

The Link between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment – Differences between Public and Private Sector Employees

Yannis Markovits (Aston University, Birmingham, UK) yannis.markovits@otenet.gr, Ann J. Davis (Aston University) davisaj1@aston.ac.uk, Doris Fay (Universität Potsdam, Germany) doris.fay@uni-potsdam.de, and Rolf van Dick (Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany) van.dick@psych.uni-frankfurt.de

RUNNING HEAD: Relationships between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in two sectors

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS: Yannis Markovits, Nik. Plastira 66B Str., GR-542 50, Thessaloniki, Greece or Work and Organizational Psychology Unit, Aston Business School, Aston University, Aston Triangle, B4 7ET, Birmingham, United Kingdom, Tel: 00302310302762, 00302310571147, fax: 00302310571102

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very thankful for the reviewers' comments and the editor's detailed suggestions that have helped improve the quality of the present paper greatly.

ABSTRACT

Employees in the public and private sectors experience different working conditions and employment relationships. Therefore, it can be assumed that their attitudes toward their job and organizations, and relationships between them, are different. The existing literature has identified the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction as interesting in this context. The present field study examines the satisfaction-commitment link with respect to differences between private and public sector employees. A sample of 617 Greek employees (257 from private sector and 360 from public sector) completed standardized questionnaires. Results confirmed the hypothesized relationship differences: Extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction are more strongly related to affective commitment and normative commitment for public sector employees than for private sector ones. The results are discussed, limitations are considered, and directions for future research are proposed.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment is an important and widely researched concept in both organizational behavior and human resources management. It has been demonstrated to have substantial and meaningful relationships with a number of organizationally relevant outcomes, including trust, morale, turnover intentions, and absenteeism (e.g., Brief, 1998; for a recent meta-analysis see Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Organizational commitment is defined as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It is characterized by the belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, the willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and a desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Over the last twenty years, many studies have established relationships both with other attitudes, with behavioral intentions (focal and discretionary) and with behavior, such as job performance and turnover. It has been conceptualized variously as a unidimensional or a multidimensional attitudinal variable (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1990; Buchanan, 1974; Cook & Wall, 1980; Cooper-Hakim, & Viswesvaran, 2005; Mowday, et al., 1982; Mowday, et al., 1979; Salancik, 1977).

Recent theorizing and empirical research has recognized that the meaning of organizational commitment differs depending on the organizational context and environment in which it is assessed. For example, private sector employees have, on average, organizational and job attitudes that are different from those of public sector employees (Karl & Sutton, 1998; Naff & Crum, 1999, Kelman, 2007). Thus, organizational commitment is expected to be different in its nature and meaning in different organizational settings as well as in different cultural

environments (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Smith, Fischer & Sale, 2001). This study seeks to enhance understanding in this area by exploring the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, one of the most powerful predictors of organizational commitment, in public and private sector contexts.

According to Spector (1997: 2), job satisfaction refers to “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs”. It is an attitudinal variable that has been explored both as an overall evaluation of the job and as a cluster of attitudes relating to different aspects of the job. We take the position that job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely extrinsic satisfaction (e.g. satisfaction with pay, physical conditions, policies, and procedures) and intrinsic satisfaction (e.g. satisfaction with creativity, achievement and accomplishment) (cf. Cooper-Hakim, & Viswesvaran, 2005).

The importance of job satisfaction and its relationship with organizational commitment has been acknowledged for many years. Meyer et al.’s (2002) meta-analysis and Brief’s (1998) work on attitudes provide substantial insight into this relationship. We propose that reciprocal relationships exist between forms of organizational commitment and elements of job satisfaction. A satisfied and happy employee tends to be committed to the organization, returning back to the organization this positive affect via commitment and the concomitant organizationally relevant outcomes identified earlier (for a detailed analysis of reciprocity norms see Bergman, 2006; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). This position is supported by studies by Cramer (1996), Delobbe and Vandenberghe (2000), Meyer et al. (2002), Yilmaz (2002) and Yousef (2001; 2002) and was also demonstrated in quantitative and qualitative reviews (e.g., Riketta & van Dick, 2005; Riketta & van Dick, 2009).

