

“HEY, YOU! TAKE A LOOK AT HOW COMPATIBLE NATIONAL CULTURES AND WORK CENTRALITY MIGHT BE! IS IT A COINCIDENCE?”. A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON BETWEEN BRAZILIANS AND GREEKS

“EI, VOCÊ! VEJA COMO AS CULTURAS NACIONAIS E A CENTRALIDADE DO TRABALHO PODEM SER COMPATÍVEIS! SERÁ COINCIDÊNCIA?”. UMA COMPARAÇÃO TRANSCULTURAL ENTRE BRASILEIROS E GREGOS

ANDERSON FABIANO VIEIRA MEDEIROS

andersonfabiano17@hotmail.com
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG)
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9129-9947>

ANDRÉ LUIZ MENDES ATHAYDE

andreluizathayde@outlook.com
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG)
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2109-2130>

A B S T R A C T

Given the need to deepen the understanding of differences in national perceptions of work from a cross-cultural perspective, which remains underinvestigated, this study aimed to analyze work centrality among Brazilians and Greeks. To this end, data from 1,762 Brazilians and 1,200 Greeks were analyzed with statistical correlation and comparison tests, discussing differences in light of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The results showed that age was the sociodemographic characteristic most strongly associated with work-related variables in both countries, suggesting that older individuals tend to attribute greater importance to work. The results also showed that all five work-related variables, taken as a reference for work centrality, presented statistically significant differences between the two countries, suggesting that Greeks value work more than Brazilians. The results proved to be compatible with cultural characteristics. Our argument throughout this paper is that the compatibility between national cultures and work centrality is no coincidence. Thus, we suggest that cultural variables should not be neglected when proposing explanatory models of work centrality. Theoretically, this study proposes how cultural dimensions are likely to associate with work. Concerning practical implications, this research contributes to culturally adapted management processes.

K E Y W O R D S

Importance of work; Meaning of work; Significance of work; Cross-cultural study; Hofstede.

RESUMO

Dada a necessidade de aprofundar a compreensão das diferenças de percepções nacionais sobre o trabalho a partir de uma perspectiva transcultural, que permanece pouco investigada, este estudo objetivou analisar a centralidade do trabalho entre brasileiros e gregos. Dados de 1.762 brasileiros e 1.200 gregos foram analisados com testes de correlação estatística e comparação, discutindo as diferenças à luz das dimensões culturais de Hofstede. Os resultados apontaram a idade como a característica sociodemográfica mais fortemente associada às variáveis relacionadas ao trabalho em ambos os países, sugerindo que indivíduos mais velhos tendem a atribuir maior importância ao trabalho. Todas as cinco variáveis relacionadas ao trabalho, tomadas como referência para a centralidade do trabalho, apresentaram diferenças estatisticamente significativas entre os dois países, sugerindo que gregos valorizam o trabalho mais que brasileiros. Os resultados se mostraram compatíveis com as características culturais. A compatibilidade entre culturas nacionais e centralidade do trabalho não é coincidência. Variáveis culturais não devem ser negligenciadas em propostas de modelos explicativos da centralidade do trabalho. Teoricamente, este estudo sugere como dimensões culturais provavelmente se associam ao trabalho. Em termos práticos, esta pesquisa contribui para processos de gestão culturalmente adaptados.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Importância do trabalho; Significado do trabalho; Significância do trabalho; Estudo transcultural; Hofstede.

INTRODUCTION

Human life consists of various spheres for its fullest enjoyment. Among these spheres, work occupies a prominent place, assuming diverse meanings and varying levels of importance for individuals in society (Mendes & Athayde, 2026). Etymologically, *work* comes from the Latin *tripalium*, which, in the past, referred to an instrument of torture, thus linked to something painful and tiring (Veschi, 2019). With the development of civilization, work has figured as a symbol of power, self-fulfillment, personal growth, status, social change, and a means for survival, among other abundant forms of participation in society (Ribeiro & Léda, 2004).

The expression *work centrality*, concisely, refers to how relevant people consider work to be, the degree of importance they attribute to work compared to other spheres of life (Mendes & Athayde, 2026). Among other meanings, work promotes the appreciation of the individual before society and family, in addition to helping in the formation and discovery of their identity, both professionally and personally (Graebin, Matte, Larentis, Motta, & Olea, 2019).

Work is given varying levels of importance by individuals (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Gai, Sales, & Costa, 2021). The complex, multifaceted, and heterogeneous meaning of work in human life highlights the significant impact that work activity has on the entirety of a person's development, both internally and in their social construction (Satuf & Neves, 2021; Neves, Nascimento, Felix

Jr., Silva, & Andrade, 2018). Given its multiple meanings, work has achieved a significant place in human life (Azevedo, 2020).

The importance individuals place on work is a reflex of the evident role it plays in people's daily lives. Among other benefits, work favors self-realization (Ribeiro & Léda, 2004), social engagement (Albrecht, Green, & Marty, 2021), personal development (Górny, 2018), life satisfaction (Lu, Huang, Bond, & Xu, 2019), and social status (Moura & Oliveira-Silva, 2019).

Numerous studies have investigated work centrality and the various roles it assumes (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Le, Hancer, Chaulagain, & Pham, 2023; Fedrigo, Cerantola, Frésard, & Masdonati, 2023; Gu, Tan, Ho, & Liu, 2022; Nunes, Gonçalves, & Torga, 2022; Satuf & Neves, 2021; Gai, Sales, & Costa, 2021; Popa, Stefan, Albu, Popa, & Vlad, 2020; Mengatto & Camargo, 2019). However, research exploring the importance individuals from different countries place on work and the possible influence of national culture on this assigned importance does not occur with the same frequency (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Caldeira & Athayde, 2024).

Although the topics of work centrality, meanings, and significance are widely explored in the literature under a substantial diversity of theoretical and empirical perspectives (Nunes, Gonçalves, & Torga, 2022; Graebin et al., 2019; Neves et al., 2018; Pereira & Tolfo, 2016; Oliveira, Pérez-Nebra, & Antloga, 2016), studies on such topic under a cross-cultural approach still constitute a gap to be filled (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Le et al., 2023; Gu et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2019). The characteristics of national cultures are factors that may influence how individuals approach work (Jaw, Ling, Wang, & Chang, 2007; Hofstede, 2001). Jaw et al. (2007), for example, demonstrated that several characteristics of workers in the organizational environment reflect national culture.

Hofstede (2001) defines culture as a set of beliefs, values, and thought patterns shared by members of a given society, influencing how they perceive and assign meaning to various aspects of life. He views culture as the collective programming of the mind. Besides sociodemographic and psychological factors (Athayde, Torres, & Thomason, 2023; Athayde, Torres, & Thomason, 2022abc), contextual cultural characteristics are associated with individual values, attitudes, and behavior. Strong theoretical and empirical evidence in the literature points to the possible influence of national culture on individual values, attitudes, and behaviors (Athayde & Salgado, 2026; Athayde & Leal, 2025; Athayde & Oliveira, 2025; Athayde & Pereira, 2024; Athayde & Coutinho, 2023; Athayde & Mota, 2023; Athayde & Rocha, 2022; Athayde & Rocha, 2021; Wang, 2024; Hemesath & Tepe, 2024; Caldeira & Athayde, 2024; Hofstede, 2001). Such pieces of evidence lead us to hypothesize, in this study, that the same may occur with the importance given by individuals to work.

