8

Can Intentions to Emigrate be Explained through Individual Values? An Exploratory Study in Lithuania

Vilmantė Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, Audra I. Mockaitis, Jurga Duobienė, Ineta Žičkutė, and Vilmantė Liubinienė

Introduction

Global changes and developments increased the international demand for skilled and specialized labor (Fernando & Cohen, 2016). The flexibility of the labor market in the European Union and the Schengen area has led to increased internal migration in these regions (e.g., 1.9 million people who previously resided in one EU member state migrated to another EU member state in 2017 [Eurostat, 2020]). Millions of people work abroad every year resulting from migration, expatriation, or short overseas assignments. Therefore, finding a skilled, specialized foreigner in an organization is no longer exceptional (Dang et al., 2020).

When people migrate, they move between societies that can have different value systems (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011). Therefore, the value differences

V. Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė (✉) • J. Duobienė • I. Žičkutė • V. Liubinienė
Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania
e-mail: vilmante.kumpikaite@ktu.lt; jurga.duobiene@ktu.lt; ineta.zickute@ktu.lt; vilmante.liubiniene@ktu.lt

A. I. Mockaitis
Maynooth University, Maynooth, Ireland
e-mail: audra.mockaitis@mu.ie

A. I. Mockaitis (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Migration in International Business*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38886-6_8

between locals and migrants could pose different challenges at work and in the daily life of migrants. However, Bhugra (2004) points out that it does not matter what migration reasons are and when individuals migrate abroad for economic, political, or educational purposes; their cultural and ethnic identity is likely to change. Previous studies have focused on the values of migrants and value change. Several authors (e.g., Alba & Nee, 2009; Bardi et al., 2014; Leong, 2013; Lönnqvist et al., 2011, 2013; Rudnev, 2014; Tartakovsky, 2009) have investigated value changes and provided insights on how the values of immigrants change in the process of immigration, and what value system immigrants hold after some years of life in the new country. Others (e.g., Bobowik et al., 2011; Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al., 2020; Tartakovsky et al., 2017) have compared migrants with the non-migrant population in the destination country or their country of origin. Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al. (2020) highlighted that values differ significantly between people who have migration experience and intention to migrate in relation to citizens who do not have such experience or intention to move.

Studies have long highlighted challenges that international employees face within organizations due to their different cultural backgrounds and values (Perlstein & Ciuk, 2019; Kim et al., 2018), and the challenges that organizations face in managing multinational teams of employees (Mockaitis et al., 2018; Zander et al., 2012), as well as local firms (Makkonen, 2016). Some knowledge about the types of values that are tied to decisions to emigrate can help to understand if and how values might change during the migration or acculturation process in a new host country, and also provide a baseline for assessing these differences. In this chapter, we examine the relationship between individual-level cultural values and individuals' intentions to emigrate. We apply the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992, 2006a, 2012) in Lithuania, which is known as one of the most emigrating countries in the European Union (Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, 2019a). In fact, its rates of emigration were so high that between 1990 and 2018, every sixth citizen left the country (Migration in numbers, 2020).

The structure of this chapter consists of a theoretical background that describes push and pull factors that motivate migration values in the context of migration. We next present the research method followed by the empirical research results, and finally, we discuss the findings and future research directions.

Theoretical Background

Push and Pull Factors in the Decision to Emigrate

Although our focus is on cultural factors affecting the migration decision, much attention is given in the literature to a range of individual, social, and economic factors, with a focus on the institutional environments of countries as drivers of migration. The conventional push-pull models in migration research represent these socioeconomic factors that motivate people to migrate (Van Hear et al., 2018; Ojeda-Gonzalez et al., 2018). *Push factors* are factors that stimulate people to leave their country of origin, and *pull factors* are those factors that attract individuals to a destination country or region (Lee, 1966). In studies on Lithuania, Kumpikaitė and Žičkutė (2012) and Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al. (2017) identified the pull factors that are most important for Lithuanian emigrants. Among the most important were factors related to employment opportunities and financial stability, followed by factors that ease transition into a host society, such as the existence of a large ethnic community in the host country, and having relatives in the host country.