The present study examines the effect of the organizational context, specifically public versus private sector employment, on the relationship between job satisfaction (seen as a predictor variable) and organizational commitment (seen as a dependent variable).

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Research on the distinctive features of private and public sector organizations can be found in organizational behavior and management studies, as well as in work and organizational psychology research. These studies exemplify the differences between the sectors' organizational contexts which influence the attitudes and work behaviors of managers and employees alike (cf. Boyne, 2002; Cho & Lee, 2001; Goulet & Frank, 2002). Alternatively, they raise or examine methodological and research questions deriving from the similarities and differences observed between private and public sector organizations (cf. Rainey & Bozeman, 2000). However, only a few studies have looked into either job satisfaction or organizational commitment with respect to the form and type of employment.

This section first reviews the literature on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the private and public sectors. It continues with a brief review of research on the Greek organizational and cultural context. Finally, we will focus on public sector employees, looking at possible explanations for reported lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment compared to private sector employees.

Job satisfaction

Solomon (1986), in the Israeli context, argues that the existence of and clear connections between performance-based rewards, on the one hand, and policies intending to promote

efficiency, on the other, make private sector managers more satisfied with their jobs than public sector managers, where such linkage is much less apparent. Karl and Sutton (1998) support the view that private sector employees place more value on high wages, while public sector employees place more value on interesting work. Naff and Crum (1999) argue that private sector employees in the United States have different values and respond to different incentives than public sector employees. The former experience more extrinsic satisfaction from jobs than the latter and in turn are more committed to their organizations. Intrinsic rewards, meanwhile, can make people feel intrinsically satisfied in jobs and committed to organizations irrespective of where they work. In a recent study in Australia, Brunetto and Farr-Wharton (2006) concluded that the impact on job satisfaction from the ambiguity felt with respect to customers, promotion, superiors, and situations which are ethically critical, was stronger for public sector employees than for private sector ones.

While these studies identify differences between private and public sector employees' job attitudes, generalizability of the findings may be limited due to cultural differences in the countries being studied. However, the consistency in the direction of these differences, irrespective of national contexts, provides an adequate basis from which to expect general divergence in attitudes between private and public sector employees.

Organizational commitment

With respect to organizational commitment, private sector employees in Australia report significantly higher levels of commitment than public sector ones (Rachid, 1995; Rachid, 1994). Rachid argues that the "bureaucratic culture" which dominates the public sector, and the "culture gap" (Bourantas, Anagnostelis, Mantes, & Kefalas, 1990) between the perceived and the desired

organizational culture, are responsible for lower levels of public sector organizational commitment. Fletcher and Williams (1996), for the UK, conclude that organizational commitment is, by and large, greater for private than for public sector employees. In general, the stereotype seems to hold that public sector employees have lower levels of organizational commitment (Rainey, 1997; Baldwin, 1991; Savery, 1991; Odom, Boxx, & Dunn, 1990). However, as Cho and Lee (2001) state, this assertion cannot be verified by cross-sector analyses. They argue that both organizational culture and inherent societal values determine differences in commitment between public and private sector managers in South Korea, although these differences are not themselves sufficient to support the argument that organizational commitment levels are different between private and public sector.

Goulet and Frank (2002), in a study of employees from three different sectors (public, non-profit, and for-profit), supported the view that the lowest levels of organizational commitment are exhibited in the public sector. They explain these findings by claiming that extrinsic rewards (salary, fringe benefits, and so forth) are critical factors in determining levels of commitment, especially in a robust economy. However, in contrast to this notion, Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003) found that the degree of civil servants' organizational commitment is related to their implicit psychological contract. That is, intrinsic rewards and the relational supportive dimensions of their psychological contracts have the ability to work as sufficient motivation for effective job performance, and to bring out desired employee attitudes and behaviors.