In this context, taking citizens of a developing country and a developed one as the research *locus* for this investigation, the questions that guided this study were: *What are the differences between Brazilians and Greeks regarding the importance they place on work? Are these differences compatible with the characteristics of the national cultures of Brazil and Greece?*

Brazil and Greece were chosen to be contrasted, firstly, because they are considered culturally distinct countries in a series of cross-cultural studies (e.g., Hofstede Insights, 2025). Secondly, Greece was specifically chosen for comparison with Brazil because it occupies the first positions in rankings of nations with the highest average hours worked. For example, according to the ranking of countries whose citizens work the most in the world (World Population Review, 2024),

developed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Greece ranked 4th. Brazil was not included in the referred ranking, since it presents only the 45 countries in the world with the highest rates of hours worked per person per year. Although this ranking was considered when choosing the countries to be contrasted in this study, it is important to emphasize that a country with a high weekly workload does not necessarily indicate that such a country attaches high importance to work.

The choice of Greece remained theoretically relevant because, although long working hours do not automatically imply high work centrality, they represent a relevant behavioral indicator of the social relationship with work and allow for contrasting distinct cultural contexts in terms of values, norms, and occupational dedication. International studies show that the number of hours worked reflects multiple institutional and cultural factors and is useful as a comparative contextual variable, even if conceptually distinct from work centrality (Hofstede, 2001; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023).

The general objective was to analyze work centrality among Brazilians and Greeks. To support the achievement of this objective, the following specific objectives were established: i. to analyze correlations between work centrality among Brazilians and Greeks and their sociodemographic characteristics, such as age, sex, number of children, and levels of education and income; and ii. to discuss possible differences in work centrality in light of the national cultures of Brazil and Greece.

To characterize Brazilian and Greek cultures, we used the six cultural dimensions proposed by Geert Hofstede (2011), considered the most widely adopted in cross-cultural studies (Athayde & Salgado, 2026; Vignoles et al., 2016; Athayde & Torres, 2022): (a) Power Distance, (b) Individualism, (c) Masculinity, (d) Uncertainty Avoidance, (e) Long-Term Orientation, and (f) Indulgence. These dimensions will be detailed in the literature review section and will be used to support the hypotheses raised for empirical testing.

Furthermore, to represent Brazilian and Greek perceptions of work, we used five variables from the World Values Survey (WVS) database, which is a global investigation of changes in individuals' political and sociocultural views. These variables were chosen because they represent the importance the respondents attribute to work, taken as a reference for work centrality. The survey sample consisted of 1,762 Brazilians and 1,200 Greeks, whose secondary data were extracted from the WVS database (, 2025). Further details will be presented in the methodological procedures section.

In theoretical terms, this research can contribute to the advancement of the literature on the topics of work centrality, meanings, significance, and relations from a cross-cultural perspective by highlighting cultural dimensions with the highest potential impact on individual perceptions of work. The findings can contribute to future research that proposes explanatory models of values, attitudes, and behaviors related to work. In practical terms, this research can contribute to the field of human resources management by providing managers and psychologists with evidence on the potential influence of cultural context on the individual-work relationship and its natural implications for employee job satisfaction, self-fulfillment, and professional and personal development.

This study consists of five sections. In addition to this introductory section, which presents the theme, problem, objectives, and rationale, the theoretical framework of the research will be

presented, culminating in the development of theoretically supported hypotheses for empirical testing. Subsequently, the methodological procedures adopted in the study to achieve its objectives will be presented, such as the research design, the database, and the data analysis techniques. The results will then be presented and discussed in light of theory and previous studies on the topic. At last, final remarks will be presented, outlining the study's theoretical and managerial contributions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Work centrality

Work is a topic studied in various academic fields, including Psychology, Economics, Administration, Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology, and Organizational Communication (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Dejours, 2004). It is understood as an activity, whether paid or unpaid, productive or creative, performed for a specific purpose. It is a complex, multifaceted, and polysemic activity that not only allows for but also requires different perspectives to be fully comprehended (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Neves et al., 2018).

Work is a fundamental feature of every society. Depending on how work is socially conceived, it is possible to observe a diversity of practices within social structures that give it meaning. The meaning of work varies over time within a given society. It is a historically dated concept, framed by economic production (Mendes & Athayde, 2026). Work can be paid (e.g., employment contract) or unpaid (e.g., domestic work, childcare, and commuting). The conception of work as an organized and remunerated activity is more recent (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Tersac & Maggi, 2004). Work is an activity that interacts with and is shaped by the community, and therefore, over time, it has taken different paths of involvement in society (Satuf & Neves, 2021).

In this research, the expressions *work meaning* and *work significance* are considered synonymous, and both intersect with *work centrality* (importance given to work), as already adopted in previous studies (e.g., Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Caldeira & Athayde, 2024; Neves et al., 2018). Work can be understood as a multidimensional and dynamic construct, arising from changing personal conditions and the environment in which one lives, generating interactions that complement each other. This definition was proposed by the Meaning of Work International Research Team (MOW Group) (1987), which first contributed to the understanding of the topic worldwide.

According to Moura and Souza (2007), over time, work has acquired numerous meanings directly linked to the historical context. Reinforcing this idea, Duarte and Simões (2015) highlight that the meanings attributed to work are influenced by workers' experiences, giving it a meaning adapted to each reality. Scotta (2024) emphasizes that, even in scenarios where significant inflections in the work model are occurring, as evidenced by the pandemic in 2020 and the implementation of remote and hybrid work in previously non-adopted companies, the influence of work on individuals remains direct, affecting their perception of the environment, engagement, satisfaction, and even their mental health.

Gai, Sales, and Costa (2021) argue that, even with the evolution of work itself, its means, and, especially, its meaning over time, its relevance in people's lives remains. Work activities are almost intrinsically linked to the individual, making it impossible to imagine life without work (Górny, 2018; Kilimnik, Reis Neto, Santos, Malta, & Santos, 2015). From the perspective of Neves et al. (2018, p. 328), "work can be considered one of the fundamental values of human beings". The authors argue that, taking into account self-sustenance, fulfillment, goals and objectives, and the maturation of identity, work can be categorized as elementary because it plays a relevant role in the individual's full sense of life.

Work has such a significant impact on human life that its absence has proven significantly detrimental to one's mental and physical health, potentially triggering a variety of problems, including depression, lack of mental well-being, feelings of helplessness, anxiety, stress, and loss of self-esteem and identity (Paul & Moser, 2009; Bamba, Whitehead, & Hamilton, 2005).

According to Kubo, Gouvêa, and Mantovani (2013), sociodemographic aspects such as sex, education, marital status, contact with religion, union membership, number of children, family income, and life satisfaction can be reflected in different ways in the importance given by individuals to work. The phenomenon of work is a multidisciplinary and expressively rich dimension, as it can be considered an activity that encompasses economic, social, self-esteem, and self-realization goals. This is confirmed by the different theoretical and epistemological approaches and interpretations among researchers on the topic. These approaches aim to provide a solid foundation for the construct of work and its meanings and significance, as there is still no consensus in the literature on the topic (Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Pereira & Tolfo, 2016).