Push-pull factors have the opposite mirror image in both countries; for example, the low wage is a factor pushing from the country of origin and a higher wage in the destination country is a pull factor. Piore (1971) has argued that pull factors in host countries and primarily in developed countries are more important than push factors in the country of origin. Poire claimed that migrants flow from poorer to richer countries because of the labor market pulling a labor-intensive workforce. Push-pull theories have been criticized for their overly simplistic approach to migration, as they might only skim the surface in explaining the decision to migrate (and do not explain the process) (de Haas, 2021). But in this study, we are interested more in explaining the reasons for migration rather than the process per se. We also understand that lists of push-pull factors are insufficient in themselves in explaining migration intentions. But understanding the context is important; that is, we should understand the institutional context of our sample country, as well as the wider migration context, as Lithuania has long been a country of migrants.

The Lithuanian Migration Context

Lithuania is a former Soviet republic that gained its independence in 1990 and joined the European Union in 2004. It is held to be one of the most emigrating countries in the EU; its population decreased by almost 890,000

during its independence and almost 700,000 due to emigration in 1990–2018, resulting in a population of less than 2.8 million (Migration in numbers, 2020). Only since 2019 has Lithuania begun experiencing positive net migration.

Previous studies (see Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, 2019a; Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė & Žičkutė, 2017) revealed that the main push factors on Lithuanian emigrants were economic, such as (1) low wages, (2) personal life conditions, (3) income inequality, and (4) price levels of products. However, non-economic push factors, such as wishing for a change in life and family reasons also were important factors for migration. Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė and Žičkutė (2017) highlighted following five main pull factors fostering migration of Lithuanians: (1) higher income in the host country, (2) relatives living in the host country, (3) the possibility of self-development, (4) better job opportunities, and (5) self-realization.

Different destination countries and migration reasons have been attracting Lithuanians since 1990. Before Lithuanian accession to the EU, the United States was the most attractive destination for Lithuanians, as it was before World War II (Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė & Žičkutė, 2017). Germany and the UK were also preferred for their levels of economic development and language (during the Soviet regime, Lithuanians primarily studied Russian as their first language and English or German as their second). When Lithuania joined the European Union in 2004, the United Kingdom became the top destination country until 2017, when most settled migrants remained, but and the uncertainty of Brexit put off potential new migrants (Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, 2019b). While the USA lost its popularity after 2004, the popularity of the Scandinavian countries grew. During 2010–2019, the largest numbers of Lithuanians emigrated to the UK, Ireland, Norway, Germany, Russia, the USA, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands (Migration in numbers, 2020). Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė (2019a) analyzed the various pull factors in the main destination countries for Lithuanians (UK, Norway, Germany, and Ireland) and highlighted that economic factors were of highest importance (higher income, better job opportunities) for most emigrants, as well as opportunities for personal development. Family reasons were also high on the list, while in the UK, language was also a key determinant. Although the order of importance of these factors differed slightly among countries, economic pull factors were a priority.

Values in the Context of Migration

Values affect perception and attitudes and guide people's behavior (Boer & Fischer, 2013; Schwartz, 2006a; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014; Schwartz et al., 2012). Migrants do not abandon their beliefs overnight or leave all their values behind. They leave the country with their ethnic and cultural identities based on a certain system of values, which is usually formed during the pre-adult years. However, migration scholars have been interested in the adaptation and acculturation of migrants, such as whether or not they adopt the culture of the host country in favor of those of their country of origin. Welzel and Inglehart (2010) argue that people's values do change in response to changing living conditions. But little is known about the process of value change in migrants, especially as pertains to their personal values and over time. That is, we know relatively little about whether (or how) values may change as a result of permanent migration compared to short-term migration, and whether change in values is more prominent in migrants who have little to no contact with their country of origin, compared to migrants who do. Moreover, the reasons for migrating differ among individuals. Can different reasons for migrating lead to different degrees of change in individuals' values?

Individual-level values can be traced to the Rokeach Values Survey (RVS), the seminar work of Rokeach (1973). Although societal-level values have been used to compare national cultures (e.g., Hofstede, 1984; House et al., 2004; Lnglehart, 1997), and individuals do have values or characteristics that can be reflective of their societal cultures, prior research has shown that individuals' decisions are influenced by individual-level values (Tsui et al., 2007; Ralston et al., 2014), and to compare individuals (and behaviors of individuals), we should consider characteristics of individuals (not societies). Comparisons across groups of individuals, especially if they are from a single source country or culture, should be conducted at the individual level of analysis, and include personal values. Ultimately, as argued by Ralston et al. (2014: 287), "individuals are individuals."