Castaing (2006) conducted a study in the French civil service and found that Public Service Motivation (PSM; Perry, 1996) had a substantial effect on affective commitment, implying that if the state hires individuals with high PSM, there will be a positive effect on organizational commitment. PSM is defined as "the belief, values and attitudes that go beyond self-interest and

organizational interest, that concern the interest of the larger political entity and that motivate individuals to act accordingly whenever appropriate” (Vandenabeele, 2007: 547). PSM is described in terms of beliefs, values and attitudes. It exceeds self- and organizational interest and is characterized by a concern for the public interest which drives civil servants to act accordingly (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). Camilleri (2006) found in the Maltese civil service that PSM is reinforced and strengthened by primarily affective commitment but also by normative commitment. Finally, Cerase and Farinella (2006) produced similar results using a sample from the Italian Revenue Service, arguing for the significant impact of affective commitment on PSM, and to a lesser extent of continuance commitment. In fact, the mere existence of PSM seems to make employees in the public sector feel committed to their organization and satisfied with their job.

Boyne (2002) presents meta-analytic evidence from thirty-four empirical studies on differences between public and private sector organizations. He points out that, while three out of the five studies which compared organizational commitment between the private and the public sector showed lower commitment in the public sector, the remaining studies indicated no such difference. The lower levels of public sector commitment were attributed to inflexible personnel procedures and the limited link between job performance and rewards.

These studies imply that normative commitment (the sense of obligation, duty and loyalty) is more relevant in the public than in the private sector, due to the nature and content of both the explicit employment contract and implicit psychological contracts. Moreover, this difference could be related to the existence of PSM, since the sense of obligation felt in normative commitment is closer to the perceptions of PSM that involve a “calling” or a sense of duty

(Steijn & Leisink, 2006). Normative commitment thus seems to be more prevalent among public sector employees compared to those working in the private sector.

The public sector employee

On balance it thus seems that there are few clear differences in the levels of commitment between public and private sector employees. We do assume, however, that the nature of public sector employment (at least in Greece) that we will describe below suggests moderating effects of sector (private versus public) on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

At times of economic prosperity and opportunities for personal and professional development, the private sector offers more attractive employment than the public sector. Under these conditions, private sector employees are more extrinsically satisfied than civil servants and more organizationally committed (Goulet & Frank, 2002; Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998; Caldwell, Chatman, & O'Reilly, 1990). Economic recession, high unemployment rates, and low levels of employment security, by contrast, produce opposite results; civil servants become more extrinsically satisfied and more committed than private sector employees. Furthermore, intrinsic rewards have the ability to make people feel intrinsically satisfied and in turn also more committed. As Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2003) argue, provision of these rewards could impact civil servants more than private sector employees and significantly influence their level of organizational commitment.

If someone feels satisfied (extrinsically and intrinsically) with his or her job, then he or she becomes committed towards the organization. However, the question arises whether this increased commitment is the same for all forms of organizational commitment. Furthermore, if

someone holds a job that they do not expect to provide satisfaction, but which is subsequently found to be extrinsically and intrinsically satisfying, does the employee in response increase his or her organizational commitment? If we assume, following the research reported above, that public sector employees tend to enter employment less motivated, then the experience of a satisfying organizational environment and job content would positively influence their commitment. This could be more evident for those employees entering an organizational environment who are looking for job security, acceptable wages, and the satisfaction of basic human needs. This, according to Bourantas and Papalexandris (1992), who examined differences between private and public sector employees in Greece, is typical of public sector employees. Their research identified differences in the dispositions of people attracted to each sector. Greek private sector employees tend to have higher levels of activity, sense of competence, tolerance of ambiguity, a stronger Protestant work ethic, and higher growth need than their public sector counterparts. Private and public sector employment in Greece exemplify substantial differences with respect to employment relationships, status, wages, fringe benefits, and employee human resource management. Table 1 summarizes some of the most important and significant differences between private and public sector employees in Greece (see Markovits, Davis, & van Dick, 2007).

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The particular cultural values and societal practices of a country, coupled with the political, economic, and social conditions, create different profiles for private and public sector employees. In Greece, the cultural values of high uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and power

distance together with a relatively low performance orientation (Markovits, et al., 2007) might lead to high levels of commitment to a workplace offering long term security and stability such as employment in the federal government or in municipalities. If a public sector employee perceives his or her job as satisfying, whether extrinsically or intrinsically, then he or she is likely to respond positively with high commitment.