Age-related aspects yield different perceptions of work. Among young people, Graebin et al. (2019) found that the relationship with work places a high value on the experiences acquired. The exchanges established through interpersonal relationships carry higher value and are used to form the individual, causing their identity to be conflated with their occupation, with the social factor being the point of greatest significance. On the other hand, older people find value in seeking reaffirmation since, in work activities, the feeling of usefulness, in addition to redefining their stage of life, distances them from old age and gives them the meaning of being alive, as explained by Mengatto and Camargo (2019) and Marra, Silva, and Valadares (2017).

Studies have shown that work has been taking up more of the workers' lives throughout the day, with high working hours, impacting individual-family relationships and potentially generating an imbalance in individual well-being. For individuals from different countries, national cultures may place different values on work-life balance (Lucia-Casademunt, García-Cabrera, & Cuéllar-Molina, 2015).

According to Haller, Klösch, and Hadler (2023), work is one of the most significant activities for men and women in modern societies. The authors found that behaviors with intrinsic characteristics related to work were stronger in societies with greater equality, given that the fulfillment of labor potential, autonomy, and greater freedom in work-related decisions are provided by a more equitable environment that allows for integral social development. The availability of these factors has removed work from its status as a merely compulsory activity, enabling the development of human capabilities.

Factors such as intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation were highlighted in the study developed by Popa et al. (2020). Motivation plays an important role in job performance. This can be improved in terms of time, effort, and intensity when motivation is high and anchored in individual self-concept. However, according to their study, the fuel for increased motivation may differ for workers in different countries, highlighting the possible effect of national culture on individuals.

Having retrieved some studies on the topic of work centrality, the next section will focus on the characteristics of the Brazilian and Greek national cultures according to Geert Hofstede.

Characteristics of Brazilian and Greek national cultures according to Hofstede

According to Hofstede (2001), the values and behaviors shared by a group of people characterize culture, distinguishing one group from another. Culture is a collective phenomenon that influences patterns of thought and behavior and is reflected in the meaning people attribute to different areas of life, including work. When it comes to national culture, cross-cultural researchers do not generalize that all individuals within a country are similar but rather rely on probability. That is, if an individual is randomly selected from a country, there is a greater likelihood that they will exhibit certain characteristics. This means that cross-cultural researchers recognize the existence of subcultures but treat national cultures as a predominant set of characteristics (Athayde & Salgado, 2026; Mendes & Athayde, 2026; Athayde & Leal, 2025; Athayde & Oliveira, 2025; Athayde & Pereira, 2024; Vignoles et al., 2016), an approach adopted in this study.

Since this research aims to discuss possible differences in work centrality in light of the national cultures of Brazil and Greece, the main characteristics of the national culture of these countries will be presented below, taking as a reference the six cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede (Hofstede, 2011), widely adopted in cross-cultural studies (Vignoles et al., 2016; Athayde & Torres, 2022), and their respective scores indexed on a scale of 0 to 100, with scores below 50 considered low and scores above 50 considered high (Hofstede Insights, 2025).

The first dimension, named Power Distance, reflects how power is distributed in a society. This dimension indicates how members of a society accept that power and privileges are distributed unequally. Countries with a high Power Distance are formed by individuals who, in general, consider it natural and acceptable for some members of society to have more power and privileges than others (Hofstede, 2011).

The second dimension is Individualism, which addresses the degree of interdependence that members of a society maintain with each other. Societies whose members generally identify with larger groups and more open social networks, seeking care in exchange for loyalty, have been termed collectivist. On the other hand, societies whose individuals are encouraged to be proactive and to take care of themselves and their immediate family, focusing on the particularities of the “self”, are defined as individualistic (Hofstede, 2011).

The Masculinity dimension, in turn, refers to the extent to which a society is driven by competition, meritocracy, persistence, achievement, victories, and success. A lower score indicates a society oriented toward collective well-being, collaboration, and quality of life. A high score reflects a masculine society, while a low score corresponds to a feminine society (Hofstede, 2011).

Uncertainty Avoidance is the cultural dimension that expresses the level of discomfort of members of a society in dealing with the idea of the unknown, uncertainty about the future, ambiguity, and risk. Societies with high Uncertainty Avoidance rely on strong control, rules, and beliefs and cling to institutions to mitigate the unpredictability of the future. Conversely, in cultures with low Uncertainty Avoidance, there is greater acceptance of ambiguity and uncertainty, and people are more prone to risk and flexibility (Hofstede, 2011).

The fifth dimension, Long-Term Orientation, concerns how people across cultures manage time, how they view the past, and how they prepare for future challenges. Societies with low scores on this dimension tend to preserve their traditions more, continuing customs, and focusing on the short term. Those with high scores are oriented towards the long term, presenting more adaptive behaviors (Hofstede, 2011).

The last dimension, Indulgence, describes the extent to which people attempt to control the satisfaction of their impulses and desires. Poor control over desires allows concern for tastes to overshadow consequences, leading to an indulgent society. Restraint, on the other hand, focuses on curbing impulses, adhering to more rigid and inflexible social rules and norms. Indulgent individuals tend toward optimism (Hofstede, 2011).

The scores for Brazil and Greece on Hofstede's national culture dimensions (Hofstede Insights, 2025) are summarized in Table I.

Table I - Hofstede's national culture dimensions for Brazil and Greece

Cultural dimension	Brazil	Greece
Power Distance	High (69)	High (60)
Individualism	Low (36)	High (59)
Masculinity	Intermediate (49)	High (57)
Uncertainty Avoidance	High (76)	High (100)
Long Term Orientation	Low (28)	Intermediate (51)
Indulgence	High (59)	Intermediate (50)

Study hypotheses

Based on the literature review on work centrality and Hofstede's Cultural Model (Hofstede 2011), six hypotheses were raised to be tested empirically, described in Table 2, taking as reference Hofstede's six cultural dimensions: Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long-term Orientation, and Indulgence.

Table 2 - Study hypotheses

Hypothesis	Description
H1	Countries with high scores on the Power Distance cultural dimension consider status and power symbols to be very important for indicating social status and communicating respect (Hofstede, 2011), making work a potential symbol of status and power. In this sense, given Brazil's higher score on this dimension compared to Greece, <i>Brazilians place more importance on work than Greeks.</i>
H2	Countries with high scores on the cultural dimension of Individualism consider that success should be based on merit (Hofstede, 2011), thus making work a possible means of achieving merit-based success. In this sense, given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil, <i>Greeks place more importance on work than Brazilians.</i>
H3	Countries with high scores on the cultural dimension of Masculinity consider that people should strive to be the best they can be (Hofstede, 2011), thus making work a possible means to be the best they can be through competitiveness, persistence, and victories. In this sense, given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil, <i>Greeks place more importance on work than Brazilians.</i>
H4	Countries with high scores on the Uncertainty Avoidance cultural dimension are less comfortable with an uncertain future (Hofstede, 2011), and work is therefore a potential means of creating financial and social security in the face of an uncertain future. In this sense, given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil, <i>Greeks place more importance on work than Brazilians.</i>
H5	Countries with high scores on the cultural dimension Long-term Orientation think more about the future, and tend to emphasize planning and present sacrifices in pursuit of future benefits (Hofstede, 2011). This can increase the centrality of work, as work is perceived as the primary means to achieve stability, social progress, and the fulfillment of long-term goals. In this sense, given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil, <i>Greeks place more importance on work than Brazilians.</i>
H6	Countries with low scores on the cultural dimension of Indulgence are marked by restraint of their impulses and a greater adherence to norms and discipline (Hofstede, 2011). Thus, considering that work, in general, requires discipline, control, and adherence to norms, and taking into account that Greece has a lower score on the cultural dimension of Indulgence compared to Brazil, <i>Greeks place more importance on work than Brazilians.</i>

Having presented the study hypotheses, raised with theoretical support, the next section presents the methodological procedures adopted in this research.