As the RVS was developed in the USA, it was limited in its application in cross-cultural research. In response, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) adapted the instrument to cross-cultural research. The Schwartz Values Survey (SVS), developed based on samples in 73 countries (Schwartz, 2006b), has been used to measure values at the societal and individual levels. At the individual level, there are ten primary value sub-dimensions: (1) *self-direction* (involving independent thought and action), (2) *stimulation* (the need for variety), (3) *hedonism* (the drive for pleasure and self-gratification), (4) *achievement* (which

involves the self-attainment of personal success), (5) *power* (the attainment of a dominant position in the social system), (6) *security* (safety, harmony and stability), (7) *conformity (*behaving according to social expectations or norms), (8) *tradition* (respect and commitment to cultural or religious customs and ideas), (9) *benevolence* (concern for the welfare of one's closest affiliate), and (10) *universalism* (concern for the welfare of all people). These sub-dimensions have been grouped into two higher-order sets of value dimensions: individualism and collectivism. Individualism includes power, achievement, hedonism, self-direction and stimulation. Collectivism includes the values of benevolence, tradition and conformity. An additional set of four higher-order values represent sets of opposing dimensions in the Schwartz circumplex model. Openness to change versus conservation (e.g., stimulation and self-direction versus conformity, security and tradition), self-enhancement versus self-transcendence (e.g., power, achievement and hedonism versus benevolence and universalism).

The SVS has been tested for internal consistency across national samples at both the societal and individual levels. Ralston et al. (2011) conducted a test across 50 countries and concluded that the SVS is a better predictor of individual-level values than at the level of societies, especially the higher-order individual-level value dimensions, using more varied samples than the original SVS samples, that is, of working adults. However, they found that only 8 of the 50 countries in their sample demonstrated acceptable scale reliabilities for all 10 of the SVS values. A few of the sub-dimensions, such as hedonism, security and self-direction, were problematic across a larger percentage of countries. However, the higher-order dimensions of individualism and collectivism were highly reliable across all societies, as were openness to change, conservation, self-transcendence and self-enhancement. Ralston et al. (2011) have proposed that researchers can use the higher-order value dimensions meaningfully in cross-cultural research, as these demonstrated more acceptable reliability scores within country samples than the internal reliabilities of the individual-level sub-dimensions.

The SVS values have been found in a number of studies to influence individuals' decision-making. For example, Ralston et al. (2014) found that values are predictors of ethical decision-making across societies. Other study by Piurko et al. (2011) explored the SVS values in relation to left-right political orientations in 20 countries. A study by Brosch and Sander (2014) provided insights into the role of universal core values and emotions in decision-making.

The SVS values may influence individuals' decision to migrate as well, by affecting priorities and goals. For example, individuals who place a high value

on security and stability may be less likely to emigrate, as they would be concerned about leaving behind the familiar and taking on the risks and uncertainties of a new environment. Individuals who value conformity and tradition might likewise be less likely to emigrate, as moving to a new culture might go against the grain, would introduce the unfamiliar and involve adapting to new customs. On the other hand, individuals who are self-directed and value achievement might be up for a challenge and might pursue new avenues for achieving their personal ambitions if they are dissatisfied in the home country. Individuals who seek novelty and excitement (stimulation) or self-expression may be more likely to emigrate to pursue new opportunities and experiences that align with their values.

Regarding the higher-order value dimensions of the SVS, we might expect that individuals higher on the individualism dimension would be more inclined to emigrate than individuals higher on collectivism. Individualism includes the sub-dimensions that would stimulate emigration, which necessitates a high degree of individual initiative and reliance on oneself. The group orientation of collectivism, focus on tradition and upholding established norms, would work in the opposite direction. We thus propose that:

Hypothesis 1a: The value dimension of individualism will be positively associated with intention to emigrate.
Hypothesis 1b: The value dimension of collectivism will be negatively associated with intention to emigrate.