Such stability and security is not characteristic of the Greek private sector, where employment is more volatile, and driven primarily by extrinsic rewards. Private sector employees typically positively value their degree of job satisfaction; however, they do not feel as strongly committed to their organization as public sector employees. While research largely supports the assertion that private and public sector employees project different attitudes and behaviors towards their organizations and jobs, none of the studies focused on relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with respect to differences between sectors. The next section will outline how this paper seeks to fill that gap.

HYPOTHESES

Following the literature review above, we develop a framework in which relationships between two forms of organizational commitment (affective and normative) on the one hand, and the two facets of job satisfaction (extrinsic and intrinsic) on the other, interact with the type of employment in the private versus the public sector (see Figure 1). We have excluded from the analysis continuance commitment, since this form of commitment is arguably not pertinent to public sector employment in Greece, since the more affective and cognitive forms of

commitment prevail. In short, we assume that the type of employing sector moderates the relationship between satisfaction and commitment. Thus, our hypotheses state:

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment will be stronger for public sector than for private sector employees.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment will be stronger for public sector than for private sector employees.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

METHODS

Sample

The sample consists of 617 employees, 257 from private sector firms in northern central Greece and 360 from public sector organizations in northern Greece. The private sector firms were medium-sized industrial or commercial enterprises, whereas the public sector employees were working in regional and local government authorities. The overall response rate was 63%. The sample was approached either at work or within the premises of the Regional Public Sector Training Centre of Thessaloniki. Exactly half of respondents were male, with a mean age of 36 years. The sample as a whole is quite highly educated, a little more than half of it (52.1%) having achieved graduate levels of education or higher. Of the remainder, 23.3% had completed secondary school, and the remaining 24.6% attended a technological educational institute. The majority of the sample (62.6%) was married, while 31.2% were single, 5.3% divorced and .8% widowed.

Measures

To test our hypotheses we used standardized questionnaires. To assess job satisfaction, an adaptation of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), coupled with items taken from Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979), was used, measured on 7-point Likert scale (endpoints, 1="I am very dissatisfied"; 7="I am very satisfied"). The scale is divided into two subscales representing extrinsic satisfaction (e.g., satisfaction with pay, physical conditions, security and safety, policies and procedures) and intrinsic satisfaction (e.g. creativity, development, achievement, accomplishment), respectively.

Organizational commitment was measured using the two six-item scales by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) for affective commitment (ACS; sample item "I would be very happy spending the rest of my career in this organization"), and normative commitment (NCS; sample item "I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization"). Again, items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (endpoints, 1="completely disagree"; 7= "completely agree").

Affectivity is significantly correlated with both job satisfaction (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000), and organizational commitment, particularly affective commitment (Herrbach, 2006). Therefore, we used the Positive and Negative Affectivity Scale (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) to control for affectivity-based effects. This scale measures general positive and negative affect, a personality characteristic comprising general feelings of positive or negative mood. As with the other scales, this variable was measured on a 7-point Likert scale (endpoints, 1="Never"; 7="Always"). A range of demographic variables (gender, age, educational, and marital status) were also included as additional control variables in addition to affectivity, as these have been suggested to be antecedents of both organizational commitment (Meyer, et al., 2002) and job satisfaction (Brierley, 1999).

RESULTS

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients for scales and subscales (Cronbach's α), and intercorrelations of all constructs. As anticipated, positive and negative affect are significantly correlated with both extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction. Positive affect is also significantly positively correlated with both affective and normative commitment. The other control variables demonstrate either weak or no associations with commitment, satisfaction, and affectivity.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. Dependent variables were the forms of organizational commitment (affective or normative). Control variables (z-standardized) affect, gender, age, education, and marital status were included along with the predictor variables of satisfaction dimension and sector at step 1. The interaction between sector and satisfaction was captured at step 2 by entering the product of the respective satisfaction dimension and sector.

Tables 3 and 4 show the results for affective commitment, and extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction respectively. In both analyses, the interaction term was significant ($b=.27$, $p<.01$ for extrinsic satisfaction; and $b=.31$, $p<.01$ for intrinsic satisfaction).