METHOD

Concerning the approach to the problem, this is a quantitative study that used statistical tests (Martins; Theóphilo, 2007). Statistical correlation tests were applied at the individual level between the importance given to work by Brazilians and Greeks and their respective sociodemographic characteristics. Furthermore, statistical comparison tests at the national level were adopted for the importance given to work between Brazilians and Greeks. Regarding objectives, this research is classified as explanatory, as it aims to identify reasons capable of determining, at least in part, the occurrence of a phenomenon (Gil, 1999). This study assumes that national culture may influence individuals' work centrality.

The research sample consisted of 1,762 Brazilians and 1,200 Greeks, whose data were extracted from the World Values Survey (WVS) database, a study conducted since the 1980s by social scientists at leading universities around the world on the values of people in various countries regarding diverse topics such as politics, economics, religion, culture, innovation, finance, environment, work, etc. (WVS, 2025).

The WVS survey uses questionnaires or Computer-Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI) as its primary data collection method, ensuring complete anonymity and following scientific sampling procedures (WVS, 2025). Five variables were chosen for analysis, directly linked to the study's object. These variables were chosen among the 294 available in the database because they express the importance given to work by respondents. These variables, as well as the five sociodemographic characteristics, are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 - Study variables

Variable code in the present study	Variable code in the WVS database	Description	Variable type
Importance	Q5	Importance given by respondents to work.	Work-related variables
Hard Work	Q9	Importance given by respondents to encouraging hard work in children.	
Work First	Q41	Respondents' agreement with the statement that work should always come first, even if it means less spare time.	
Future Changes	Q43	Respondents' agreement with the statement that, in the future, less importance will be given to work.	
Success	Q110	Respondents' opinion on the main way to achieve success: hard work vs. luck and connections.	
Sex	Q260	Sex	Sociodemographic characteristics
Age	Q262	Age	
Number of children	Q274	Number of children	
Education	Q275R	Education	
Income	Q288R	Income	

For the question related to the importance given to work (item Q5 of the questionnaire), respondents were asked to rate the importance they give to work on a four-point scale, ranging from 1 (very important) to 4 (not at all important) (*ordinal qualitative variable*).

For the question related to hard work (item Q9 of the questionnaire), respondents were presented with a list of qualities from which they were asked to choose those considered most

important to encourage in children. Participants then had two response options: to mark hard work as one of the qualities that should be encouraged in children or not (*dichotomous nominal qualitative variable*).

Regarding the variable “Work First” (item Q4I of the questionnaire), respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: “Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time”. Response options for this item were on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly agree) to 5 (Strongly disagree) (*ordinal qualitative variable*).

Regarding the variable “Future Changes” (item Q43 of the questionnaire), respondents were asked the following question: “If less importance is given to work in the future, will this be a 1 (Good), 2 (Indifferent), or 3 (Bad thing)?” (*ordinal qualitative variable*).

Finally, for the variable “Success” (item Q110 of the questionnaire), participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a scale ranging from 1 – “Success is the result of hard work more than luck” to 10 – “Success is the result of luck and connections more than hard work” (*ordinal qualitative variable*).

IBM® SPSS® 20.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software was used to support statistical analysis of the data. Following the guidelines of Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the variables were first checked for normal distribution to subsequently adopt the most appropriate statistical correlation and comparison tests (parametric or nonparametric). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests revealed that the data were non-normally distributed. Hence, nonparametric tests were adopted.

Considering the types of variables and following Field’s (2013) guidelines, Table 4 summarizes the statistical tests adopted to analyze the correlation between the sociodemographic characteristics of Brazilians and Greeks and their perceptions of work.

Table 4 - Statistical tests adopted for association between variables

	Sex (Q260)	Age (Q262)	Number of children (Q274)	Education (Q275R)	Income (Q288R)
Importance (Q5)	Mann-Whitney	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman
Hard Work (Q9)	Chi square	Spearman	Spearman	Chi square	Chi square
Work First (Q4I)	Mann-Whitney	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman
Future Changes (Q43)	Mann-Whitney	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman
Success (Q110)	Mann-Whitney	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman	Spearman

Next, to compare Brazilians and Greeks regarding work centrality, considering the types of variables and following Field's (2013) guidelines, Table 5 summarizes the statistical tests adopted.

Table 5 - Statistical tests adopted for comparison between Brazilians and Greeks

Work-related variables	Statistical tests adopted
Importance (Q5)	Mann-Whitney
Work Hard (Q9)	Chi square
Work First (Q41)	Mann-Whitney
Future Changes (Q43)	Mann-Whitney
Success (Q110)	Mann-Whitney

At last, the results were discussed based on Hofstede's Cultural Model and previous studies concerning the importance attributed to work.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characterization of research participants

The Brazilian and Greek samples were comprised of a balanced number of men and women, with a slight predominance of women. The other sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents, including age, number of children, education, and income, are summarized in Table 6. For income and education levels (low, medium, and high), the WVS database does not show the ranges, but mentions that they were contextualized to the reality of each country.

Table 6 - Sociodemographic characteristics of the samples

Sociodemographic characteristics	Brazil (N=1.762)		Greece (N=1.200)	
Sex (Q260)	Male 45.4%	Female 54.6%	Male 46.9%	Female 53.1%
Age (Q262)	Mean 43.56 years		Mean 50.93 years	
Number of children (Q274)	Mean 1.83 children		Mean 1.31 children	

Sociodemographic characteristics	Brazil (N=1.762)	Greece (N=1.200)
Education (Q275R)	Low 42.4%	Low 32.3%
	Intermediate 41.8%	Intermediate 43.8%
	High 15.8%	High 23.9%
Income (Q288R)	Low 40.7%	Low 28.8%
	Intermediate 53.6%	Intermediate 67.2%
	High 5.7%	High 4.0%

Regarding the 3-point scale for educational level (low, intermediate, and high), the WVS database classifies the following as “low”: 0 = “Early childhood education / no education”; 1 = “Primary education”; and 2 = “Lower secondary education”. “Intermediate” includes options 3 = “Upper secondary education”, 4 = “Post-secondary non-tertiary education”, and 5 = “Short-cycle tertiary education”. Finally, “High” includes options 6 = “Bachelor or equivalent”, 7 = “Master or equivalent”, and 8 = “Doctoral or equivalent”.

The Brazilian sample was typically characterized by individuals with an average age of 43.56 years, 1.83 children, low to moderate education, and intermediate income levels. The Greek sample, in turn, was typically characterized by individuals with an average age of 50.93 years, 1.31 children, moderate education, and intermediate income levels.

Table 7, in turn, summarizes the work centrality of the Brazilian and Greek respondents. Because the scale is inverted for the variables Q5, Q41, and I10 in the original database, the lower the means in Table 7 for these variables, the greater the importance given to work.