We would expect that the opposing higher-order dimensions would also influence intentions to emigrate in opposing ways. Openness to change is comprised of the sub-dimensions of stimulation and self-direction that would also help individuals take on or overcome the challenge of emigrating, while conservation would restrict individuals through the adherence to rules and norms within the values of conformity, security and tradition (e.g., maintaining the status quo). We propose that:

Hypothesis 2a: The value dimension of openness to change will be positively associated with intention to emigrate.
Hypothesis 2b: The value dimension of conservation will be negatively associated with intention to emigrate.

We would also expect the final two dimensions to affect intention to emigrate in different ways. Individuals higher on self-enhancement would be more likely to emigrate than individuals who place more value on

self-transcendence. Individuals who value and pursue self-enhancement might seek out better opportunities wherever they present themselves. Self-transcendent individuals need a sense of belonging, have concern for others. Being surrounded by (and not leaving behind) people they know, and value would be important. We propose that:

Hypothesis 3a: The value dimension of self-enhancement will be positively associated with intention to emigrate.
Hypothesis 3b: The value dimension of self-transcendence will be negatively associated with intention to emigrate.

Limited research has compared emigrants to nonemigrants on individual-level values and found differences between them. Tartakovsky et al. (2017) found that migrants place greater value on *power* and *security* and less emphasis on *universalism, benevolence* and *self-direction* than non-migrants. Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė et al. (2020) found that *universalism* is more important and *security* and *achievement*—less. These studies also suggest that the decision to migrate might lie in certain types of values differences that act as drivers of migration. In this study, we explore the link between individual-level values and emigration intention, by testing the Schwartz value sub-dimensions and higher-order dimensions as predictors of the intention to migrate. Our study considers the values of home country respondents.

Method

Data Collection and Sample

A questionnaire was administered online to working-age respondents residing in Lithuania. A market research firm was employed to collect the data. A total of 1250 completed questionnaires were received. The questionnaire consisted of three parts, asking for demographic information, their intentions to emigrate from Lithuania and a series of questions pertaining to their personal values. The language of the questionnaire was Lithuanian. The sample consisted of 59% females and 40.8% males. The median age of respondents was 36 years. More than half of the respondents (56%) were university educated.

Measures

The dependent variable, *Intention to emigrate*, was measured as a single Likert-scale item asking respondents whether they intend to emigrate for settlement or work in another country over the next ten years, on a scale from 1 = not at all to 7 = absolutely.

Individual values. For the measurement of values, the 56-item Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) was used (Schwartz, 1992). A previously published translation into Lithuanian by Liubinienė (1999) was used. The original 8-point Likert scale (where '−1' means 'opposed to my values', '0' means 'not important' with the following growing importance up to '7' with the meaning of 'supreme important') by Schwartz was used for coding. Following Schwartz (1992), the 56 values were grouped into 10 sub-dimensions and aggregated to higher-order dimensions. Cronbach's alphas for each of the sub-dimensions are as follows: Conformity (4 items), α = 0.74; Tradition (5 items), α = 0.77; Benevolence (7 items), α = 0.89; Universalism (8 items), α = 0.89; Self-direction (6 items), α = 0.86; Stimulation (3 items), α = 0.78; Hedonism (2 items) α = 0.81; Achievement (5 items) α = 0.81; Power (5 items) α = 0.77; and Security (7 items) α = 0.81. The four items measuring Spirituality were not included in this study.

The value sub-dimensions were also classified into individual-level higher-order value dimensions. Collectivism (α = 0.83) includes the values of benevolence, tradition and conformity. Individualism (α = 0.87) includes power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction. The other four higher-order dimensions are bi-polar in the Schwartz model, as follows: openness to change, α = 0.80 (including stimulation and self-direction) versus conservation, α = 0.81 (including conformity, tradition and security), and self-enhancement, α = 0.79 (power, achievement and hedonism) versus self-transcendence, α = 0.88 (universalism and benevolence).

Control variables. We included the following demographic variables as controls in the study. Gender was a binary variable (0 = male, 1 = female). Age was measured by the number of years at the time of data collection. Education was scored on a 5-point scale, where 1 = primary education and 5 = university degree. For the correlation analysis, to account for differences in respondents' use of the SVS and correct for scale use, we include the variable *MRAT*, as recommended in Schwartz (1992). The MRAT is computed as each individual's score on all value items, divided by the total number of items. This variable is included as a covariate to enable partialling out of the relationships of the ten values to the MRAT.