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Following Aiken and West (1991) and Dawson and Richter (2006), the simple slopes for private and public sector employees were tested to illustrate the nature of interactions for affective commitment. In line with Hypothesis 1, affective commitment was strongly and

positively related to extrinsic satisfaction for public sector respondents ($b = .63, p < .001$), while this relationship was weaker for private sector employees ($b = .36, p < .001$) (see Figure 2). The same applies for the relationship between affective commitment and intrinsic satisfaction: a strong positive relationship was found for public sector respondents ($b = .66, p < .001$), and a much weaker relationship for private sector employees ($b = .35, p < .001$) (see Figure 3).

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

To test Hypothesis 2, the above analyses were replicated for normative commitment as dependent variable. The analyses summarized in Tables 5 and 6 again indicated significant interactions between sector and both satisfaction facets ($b = .36, p < .01$ for extrinsic satisfaction by sector; and $b = .42, p < .01$ for intrinsic satisfaction by sector).

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

The simple slopes analysis shows that the nature of interactions for normative commitment supports Hypothesis 2. Normative commitment was strongly and positively related to extrinsic satisfaction for public sector respondents ($b = .54, p < .001$), while the relationship was weaker for private sector respondents ($b = .19, p < .001$) (see Figure 4). The same applies for the relationship between normative commitment and intrinsic satisfaction: it was strongly and positively related for public sector respondents ($b = .53, p < .001$), while a weaker, though still significant, relationship was observed for private sector employees ($b = .11, p < .001$) (see Figure 5).

INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

The results presented above lead to the following conclusions and implications for human resource managers, policymakers and practitioners. Public sector and private sector employees work under different organizational and employment contexts, and these differences influence their job attitudes. In particular the nature of rewards appears important. When extrinsic and intrinsic satisfactions increase, public sector employees tend to develop stronger affective and normative commitment toward their organizations than do private sector employees.

Public sector employees enter into organizational environments that are not necessarily expected to promote creativity and change, but which operate as typical bureaucracies and tend to value standardized procedures and formality. Thus, when public sector employees experience satisfaction from their jobs and the internal environment, and this applies to both extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction, then their stereotypical image of a public sector organization collapses. In return, they become more positively disposed to the organization and feel committed, involved, and loyal towards it. As such, by creating a healthy workplace, a supportive environment, and by providing extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, the public sector employee will return these to the employer through enhanced commitment - and ultimately the associated organizational consequences of that commitment. This finding is in line with Taylor's (2008) research in the context of intrinsic motivation, which supported the existence of a direct and significant association between PSM, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Taylor summarized his findings as "[r]espondents who brought high levels of PSM to their organization were likely to become more satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations" (p. 81). Furthermore, Steijn (2008) found that in the Dutch public sector, PSM was associated with higher job satisfaction and a stronger inclination to stay.

On the other hand, private sector employees are more rational in their employment choices, beliefs, and attitudes. They know what they should expect from management and what is offered in return for their work. Thus, if they experience a satisfying job and are happy in the workplace, they will also increase their commitment to the organization, but less strongly than the public sector employees, because their satisfaction more easily aligns with their prior expectations. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment for private sector employees is thus less influenced by on-the-job experiences.

The conclusions drawn from this study can provide important insights for public sector managers and policymakers, since they show why and how employees could feel more affectively and normatively committed towards their organizations. These are issues where public employers could easily intervene, such as creation of an attractive workplace environment, supportive and collaborative relations, and greater emphasis on intrinsic rewards.

There are several limitations of this study. One limitation results from the study's cross-sectional design, raising the question of causality. This issue is important here given that the existing literature suggests both that commitment causes satisfaction as well as satisfaction causing commitment. Second, our results are generated in self-reported questionnaires where both dependent and predictor variables come from the same respondent, creating the potential for common-method variance (Spector, 2006).

Longitudinal studies, and studies incorporating behavioral data from third-party informants for either the dependent or predictor variables (or both), are strongly recommended in the literature. Unfortunately, a longitudinal study was not feasible here for administrative reasons. Also, because all our variables involve individual employee attitudes, gathering information

from third parties is less appropriate (compared with, for instance, information about job performance, which could be gathered from supervisors).