Table 7 - Brazilian and Greek perceptions of work

Work-related variables	Brazil (N=1.762)	Greece (N=1.200)
Q5 (Importance): Importance given by respondents to work.	Mean: 1.44 Standard Deviation: 0.64 Inverted scale from 1 to 4	Mean: 1.36 Standard-Deviation: 0.64 Inverted scale from 1 to 4
Q9 (Work Hard): Importance given by respondents to encouraging hard work in children.	Important: 55.4% Not important: 44.6%	Important: 74.1% Not important: 25.9%
Q41 (Work First): Respondents' agreement with the statement that work should always come first, even if it means less spare time.	Mean: 2.83 Standard Deviation: 0.90 Inverted scale from 1 to 5	Mean: 2.36 Standard Deviation: 0.94 Inverted scale from 1 to 5
Q43 (Future Changes): Respondents' agreement with the statement that, in the future, less importance will be given to work.	Mean: 2.06 Standard Deviation: 0.87 Scale from 1 to 3	Mean: 2.29 Standard Deviation: 0.88 Scale from 1 to 3
Q110 (Success): Respondents' opinion on the main way to achieve success: hard work vs. luck and connections.	Mean: 4.64 Standard Deviation: 3.49 Inverted scale from 1 to 10	Mean: 5.27 Standard Deviation: 2.46 Inverted scale from 1 to 10

Table 7 shows that, among the five variables chosen to represent work centrality, the Brazilians participating in the research attribute greater importance to work in one variable (Q110), and the Greeks in four (Q5, Q9, Q41, and Q43).

Correlations between sociodemographic characteristics and work centrality

Tables 8 and 9 present the results from the correlation tests between Brazilians and Greeks and their sociodemographic characteristics.

Table 8 - Sociodemographics and work (Brazil)

	Sex (Q260)	Age (Q262)	Number of children (Q274)	Education (Q275R)	Income (Q288R)
Importance (Q5)	Sig: 0.111	Sig: 0.085	Sig: 0.431	Sig: 0.579	Sig: 0.730
Work Hard (Q9)	Sig: 0.165	ρ : -0.131 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.115 Sig: 0.000***	Sig: 0.000***	Sig: 0.010**
Work First (Q41)	Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.260 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.158 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.245 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.055 Sig: 0.025*
Future Changes (Q43)	Sig: 0.098	ρ : 0.144 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.133 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.167 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.076 Sig: 0.002**
Success (Q110)	Sig: 0.969	Sig: 0.959	Sig: 0.417	Sig: 0.778	Sig: 0.056

SOURCE: RESEARCH DATA. NOTE: *STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.05$); **STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.01$); ***STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.001$)

Table 9 - Sociodemographics and work (Greece)

	Sex (Q260)	Age (Q262)	Number of children (Q274)	Education (Q275R)	Income (Q288R)
Importance (Q5)	Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.062 Sig: 0.036*	Sig: 0.135	Sig: 0.332	Sig: 0.074
Work Hard (Q9)	Sig: 0.127	ρ : -0.102 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.085 Sig: 0.003**	Sig: 0.000***	Sig: 0.459
Work First (Q41)	Sig: 0.619	ρ : -0.179 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.105 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.176 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : 0.067 Sig: 0.024*
Future Changes (Q43)	Sig: 0.620	ρ : 0.060 Sig: 0.045*	ρ : 0.119 Sig: 0.000***	ρ : -0.138 Sig: 0.000***	Sig: 0.164
Success (Q110)	Sig: 0.878	ρ : -0.082 Sig: 0.004**	ρ : -0.097 Sig: 0.001***	ρ : 0.072 Sig: 0.013*	ρ : -0.157 Sig: 0.000***

SOURCE: RESEARCH DATA. NOTE: *STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.05$); **STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.01$); ***STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.001$)

Considering both countries together, age was the sociodemographic characteristic most associated with work-related variables (a total of eight correlations identified). This result is noteworthy because, out of the eight correlations identified, seven suggested that older individuals attribute greater importance to work.

It should also be noted that, considering both countries together, most correlation coefficients indicated weak associations (close to 0.1) according to the reference values suggested by Field (2013). In Brazil, the strongest correlations (albeit moderate) were identified between older individuals with lower education and the agreement that work should always come first. In Greece, similarly, the strongest correlations (albeit weak) were identified between older individuals with lower education and the agreement that work should always come first.

As noted, in general, older individuals with lower levels of education attribute greater importance to work. The correlation identified in this study between age and work is consistent with the study by Marra, Souza, Marques, and Melo (2013), in which researchers found that, for older individuals, “work is essential for a healthy and happy life, allowing them to exercise their potential and giving meaning to their lives” (2013, p. 117). Furthermore, these authors highlighted the combative power of working, as it opposes and resists the disabilities that come with time and the feeling of approaching death.

Similarly, Mengatto and Camargo (2019) endorse that work tends to be valued by older individuals, occupying a central position in their lives. This appreciation goes beyond the economic and financial dimension, reaching subjective aspects such as the representation of a healthy life and increased self-esteem. Additionally, Ongaro et al. (2025) found that older workers, compared to younger ones, present greater work engagement.

The intersection between work and older age is also supported by Satuf and Neves (2021). The authors concluded that age influences the meanings of work, such that it tends to become more significant over time, assuming greater centrality over other aspects of life.

Regarding the variable of education, the empirical results of the present study indicated that a lower level of education was associated with greater importance attributed to work. Ferreira, Demutti, and Gimenez (2010) pointed out that work motivation differs across populations with different levels of education, with those with lower levels of education linking the benefits of work to primary life needs such as security.

In this sense, Silva, Kemp, Carvalho-Freitas, and Brighenti (2015) indicated that, for individuals in the process of training or who hold positions requiring little education, work occupies a central position in relation to other essential aspects that permeate life, such as leisure and religion. Additionally, the study by Kilimnik et al. (2015) demonstrated no work centrality in the lives of individuals with a high level of specialization (postgraduate and master’s degrees), with other dimensions of life being identified as more important.

The results of the present research also converged with the study by Oliveira, Pérez-Nebra, and Antloga (2016). According to the authors, for workers in operational positions with low levels of education, work is more relevant for contributing to the achievement of life goals.

Comparison between Brazilians and Greeks regarding work centrality

Having discussed the main correlations between the sociodemographic characteristics of Brazilians and Greeks and their perceptions of work, Table 10 summarizes the work-related variables that presented statistically significant differences ($p < 0.001$) between Brazilians and Greeks.

Table 10 - Comparison between Brazilians and Greeks regarding work

Work-related variable	Significance level
Importance (Q5)	Sig: <0.001*
Work Hard (Q9)	Sig: <0.001*
Work First (Q41)	Sig: <0.001*
Future Changes (Q43)	Sig: <0.001*
Success (Q110)	Sig: <0.001*

SOURCE: RESEARCH DATA. NOTE: *STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ($P < 0.001$)

As shown in Table 10, statistically significant differences ($p < 0.001$) were identified between Brazil and Greece for the five variables used in this study to represent work centrality. Intersecting Table 7 (Brazilian and Greek perceptions of work) and Table 10 (Comparison between Brazilians and Greeks regarding work), the results indicate that, among the five variables, Brazilians attribute greater importance to work in one variable (Q110), and Greeks in four (Q5, Q9, Q41, and Q43).