Analysis and Results

To test our hypotheses, we conducted OLS regressions, regressing the dependent variable on each of the value sub-dimensions, as well as the higher-order individual-level value dimensions. The results are depicted in Tables 8.1 and 8.2. Table 8.1 depicts the results of the value sub-dimensions predictors. Table 8.2 depicts the higher-order dimension results. Due to multicollinearity among the dimensions and sub-dimensions, separate regressions were conducted for each, depicted in separate models. Multicollinearity was not an issue in the final results, as VIF values were all below 4.3 for the value sub-dimensions, and below 6.60 for the higher-order dimensions.

We first regressed intention to emigrate on the ten value sub-dimensions. Model 1 (Table 8.1) includes the base model with control variables. Each of the value sub-dimensions is included as a predictor in subsequent models. We can see that all of the sub-dimensions were significantly related to intention to emigrate with the exception of benevolence. Significant positive associations are found between intention to emigrate and power ($B = 0.13$, $p < 0.05$), achievement ($B = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), hedonism ($B = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$), stimulation ($B = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$) and self-direction ($B = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$). Significant negative relationships were found between the dependent variable and conformity ($B = -28$, $p < 0.001$), universalism ($B = -0.20$, $p < 0.05$), tradition ($B = -0.37$, $p < 0.001$) and security ($B = -0.32$, $p < 0.001$). These results suggest that the individuals who place more importance on those values that are associated with security, tradition and conformity (e.g., maintaining the status quo), have fewer intentions to uproot and emigrate. Individuals who place more emphasis on the self and who value power, achievement, self-direction and stimulation are more inclined to pursue their personal ambitions and are more likely to express their intention to emigrate. These values act in combination to influence emigration intentions via the higher-order value dimensions.

Our first set of hypotheses (hypothesis 1a and hypothesis 1b) predicted that the dimensions of individualism and collectivism would be associated with intentions to emigrate in opposing ways. Table 8.2 depicts the results for each of the higher-order dimensions in separate models. The results for the individualism and collectivism dimensions are depicted in models 6 ad 7. The association between individualism and intention to emigrate was positive and significant ($B = 0.95$, $p < 0.001$). The association between collectivism and intention to emigrate was negative and significant ($B = -0.77$, $p < 0.001$). Our first hypotheses (1a and 1b) are supported.

Table 8.1 Regression analysis results for Intention to Emigrate regressed on personal values

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Constant	4.73***	4.77***	4.78***	4.66***	4.69***	4.79***	4.96***	4.72***	4.69***	4.45***	4.94***
	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.44)	(0.45)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.46)
Age	-0.01	-.-1	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Gender	0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.06	0.03
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Education	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08	-0.08	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.07	-0.06	-0.10	-0.06
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
MRAT	-0.14*	-0.26**	-0.34***	-0.41***	-0.65***	0.13	-0.45***	0.07	-0.28*	0.24**	0.17
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.10)
Power		0.13*									
		(0.06)									
Achievement			0.21**								
			(0.08)								
Hedonism				0.29***							
				(0.04)							
Stimulation					0.53***						
					(0.06)						
Conformity						-0.28***					
						(0.07)					
Self-direction							0.30**				
							(0.09)				
Universalism								-0.20*			
								(0.10)			
Benevolence									0.13		
									(0.10)		
Tradition										-0.37***	
										(0.05)	
Security											-0.32***
											(0.08)
F-ratio	2.39*	2.80*	3.47***	11.02***	16.75***	4.80***	3.95**	2.77*	2.27*	12.83***	4.86***
Max VIF	1.06	2.02	2.62	1.56	2.18	2.72	3.93	4.11	4.29	1.90	2.99

Notes: * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$. $N = 1250$. Coefficients are unstandardized. Standard errors in parentheses

