards, B. D. (2019). Does holding a second job viewed as a calling impact one's work at the primary job? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 114, 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.02.010>
- Wrzesniewski, A. (2012). Callings. In K. S. Cameron, & G. M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 45–55). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2162>
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6–24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-0759\(00\)00006-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-0759(00)00006-1)
- Zhang, C., Dik, B. J., Wei, J., & Zhang, J. (2015). Work as a calling in China: A qualitative study of Chinese college students. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 23(2), 236–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072714535029>

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Study Variables*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
(1) Job	0.72	0.95	-													
(2) Career	1.91	0.95	.15**	-												
(3) Calling	1.57	1.08	-.08	-.28**	-											
(4) Age	33.42	8.67	-.07	-.23**	.15**	-										
(5) Tenure	4.96	4.61	-.02	-.12*	.03	.51**	-									
(6) Income	2.03	0.92	-.20**	-.08	.13*	.07	.11*	-								
(7) Life satisfaction	4.12	0.97	-.20**	-.08	.15**	.06	.02	.06	-							
(8) Job satisfaction	3.93	1.04	-.23**	-.16**	.40**	.07	.01	.16**	.44**	-						
(9) Salary satisfaction	2.92	1.29	-.18**	-.18**	.20**	-.04	-.12*	.16**	.34**	.40**	-					
(10) Work meaningfulness	3.83	0.82	-.28**	-.14**	.37**	-.06	.00	.19**	.41**	.74**	.44**	-				
(11) Intention to leave	2.70	1.00	.20**	.35**	-.40**	-.25**	-.08	-.11	-.30**	-.52**	-.37**	-.51**	-			
(12) Horizontal Collectivism	4.38	0.61	-.18**	-.05	.14*	.07	.13*	.04	.34**	.37**	.18**	.38**	-.25**	-		
(13) Vertical Collectivism	4.57	0.59	-.06	-.03	-.01	.15**	.15**	-.06	.32**	.20**	.07	.15**	-.10	.41**	-	
(14) Horizontal Individualism	3.92	0.67	-.00	.09	-.02	.19**	.18**	.02	.16**	.06	.05	-.01	.07	.25**	.26**	-
(15) Vertical Individualism	3.78	0.77	-.03	.16**	.09	.02	.04	-.01	.16**	.17**	.16**	.13*	-.02	.25**	.25**	.47**

Note. $N = 337\sim 352$, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 2*Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses on Predicting Work Orientations Based on Individualism-Collectivism*

Variable	Job versus Calling					Career versus Calling				
	B (SE)	Odds Ratio	95% CI	Wald	Sig.	B (SE)	Odds Ratio	95% CI	Wald	Sig.
Age	.02 (.04)	.32	.95, 1.09	.01	.573	-.05* (.02)	5.28	.91, .99	.95	.022
Tenure	.08 (.07)	.06	.96, 1.22	1.08	.203	.02 (.04)	.28	.95, 1.10	1.02	.594
Income	-1.02* (.45)	.45	.15, .87	.36	.024	-.20 (.16)	1.60	.60, 1.11	.82	.207
Educational Level										
Bachelor and above	.08 (1.22)	.00	.10, 11.80	1.08	.950	-.35 (.52)	.24	.26, 1.94	.70	.497
Vocational college	.83 (1.29)	.42	.18, 29.03	2.30	.519	-.73 (.64)	1.29	.14, 1.70	.48	.256
High school	.29 (1.57)	.04	.06, 28.94	1.34	.851	-.79 (.80)	.97	.10, 2.17	.45	.324
Elementary school ^a										
Cultural orientation										
Horizontal Collectivism	-1.97*** (.55)	12.85	.05, .40	.14	<.001	-.86 (.30)**	8.21	.24, .76	.42	.004
Vertical Collectivism	-.26 (.54)	.24	.27, 2.20	.77	.625	.45 (.31)	1.22	.77, 2.56	1.40	.269
Horizontal Individualism	1.00 (.57)	3.07	.89, 8.24	2.71	.080	.38 (.24)	2.40	.91, 2.34	1.46	.121
Vertical Individualism	-.44 (.52)	.72	.23, 1.78	.65	.397	.04 (.21)	.04	.69, 1.58	1.05	.835

Note. $N = 264\sim 280$. ^a Reference group; CI = confidence interval; sig. = significance; All df for Wald value is 1. $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 3

ANCOVA Results, Means, Standard Deviations, and Mean Differences of Job, Career, and Calling Orientations

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	η_p^2	Job orientation (<i>n</i> = 20)	Career orientation (<i>n</i> = 165)	Calling orientation (<i>n</i> = 95)
Paragraph ratings						
Job	2	103.49***	.43	2.70 (0.47)	0.55 (0.70)	0.33 (0.63)
Career	2	156.23***	.53	1.40 (0.75)	2.52 (0.60)	0.99 (0.79)
Calling	2	258.46***	.65	0.60 (0.75)	0.89 (0.73)	2.75 (0.46)
Demographics						
Age	2	7.00***	.05	38.37 ^{ab} (12.08)	31.52 ^{aa} (6.92)	34.76 ^{ba} (9.06)
Income	2	3.04	.02	1.53 ^{ba} (0.84)	1.98 ^{bb} (0.80)	2.19 ^{ab} (1.08)
Tenure	2	1.71	.01	6.43 ^{bb} (6.44)	4.55 ^{bb} (3.92)	5.43 ^{bb} (4.76)
Life/Job attitudes						
Work meaningfulness	2	22.89***	.14	3.02 ^{aa} (0.70)	3.70 ^{aa} (0.77)	4.22 ^{aa} (0.73)
Intention to leave	2	39.21***	.22	3.28 ^{ba} (0.94)	3.02 ^{ba} (0.91)	2.08 ^{aa} (0.89)
Job satisfaction	2	18.78***	.12	3.25 ^{ba} (1.29)	3.72 ^{ba} (0.98)	4.41 ^{aa} (0.91)
Salary satisfaction	2	8.44***	.06	2.65 ^{bb} (1.39)	2.77 ^{ba} (1.23)	3.43 ^{ba} (1.30)
Life satisfaction	2	6.30**	.04	3.75 ^{ba} (1.12)	4.12 ^{bb} (0.89)	4.42 ^{ab} (0.85)

Note. *N* = 264~280. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. The two superscripts (*a*: significant, *b*: non-significant) denote whether there are statistically significant mean differences compared with the other two orientations (The order of the superscripts is the other orientations from left to right in the same row, $p < .05$, two-tailed). * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$;

*** $p < .001$.