Thus, we can infer that Brazilians believe, more strongly than Greeks, that success is more a result of hard work than luck and connections. On the other hand, Greeks believe, more strongly than Brazilians, that work is important, that it is one of the qualities to be encouraged in children, that it should always come first, and that, if it were given less importance in the future, this would be a bad thing.

According to Hypothesis 1 (H1) of this research, countries with high scores on the cultural dimension Power Distance consider power symbols to be very important for indicating social status and communicating respect (Hofstede, 2011). In this sense, work could be a potential symbol of status and power. Given Brazil's higher score on this dimension compared to Greece (Hofstede Insights, 2025), it was expected that Brazilians would place more importance on work than Greeks. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 can be considered rejected.

According to Hypothesis 2 (H2), countries with high scores on the cultural dimension of Individualism consider that success should be based on merit (Hofstede, 2011), thus making work a possible means of achieving merit-based success. Given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil (Hofstede Insights, 2025), it was expected that Greeks would place more importance on work than Brazilians. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 can be considered supported.

According to Hypothesis 3 (H3), countries with high scores on the cultural dimension of Masculinity consider that people should strive to be the best they can be (Hofstede, 2011), thus

making work a possible means to be the best they can be through competitiveness, persistence, and victories. Given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil (Hofstede Insights, 2025), it was expected that Greeks would place more importance on work than Brazilians. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 can be considered supported.

According to Hypothesis 4 (H4) of this study, countries with high scores on the cultural dimension Uncertainty Avoidance deal with less comfort with an uncertain future (Hofstede, 2011). In this sense, work could be a potential means for creating financial and social security in the face of an uncertain future. Given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil (Hofstede Insights, 2025), it was expected that Greeks would place more importance on work than Brazilians. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 can be considered supported.

According to Hypothesis 5 (H5), countries with high scores on the cultural dimension Long-term Orientation think more about the future, and tend to emphasize planning and present sacrifices in pursuit of future benefits (Hofstede, 2011). This can increase the centrality of work, as work is perceived as the primary means to achieve stability, social progress, and the fulfillment of long-term goals. Given Greece's higher score on this dimension compared to Brazil (Hofstede Insights, 2025), it was expected that Greeks would place more importance on work than Brazilians. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 can be considered supported.

Finally, according to Hypothesis 6 (H6) of this study, countries with low scores on the cultural dimension of Indulgence are marked by restraint of their impulses and a greater adherence to norms and discipline (Hofstede, 2011). In this sense, considering that work, in general, requires discipline, control, and adherence to norms, and taking into account that Greece has a lower score on the cultural dimension of Indulgence compared to Brazil, it was expected that Greeks would place more importance on work than Brazilians. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 can also be considered supported.

In line with the confirmation of Hypothesis 2 (H2), Individualism refers to the degree of independence enjoyed by members of a society. Members of individualistic cultures are characterized by proactivity and persistence (Hofstede, 2011) and are more easily motivated by emotions endowed with self-awareness due to their focus on the self and their independence (Le et al., 2023). Thus, the greater proactivity and persistence of individualistic people can lead them to centralize work. The appreciation of personal fulfillment and the freedom to pursue one's ideas through work are associated with individual identity, making work a central sphere for the individual (Mengatto & Camargo, 2019).

Lima (2024) points out that individuals who live in culturally more individualistic environments have a more entrepreneurial vision and see themselves as responsible for their employability and achievement of success, generating more autonomy for their actions and internalizing greater value to what is particular, as evidenced by Greece in this study.

Regarding Hypothesis 3 (H3), the Greek population's higher score on the Masculinity dimension indicates that Greeks are more driven by competition, achievement, and pursuit of success than Brazilians (Hofstede Insights, 2025). Thus, these characteristics can foster the appreciation of a successful career, fulfillment, and professional growth, placing work at a higher level of importance than other spheres of life.

Moura and Oliveira-Silva (2019) identified characteristics such as goal achievement, professional fulfillment, and a desire for status related to the centrality of work. These attributes are notably linked to Masculinity. Professional achievements linked to career recognition, positions of greater respect, increased performance, and ideas of self-promotion emphasize the cultural dimension of Masculinity.

Lu et al. (2019) have already demonstrated that a focus on work is characteristic of cultures that strongly value high performance. Severo et al. (2017), in turn, found in their study that individuals who value their professional careers and constantly seek success and recognition consider work as a primary activity in life, in addition to using it as an option to accumulate wealth.

In line with the confirmation of Hypothesis 4 (H4), regarding Uncertainty Avoidance, Greece attributes greater importance to work than Brazil. This is likely due to the way Greek society deals with things that are inherently unpredictable. Avoiding an uncertain future leads to creating mechanisms to minimize ambiguous situations, eliminate uncertainty, and allow people to have greater control over life's events. Work, therefore, is a possible means for creating this security.

Lucia-Casademunt, García-Cabrera, and Cuéllar-Molina (2015) found that countries with higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance, such as Greece in this study, can benefit workers more in the workplace. In these cultures, central dimensions of life, such as work and family, increase well-being and, consequently, improve worker performance. The adequacy of these dimensions reduces insecurity for individuals.

In line with the confirmation of Hypothesis 5 (H5), Alipour (2021)'s study showed that societies with a higher Long-term Orientation tend to favor investments and decisions focused on the future, reinforcing the logic of valuing continuous and strategic work effort.

At last, according to Hypothesis 6 (H6), the opposite of Indulgence is Restriction. Restriction is typical of societies whose members ponder the consequences of their impulses, which enables them to attach to routines, norms, and discipline that characterize work in general.

Therefore, it is clear that the results of this research indicated considerable compatibility between cultural characteristics and perceptions of work, which reinforces the importance of exploring the topic of work centrality from a cross-cultural perspective, considering cultural dimensions as possible predictors of the importance attributed by individuals to work.

FINAL REMARKS

The first question guiding this study was: *What are the differences between Brazilians and Greeks regarding the importance they place on work?* Thus, theoretically, the novelty of this research lies in demonstrating that Brazilians believe, to a greater extent than Greeks, that success is more a result of hard work than luck and connections. On the other hand, Greeks believe, more strongly than Brazilians, that work is important, that it is one of the qualities to be encouraged in children, that it should always come first, and that, if it were given less importance in the future, this would be a bad thing.

The second guiding question of the study was: *Are these differences compatible with the characteristics of the national cultures of Brazil and Greece?* The results of this study showed high compatibility between work centrality and national culture characteristics. This research proposes that Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance are negatively associated with work centrality, whereas Individualism, Masculinity, Long-term Orientation, and Indulgence are positively associated with work centrality.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature about work relations, its centrality, meanings, and significance, enriching, with a cross-cultural analysis, a topic that permeates the daily lives of almost the entire global population. Furthermore, theoretically, it provides data that can support future research on work centrality. Concerning practical implications, this research can contribute to understanding the best management processes to employ with groups of workers in a culturally adapted manner, and, consequently, their potential impact on motivation, satisfaction, and personal and professional development.

Thus, intersecting work centrality and national cultures allows for the development of people management policies that are more culturally compatible. For example, motivational practices can be adapted to the culture. Reward, recognition, and professional development systems can be adapted to the national cultural profile. Such insights provide a scientific basis for designing more effective, customized, and culturally intelligent management strategies that combine well-being and organizational results.