Table 8.2 Regression analysis results for Intention to Emigrate regressed on higher-order dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Constant	4.73***	4.77***	4.80***	4.76***	4.73***	4.66***	4.86***
	(0.46)	(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.44)
Age	–0.01	–0.01	–0.01	–0.01	–0.01	–0.01	–0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Gender	0.00	0.06	0.00	–0.01	0.01	–0.02	0.05
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Education	–0.05	–0.12*	–0.07	–0.11	–0.07	–0.12*	–0.11
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
MRAT	–0.14*	–0.90***	–0.38***	0.74***	–0.07	0.66***	–1.05***
	(0.06)	(10)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.06)
Openness to change		0.77***					
		(0.08)					
Self-enhancement			0.26**				
			(0.09)				
Conservation				–0.89***			
				(0.10)			
Self-transcendence					–0.06		
					(0.13)		
Collectivism						–0.77***	
						(0.11)	
Individualism							0.95***
							(0.11)
F-ratio	2.39*	19.38***	3.71**	16.89***	1.97	11.40***	17.51***
Max VIF	1.06	3.18	2.98	4.39	6.51	5.25	4.47

Notes: * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$. $N = 1250$. Coefficients are unstandardized. Standard errors in parentheses

Hypotheses 2a predicted a positive relationship between openness to change and intention to emigrate, while hypothesis 2b predicted a negative relationship between the conservation dimension and intention to emigrate. The results in models 2 and 4 support the hypotheses. The coefficient for openness to change was positive and significant ($B = 0.77$, $p < 0.001$), while the coefficient for conservation was significant and negative ($B = -0.89$, $p < 0.001$). These results are consistent with the bi-polar alignment of the dimensions.

Hypothesis 3a predicted a positive relationship between intention to emigrate and self-enhancement, while hypothesis 3b—a negative relationship between self-transcendence and intention to emigrate. The results for our hypotheses tests are in models 3 and 5. The coefficient for self-enhancement was significant and positive ($B = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$) in support of hypothesis 3a. The coefficient for self-transcendence, however, was nonsignificant. Hypothesis 3b is not supported.

Discussion and Future Research Direction

This study is cross-sectional, exploratory study and its main findings represent a first step in exploring intentions to emigrate through individual values. We focused on Lithuania and found that willingness to migrate was positively related to certain values. Five of our hypotheses were supported. We found Lithuanians who score higher on the values of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction showed a higher willingness to emigrate. This makes sense, as uprooting one's life and taking the decision to move to another country requires a high degree of personal sacrifice, and acceptance of unknowns. In line with this, of the higher-order dimensions, openness to change was positively related to intentions to emigrate, alongside self-enhancement and individualism. Although we did not test pull-factors, previous studies by Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė (2019a) had highlighted that opportunities for personal growth and career advancement were important considerations in choosing a host country for migrants; the importance placed on individualism and self-enhancement (e.g., power, achievement, hedonism, self-direction, stimulation) appears to align with these preferences. On the other hand, individuals who value tradition, security and conformity, and are more particularistic, are less likely to migrate, preferring instead the status quo. Conservation and collectivism were the higher-order dimensions associated with lower intentions to emigrate.

Our study is a first step in identifying migrants' values. A limitation is that we only considered values, but we note that other factors will also influence migration intentions, such as personal circumstances of migrants, financial circumstances, employment (unemployment), and various push factors from Lithuania that can compound individuals' personal circumstances. Leong (2014) argues that congruence in values is an important factor in immigrant acculturation in the host country. Time spent in the destination country is also a key variable in the acculturation process, as it is suggested that migrant values can undergo change. Lönnqvist et al. (2011, 2013) found that migrant values do change, affected by different migrant experiences in their host countries. However, this change depends on numerous additional factors, such as the degree to which people interact with host country nationals, the extent to which they live in enclaves of other migrants and the extent to which they rely on their native language versus the host country language, the commitment to their home country, various support networks, migrant demographic characteristics, and a range of additional factors. We focused on individuals still resident in their home country. A comparison of values between potential

migrants and immigrants could be of interest in future studies, as would a longitudinal study to capture migrants' value change over time.

Additionally, looking from the perspective of international companies, individual values of international employees could be explored and compared with the values of host nationals. For example, a study by Rudnev (2014) highlighted that the values of migrants are more similar to values that are common in the host country than to values commonly held in their country of origin. We also did not explore demographic differences in relation to values in this study, although we found that intentions to migrate were not significantly related to demographic respondent profiles. However, Sawyerr et al. (2005) revealed that values of individuals depend on age and Alonso-Almeida and Llach (2019) explored the divergences between millennials in high-income countries in relation to the attractiveness of organizations according to their profile of work values. Thus, future studies that compare further the values of different migrant groups could be of benefit for international firms and provide insights for international human resource management.