In the introductory section, we have presented research that points to the possibility of commitment influencing satisfaction rather than satisfaction predicting commitment as in the analyses we have presented here. In our view, however, the two concepts will most likely mutually influence each other and thus satisfaction can be seen as a starting point for modifying commitment as well as increasing commitment could be seen as a starting point for increasing satisfaction. Again, longitudinal analyses are needed to unearth the interactional or transactional relationship between the two concepts. To deal with endogeneity issues, two-stage least squares analysis would be recommended for future research (see Greene, 2008).

Although these limitations should be taken seriously, the fact that a cross-sectional design based on self-report might increase common-method variance does pose less of a problem here, since common-method variance cannot account for interactions among variables and typically tends to result in an underestimation of statistical interactions (McClelland & Judd, 1993).

Another limitation might be the Greek translation of items, initially constructed in English for an English-speaking audience. Problems of interpretation may arise, and to counter this some statements were further explained when written in Greek. This research decided to take a direct translation and back-translation approach, assuming the items and concepts to be “etic” (suggesting the concepts are universally applicable). Other researchers prefer more “emic” approaches and seek to develop measure that are culture-specific (Vandenberghe, 2003), which would be informative but renders comparisons of studies across different cultural contexts more difficult.

A final limitation of our study is that participant selection was based on convenience samples, and thus the organizational environments and contexts where the employees were working were not matched. However the inclusion of a selection of relevant control variables, both demographic and attitudinal, seeks to limit the extent to which individual experience might confound the outcomes. Some additional control measures are desirable in future research, for instance pay level or organizational size.

This study intended to examine the moderating role of sector in accounting for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Greek cultural and organizational contexts. It identified significant impacts of sector on the relationship between affective and normative commitment, and the extrinsic and intrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction. Further research is needed to examine the external validity of these results and relate them to specific organizational outcomes, such as job performance results and employment practices. Cross-cultural comparisons would be particularly welcome, especially within the European Union, where very different cultural contexts come together under the umbrella of free markets at an ever-increasing pace.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L.S. and S.G. West. 1991. *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. New York: Sage.
- Allen, N.J. and J.P. Meyer. 1990. "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63(1): 1-18.
- Baldwin, J.N. 1991. "Public versus private employees: Debunking stereotypes." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 11(1-2): 1-27.
- Bergman, M.E. 2006. "The relationship between affective and normative commitment: Review and research agenda." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27(5): 645-663.
- Bourantas, D. and N. Papalexandris. 1992. "Variables affecting organizational commitment: Private- versus publicly-owned organizations in Greece." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 7(1): 3-10.
- Bourantas, D., J. Anagnostelis, Y. Mantes, and A.G. Kefalas. 1990. "Culture gap in Greek management." *Organization Studies* 11(2): 261-283.
- Boyne, G.A. 2002. "Public and private management: What's the difference?" *Journal of Management Studies* 39(1): 97-122.
- Brief, A.P. 1998. *Attitudes In and Around Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Brierley, J.A. 1999. "Accountants' job satisfaction: A meta-analysis." *British Accounting Review* 31(1): 63-84.
- Brunetto, Y. and R. Farr-Wharton. 2006. "A comparison of the administrative subculture of public and private sector employees." *International Journal of Public Administration* 29(8): 616-638.

- Buchanan, B. 1974. "Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 19(4): 533-546
- Caldwell, F.D., J.A. Chatman, and C.A. O'Reilly. 1990. "Building organizational commitment: A multifirm study." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63(2): 245-261.
- Camilleri, E. 2006. "Towards developing an organizational commitment-public service motivation model for the Maltese public service employees." *Public Policy and Administration* 21(1): 63-83.
- Castaing, S. 2006. "The effects of psychological contract fulfilment and public service motivation on organizational commitment in the French civil service." *Public Policy and Administration* 21(1): 84-98.
- Cerese, F.P. and D. Farinella. 2006. "Explorations in public service motivation: The case of the Italian Revenue Agency." *Presented at the Annual Conference of the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA)*, Milan.
- Cho, K.H. and S.H. Lee. 2001. "Another look at public-private distinction and organizational commitment: A cultural explanation." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* 9(1): 84-102.
- Clugston, M., J.P. Howell, and P.W. Dorfman. 2000. "Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment?" *Journal of Management* 26(1): 5-30.
- Connolly, J.J. and C. Viswesvaran. 2000. "The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis." *Personality and Individual Differences* 29(2): 265-281.
- Cook, J. and T. Wall. 1980. "New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 53(1): 39-52.