It is relevant to note that this study does not claim that national culture is the sole or primary reason for work centrality. Rather, this research seeks to highlight the importance of considering cultural variables in attempts to understand values, attitudes, and behaviors related to work within society. Cultural dimensions were not adopted in this study as predictive variables in the statistical tests, but were used as theoretical support for discussing the empirical results regarding perceptions of work.

This study explored perceptions of work, taking as a reference the five variables contained in the WVS database directly related to the research object. This means that the results could be different if other variables or a larger number of variables were available. Therefore, we suggest that future studies explore other variables related to work and compare the Brazilian reality with that of other culturally distant countries. Furthermore, other cultural characteristics can be added to enrich the discussion provided by Hofstede's cultural dimensions, such as patriarchy, paternalism, and the Brazilian way of life (*jeitinho brasileiro*) in Brazil.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L., Green, C. R., & Marty, A. (2021). Meaningful Work, Job Resources, and Employee Engagement. *Sustainability*, 13, 1-14.
- Alipour, A. (2021). What matters for the future? Comparing Globe's future orientation with Hofstede's long-term orientation. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 28(4), 734-759.
- Athayde, A. L. M., Salgado, S. V. A. (2026). Intersections between national culture and innovation: theoretical-empirical gaps in the international literature. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*. Accepted paper.

- Athayde, A. L. M., Leal, A. C. R. (2025). People's (un)concern about the environment: A discussion in light of Brazilian and American national cultures. *International Business and Management Review - Internext*, 21(1), 1-22. doi: 10.18568/internext.795
- Athayde, A. L. M., Oliveira, M. I. R. (2025). As culturas nacionais têm a ver com a (des) igualdade de gênero no trabalho? Uma comparação entre o Brasil e os Estados Unidos da América. *Desenvolvimento Regional em debate - DRd*, 15:271-297. doi: 10.24302/drd.v15.4897
- Athayde, A. L. M., Pereira, A. A. (2024). Características individuais de inovação: uma comparação transcultural entre o Brasil e a China. *Administração de Empresas em Revista*, 1, 1-34. <https://revista.unicuritiba.edu.br/index.php/admrevista/article/view/6579> Access on June 1st 2026.
- Athayde, A. L. M., Coutinho, H. I. S. (2023). Innovation individual characteristics: a cross-cultural comparison between Brazilians and Americans. *Revista de Administração, Sociedade e Inovação - RASI*, 9(1), 11-24. doi: 10.20401/rasi.9.1.665
- Athayde, A. L. M., Mota, M. A. P. (2023). Environmental values: Cross-cultural comparison between Brazil and USA. *Pretexto*, 24, 9-24. <https://revista.fumec.br/index.php/pretexto/article/view/9390> Access on: June 1st 2026.
- Athayde, A. L. M., Torres, C. V., Thomason, S. J. (2023). Sociodemographics and Guidance Sources at Work: A Comparison Between Brazil and the United States. *Revista Gestão & Conexões*, 12(1), 72-91. doi: 10.47456/regec.2317-5087.2023.12.1.38663.72-91
- Athayde, A. L. M., Rocha, G. A. F. (2022). Finanças pessoais: uma comparação transcultural entre o Brasil e os Estados Unidos. *Reuna*, 27, 1-24. <https://portaldeperiodicos.animaeducacao.com.br/index.php/reuna/article/view/49795> Access on: June 1st 2026.
- Athayde, A. L. M., Torres, C. V., Thomason, S. J. (2022a). Dark personality traits and the use of sources of guidance at work: a comparison between the United States and Brazil. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*, 15(2), 200-215. doi: 10.5902/1983465965100
- Athayde, A. L. M., Torres, C. V., Thomason, S. J. (2022b). Personal values and the use of sources of guidance at work: A comparison between the United States and Brazil. *Revista de Administração, Contabilidade e Economia da Fundace - RACEF*, 13(2), 100-118. doi: 10.13059/racef.v13i2.858
- Athayde, A. L. M., Torres, C. V., Thomason, S. J. (2022c). Psychological profile and sources of guidance at work. *Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração*, 16(2), 14-28. doi: 10.12712/rpca.v16i2.55133
- Athayde, A. L. M., Rocha, G. A. F. (2021). The influence of sociodemographic characteristics on personal finance: a cross-cultural comparison between the United States and Brazil. *Revista Eletrônica de Administração e Turismo - REAT*, 15, 40-64. doi: 10.15210/reat.v15i2.21128
- Athayde, A. L. M. & Torres, C. V. (2022). Employees' use of sources of guidance at work: a cross-cultural comparison between the United States and Brazil. *Internext*, 17, 1-21.
- Azevedo, A. M. (2020). Trabalho com significado e sentido de vida: um estudo com líderes empresariais. *Sociologia: Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto*, 40, 57-74.
- Bambra, C., Whitehead, M., & Hamilton, V. (2005). Does "Welfare-to-Work" Work? A Systematic Review of the Effectiveness of Welfare-to-Work Programmes in the UK. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 59(1), 83-89.
- Caldeira, S. F. & Athayde, A. L. M. (2024). A importância dada ao trabalho: uma comparação transcultural entre o Brasil e os Estados Unidos. *Revista de Carreira Pessoas - ReCaPe*, 14(3), 467-487.
- Dejours, C. (2004). Subjetividade, trabalho e ação. *Revista Produção*, 14(3), 27-34.
- Duarte, J. M. G. & Simões, A. L. de A. (2015). Significados do trabalho para profissionais de enfermagem de um hospital de ensino. *Revista Enfermagem UERJ*, 23(3), 388-394.
- Fedriga, L., Cerantola, M., Frésard, C. E., & Masdonati, J. (2023). Refugees' Meaning of Work: A Qualitative Investigation of Work Purposes and Expectations. *Journal of Career Development*, 50(1), 52-68.
- Ferreira, A., Demutti, C. M., & Gimenez, P. E. O. (2010). A Teoria das Necessidades de Maslow: A Influência do Nível Educacional Sobre a sua Percepção no Ambiente de Trabalho. *Anais... XIII SemeAD – Seminários em Administração*, 1-17.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. London: Sage Publications.
- Gai, M. J. P., Sales, S. S., & Costa, V. M. F. (2021). Sentidos e significados do trabalho: perspectivas e teóricas epistemológicas. *Revista Caribeña de Ciencias Sociales*, 10(7), 173-187.
- Gil, A. C. (1999). *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Atlas.