Acknowledgments This research was funded by a grant (No. S-MIP-17-118) from the Research Council of Lithuania.

References

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2009). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. MA, Harvard University Press.

Alonso-Almeida, M. D. M., & Llach, J. (2019). Socially responsible companies: Are they the best workplace for millennials? A cross-national analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(1), 238–247. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1675

Bardi, A., Buchanan, K. E., Goodwin, R., Slabu, L., & Robinson, M. (2014). Value stability and change during self-chosen life transitions: Self-selection versus socialization effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(1), 131–147. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034818

Bhugra, D. (2004). Migration, distress and cultural identity. *British Medical Bulletin, 69*(1), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldh007

Bobowik, M., Basabe, N., Paez, D., Jimenez, A., & Bilbao, M. A. (2011). Personal values and well-being among Europeans, Spanish natives and immigrants to Spain: Does the culture matter? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 12*, 401–419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9202-1

Boer, D., & Fischer, R. (2013). How and when do personal values guide our attitudes and sociality? Explaining cross-cultural variability in attitude–value linkages. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(5), 1113–1147. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031347

Brosch, T., & Sander, D. (2014). Appraising value: The role of universal core values and emotions in decision-making. *Cortex: A Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior, 59*, 203–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.03.012

Dang, V. T., Vu, T. T., & Nguyen, P. T. (2020). Workplace learning and foreign workers' commitment to host cultural organization: The effects of cross-cultural adjustment and supervisor trust. *Employee Relations: The International Journal, 43*(1), 297–317. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-02-2020-0039

de Haas, H. (2021). A theory of migration: The aspirations-capabilities framework. Comparative. *Migration Studies, 9*(8), 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00210-4

Eurostat. (2020). *Emigration by age group, sex and country of next usual residence*. Retrieved December 20, 2022, from https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=migr_emi3nxt&lang=en

Fernando, W. D. A., & Cohen, L. (2016). Exploring career advantages of highly skilled migrants: A study of Indian academics in the UK. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(12), 1277–1298. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1072101

Fischer, R., & Schwartz, S. (2011). Whence differences in value priorities? Individual, cultural, or artifactual sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*(7), 1127–1144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110381429

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5).

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations : The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.

Kim, S., Mori, I., & Rahim, A. R. A. (2018). Cultural values matter: Attractiveness of Japanese companies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 18*(1), 87–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595818759570

Kumpikaitė, V., & Žičkutė, I. (2012). Darnus vystymasis emigracijos kontekste: Lietuvos atvejis. *Vadybos mokslas ir studijos-kaimo verslų ir jų infrastruktūros plėtrai, 3*, 89–97.

Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, V. (2019a). Four Lithuanian emigration waves: Comparison analysis of the main host countries. In *Diaspora networks in international business* (pp. 159–181). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91095-6_9

Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, V. (2019b). Endangered Lithuania. *Migration Letters, 16*(4), 637–646. https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v16i4.619

Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, V., Duobienė, J., Liubinienė, V., Žičkutė, I., & Pinnington, A. (2020). The contribution of universal values in migration decisions. Who stays

and who leaves? In EURAM 2020 Conference, 4–6 December, Dublin, Ireland (online).

Kumpikaitė-Valiūnienė, V., & Žičkutė, I. (2017). Emigration after socialist regime in Lithuania: Why the west is still the best? *Baltic Journal of Management, 12*(1), 86–110. https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-02-2016-0053

Lee, E. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography, 3*(1), 47–57. https://doi.org/10.2307/2060063

Leong, C. H. (2013). The socio-psychological profile of prospective emigrants: Singaporeans leaving Singapore. In E. Tartakovsky (Ed.), *Immigration: Policies, challenges, and impact* (pp. 29–50). Nova Science.

Liubinienė, V. (1999). *National Identity in Lithuania: Processes during the period of changes*. Praha: Research Support Scheme. Retrieved December 10, 2020, from http://rss.archives.ceu.hu/archive/00001032/01/33.pdf

Lnglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodemization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton University Press.