- Górny, M. (2018). The importance of work in human life and development. The consequences of unemployment. *Refleksje*, 18, 51-64.
- Graebin, R. E., Matte, J., Larentis, F., Motta, M. E. V. da, & Olea, P. M. (2019). O significado do trabalho para jovens aprendizes. *Revista Gestão Organizacional*, 12(1), 17-38.
- Gu, M., Tan, C. M., Ho, Y. S., & Liu, L. (2022). Work-family conflict and happiness: the moderating role of national culture. *Evidence-based HRM*, 10(3), 293-311.
- Haller, M., Klösch, B., & Hadler, M. (2023). The Centrality of Work: A Comparative Analysis of Work Commitment and Work Orientation in Present-Day Societies. *Sage Open*, 13(3), 1-19.
- Hemesath, S. & Tepe, M. (2024). Multidimensional preference for technology risk regulation: The role of political beliefs, technology attitudes, and national innovation cultures. *Regulation & Governance*, 18(4), 1-20.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind*. 1. ed. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Hofstede Insights. (2025). *Country Comparison Tool*. Available at: <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison-tool?countries=brazil%2Cnetherlands>. Access on: 24 mar. 2025.
- Jaw, B. S., Ling, Y. W., Wang, C. Y. P., & Chang, W. C. (2007). The impact of culture on Chinese employees' work values. *Personnel Review*, 36(1), 128-144.
- Kilimnik, Z. M.; Reis Neto, M. T., Santos, G. S. dos, Malta, V. D., & Santos, M. F. (2015). O significado do trabalho: um estudo com professores de administração em uma universidade. *Revista Lugares de Educação*, 5(11) 3-27.
- Kubo, S. H., Gouvêa, M. A., & Mantovani, D. M. N. (2013). Dimensões do significado do trabalho e suas relações. *Pretexto*, 14(3), 28-49.
- Le, L. H., Hancer, M., Chaulagain, S., & Pham, P. (2023). Reducing hotel employee turnover intention by promoting pride in job and meaning of work: A cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 109, 1-10.
- Lima, J. C. (2024). Sobre empreendedorismo e cultura do trabalho. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 39, 1-18.
- Lu, Q., Huang, X., Bond, M. H., & Xu, E. H. (2019). Committing to Work at the Expense of Other Life Pursuits: The Consequence of Individuals' Relative Centrality of Work Across Job Types and Nations Differing in Performance Orientation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 50(7), 848-869.
- Lucia-Casademunt, A. M., García-Cabrera, A. M., & Cuéllar-Molina, D. G. (2015). National culture, work-life balance and employee well-being in European tourism firms: the moderating effect of uncertainty avoidance values. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 11(1), 62-69.
- Marra, A. V., Silva, T. R., & Valadares, K. M. (2017). O significado do trabalho na aposentadoria gerencial feminina. *Caderno Espaço Feminino*, 30(2), 1-19.
- Marra, A. V., Souza, M. M. de, Marques, A. L., & Melo, M. C. de O. (2013). Significado do trabalho e envelhecimento. *Revista Administração em Diálogo*, 15(2), 103-128.
- Martela, F., Gómez, M., Unanue, W., Araya, S., Bravo, D., & Espejo, A. (2021). What makes work meaningful? Longitudinal evidence for the importance of autonomy and beneficence for meaningful work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 131, 1-15.
- Martins, G. & Théóphilo, C. (2007). *Metodologia da investigação científica para ciências sociais aplicadas*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Mendes, M. V. M. & Athayde, A. L. M. (2026). Intersecções entre cultura nacional e centralidade do trabalho: proposição de modelo teórico. In Bicalho, L. M. A. et al. (Ed.), *História em Movimento: Gênero, Identidade, Memória e Transformações Históricas* (pp. 115-128). Aurum Editora. doi: 10.63330/livroautor382026-008
- Mengatto, A. P. de F. & Camargo, D. de. (2019). O Programa Sênior da UFPR e o significado do trabalho para aposentados. *Interação em Psicologia*, 23(3), 379-391.
- Moura, A. R. & Oliveira-Silva, L. C. (2019). Centralidade do trabalho, metas e realização pessoal: intersecções entre trabalho e carreira. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 20(1), 1-27.
- Moura, L. R. de & Souza, W. J. de. (2007). Elementos do trabalho voluntário na Pastoral da Criança: características e motivos. *Holos*, 3, 150-160.
- Mow International Research Team. (1987). *The meaning of working*. New York: Academic Press.
- Neves, D. R., Nascimento, R. P., Felix Jr., M. S., Silva, F. A. da, & Andrade, R. O. B. de. (2018). Sentido e significado do trabalho: uma análise dos artigos publicados em periódicos associados à Scientific Periodicals Electronic Library. *Cadernos Ebape.br*, 16(2), 318-330.

- Nunes, T. S., Gonçalves, J., & Torga, E. M. M. F. (2022). Precarização e Função Social: análise dos significados do trabalho de docentes da pós-graduação. *Avaliação*, 27(1), 68-90.
- Oliveira, M. K., Pérez-Nebra, A. R., & Antloga, C. S. (2016). Relação entre significado do trabalho e rotatividade de serventes de limpeza. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 16(2), 190-202.
- Ongaro, J. D., Greco, P. B. T., Morais, B. X., Rossato, G., Andolhe, R., & Magnago, T. S. B. de S. (2025). Fatores associados ao engajamento no trabalho de servidores públicos do sul do Brasil. *Revista Mineira de Enfermagem - REME*, 29, 1-11.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - OECD (2023). *Hours worked*. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/hours-worked.html?layoutName=main_body_1&metadataElementIds_main_body_1=23&metadataElementValues_main_body_1=business&utm_source=chatgpt.com. Access on May 29 2026.
- Paul, K. I. & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 264-282.
- Pereira, E. F. & Tolfo, S. da R. (2016). Estudos sobre sentidos e significados do trabalho na psicologia: uma revisão das suas bases teórico-epistemológicas. *Psicologia Argumento*, 34(86), 302-317.
- Popa, I., Stefan, S. C., Albu, C. F., Popa, S. C., & Vlad, C. (2020). The impact of national culture on employees' attitudes toward heavy work investment: comparative approach Romania vs. Japan. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 22(14), 1014-1029.
- Ribeiro, C. V. dos S. & Leda, D. B. (2004). O significado do trabalho em tempos de reestruturação produtiva. *Estudos e Pesquisa em Psicologia*, 4(2), 76-83.
- Satuf, C. & Neves, J. A. B. (2021). A influência de fatores demográficos e estruturais nos significados do trabalho entre brasileiros: evidências do World Values Survey. *Opinião Pública*, 27(2), 476-508.
- Scotta, G. (2024). A importância da cultura organizacional no ambiente remoto. *Saber Humano*, 1(1), 7-31.
- Severo, E. A., Ceolin, C. C., Guimarães, J. C. F. de, Souza, I. R. A. de, & Decesaro, L. (2017). O significado do trabalho para as gerações X e Y no sul do Brasil. *Revista Perspectivas Contemporâneas*, 12(2), 4-18.
- Silva, G. C. da, Kemp, V. H., Carvalho-Freitas, M. N., & Brighenti, C. R. G. (2015). Significado do trabalho voluntário empresarial. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 15(2), 157-169.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Tersac, G. de & Maggi, B. (2004). O trabalho e a abordagem ergonômica. In: Daniellou, F. (Ed.). *A ergonomia em busca de seus princípios. Debates epistemológicos*. São Paulo: Edgard Blucher.
- Veschi, B. (2019). *Etimologia de Trabalho. Etimologia origem do conceito*. Available at: <https://etimologia.com.br/trabalho/>. Access on: 12 nov. 2024.
- Vignoles, V. L. et al. (2016). Beyond the "East-West" Dichotomy: Global Variation in Cultural Models of Selfhood. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(8), 966-1000.
- Wang, T. (2024). Exploration of the Inheritance and Innovation Carrier of National Culture in the Teaching Model of Art Design Major in Higher Vocational Colleges: Integrating Lijiang Baisha Murals into Higher Vocational Art Design Curriculum System. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 8(1), 165-172.
- World Population Review (2024). *Most Overworked Countries 2024*. Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/most-overworked-countries>. Access on: 26 nov. 2024.
- World Values Survey – WVS (2025). *Online data analysis*. Available at: <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>. Access on: 24 mar. 2025.