Lönnqvist, J. E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Verkasalo, M. (2011). Personal values before and after migration: A longitudinal case study on value change in Ingrian–Finnish migrants. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2*(6), 584–591. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550611402362

Lönnqvist, J.-E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Verkasalo, M. (2013). Rebound effect in personal values: Ingrian Finnish migrants' values two years after migration. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*(7), 1122–1126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113480040

Makkonen, P. (2016). Career self-management behaviour of Western self-initiated expatriates in local organizations in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(11), 1135–1157. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1061580

Migration in numbers. (2020). Retrieved December 10, 2020, from https://123.emn.lt/en/

Mockaitis, A. I., Zander, L., & De Cieri, H. (2018). The benefits of global teams for international organizations: HR implications. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29*(14), 2137–2158. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1428722

Ojeda-Gonzalez, S., Mihi-Ramirez, A., Arteaga-Ortíz, J., & Cuenca-Garcia, E. (2018). Spain trade in view of some migratory and economic considerations. *Engineering Economics, 29*(1), 53–61. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.29.1.19387

Perlstein, M., & Ciuk, S. (2019). HRM roles in cross culture training provision: Insights from Israeli companies. *Personnel Review, 48*(1), 273–287. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2016-0279

Piore, M. J. (1971). *The dual labor market: Theory and implications* (pp. 93–97). Routledge.

Piurko, Y., Schwartz, S. H., & Davidov, E. (2011). Basic personal values and the meaning of left-right political orientations in 20 countries. *Political Psychology, 32*(4), 537–561. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00828.x

Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Furrer, O., Kuo, M. H., Li, Y., Wangenheim, F., Dabic, M., Naoumova, I., Shimizu, K., Carranza, M., Fu, P. P., Potocan, V. V., Pekerti, A., Lenartoqicz, T., Srinivasan, N., Casado, T., Rossi, A. M., Szabo, E., Butt, A., Palmer, I., Ramburuth, P., Brock, D. M., Terpstra-Tong, J., Grison, I., Reynaud, E., Richards, M., Hallinger, P., Castro, F. B., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J., Milton, L., Ansari, M., Starkus, A., Mockaitis, A., Dalgic, T., Leon-Darner, F., Thanh, H., Moon, Y., Molteni, M., Fang, Y., Pla-Barner, J., Alas, R., Maignan, I., Jesuino, J. C., Lee, C., Nicholson, J. D., Chia, H., Danis, W., Dharmasiri, A. S., & Wber, M. (2014). Societal-level versus individual-level predictions of ethical behavior: A 48-society study of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 122*, 283–306.

Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Reynaud, E., Srinivasan, N., Furrer, O., Brock, D., et al. (2011). A twenty-first century assessment of values across the global workforce. *Journal of Business Ethics, 104*(1), 1–31. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41476064

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. Free press.

Rudnev, M. (2014). Value adaptation among intra-European migrants: Role of country of birth and country of residence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*(10), 1626–1642. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022114548482

Sawyerr, O. O., Strauss, J., & Yan, J. (2005). Individual value structure and diversity attitudes: The moderating effects of age, gender, race, and religiosity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(6), 498–521. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510615442

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (2006a). Les valeurs de base de la personne: Théorie, mesures et applications [Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications]. *Revue Française de Sociologie, 47*, 249–288. https://doi.org/10.3917/rfs.474.0929

Schwartz, S. H. (2006b). A theory of cultural value orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology, 5*, 137–182.

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116

Schwartz, S. H., & Butenko, T. (2014). Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44*(7), 799–813. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2053

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(4), 663–688. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393

Tartakovsky, E. (2009). Cultural identities of adolescent immigrants: A three-year longitudinal study including the pre-migration period. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(5), 654–671. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9370-z

Tartakovsky, E., Walsh, S. D., Patrakov, E., & Nikulina, M. (2017). Between two worlds? Value preferences of immigrants compared to local-born populations in the receiving country and in the country of origin. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*(6), 835–853. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117709534

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 426–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300818

Van Hear, N., Bakewell, O., & Long, K. (2018). Push-pull plus: Reconsidering the drivers of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44*(6), 927–944. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1384135

Welzel, C., & Inglehart, R. (2010). Agency, values, and well-being: A human development model. *Social Indicators Research, 97*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9557-z

Zander, L., Mockaitis, A. I., & Butler, C. L. (2012). Leading global teams. *Journal of World Business, 47*, 592–603. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.012