- Cooper-Hakim, A. and C. Viswesvaran. 2005. "The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework." *Psychological Bulletin* 131(2): 241-259.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A. and M.I. Kessler. 2003. "The employment relationship in the U.K. public sector: A psychological contract perspective." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13(2): 213-230.
- Cramer, D. 1996. "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A two-wave panel study." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17(4): 389-400.
- Dawson, J. F. and A.W. Richter. 2006. "Probing three-way interactions in moderated multiple regression: Development and application of a slope difference test." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91(4): 917-926.
- Delobbe, N. and C. Vandenberghe. 2000. "A four-dimensional model of organizational commitment among Belgian employees." *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 16(2): 125-138.
- Fletcher, C. and R. Williams. 1996. "Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment." *British Journal of Management* 7(2): 169-179.
- Goulet, L.R. and M.L. Frank. 2002. "Organizational commitment across three sectors: Public, non-profit, and for-profit." *Public Personnel Management* 31(2): 201-210.
- Greene, W.H. 2008. *Econometric analysis* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Herrbach, O. 2006. "A matter of feeling? The affective tone of organizational commitment and identification." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27(5): 629-643.
- Karl, K.A. and C.L. Sutton. 1998. "Job values in today's workforce: A comparison of public and private sector employees." *Public Personnel Management* 27(4): 515-527.

- Kelman, S. 2007. "Public administration and organization studies." *The Academy of Management Annals* 1: 225-267.
- Kirkman, B.K. and D.L. Shapiro. 2001. "The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance." *Academy of Management Journal* 44(3): 557-569.
- Markovits, Y., A.J. Davis, and R. van Dick. 2007. "Organizational commitment profiles and job satisfaction among Greek private and public sector employees." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 7(1): 77-99.
- McClelland, G. H. and C.M. Judd. 1993. "Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects." *Psychological Bulletin* 114(2): 376-390.
- Meyer, J.P., N.J. Allen, and C.A. Smith. 1993. "Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78(4): 538-551.
- Meyer, J.P., D.J. Stanley, L. Herscovitch, and L. Topolnytsky. 2002. "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 61(1): 20-52.
- Mowday, R.T., L.W. Porter, and R.M. Steers. 1982. *Employee organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R.T., R.M. Steers, and L.W. Porter. 1979. "The measurement of organizational commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14(2): 224-247.
- Naff, K.C. and J. Crum. 1999. "Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference?" *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 19(4): 5-16.

- Odom, R.Y., W.R. Boxx, and M.G. Dunn. 1990. "Organizational cultures, commitment, satisfaction, and cohesion." *Public Productivity and Management Review* 14(2): 157-169.
- Perry, J.L. 1996. "Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6 (1): 5-22.
- Perry, J.L. and A. Hondeghem. 2008. "Building theory and empirical evidence about Public Service Motivation." *International Public Management Journal*. 11(1): 3-12.
- Rachid, Z. 1995. "Organizational commitment and perceived management styles: The public-private sector contrast." *Management Research News* 18(6/7): 9-19.
- _____, 1994. "Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style: A comparison of public and private sector employees." *Human Relations* 47(8): 997-1010.
- Rainey, H.G. 1997. *Understanding and managing public organizations*. (2nd ed.) New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Rainey, H.G. and B. Bozeman. 2000. "Comparing public and private organizations: Empirical research and the power of the a priori." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2): 447-469.
- Rhoades, L., R. Eisenberger, and S. Armeli. 2001. "Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of Perceived Organizational Support." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(5): 825-835.
- Riketta, M., and R. van Dick, R. 2005. Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analysis comparison of the strength and correlates of work-group versus organizational commitment and identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67: 490-510.

- Riketta, M., and R. van Dick, R. (2009). „Commitment’s place in the literature“. Pp. 69-95 H.J. Klein, T.E. Becker and J.P. Meyer (eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions*. New York: Routledge.
- Salancik, G.R. 1977. “Commitment and the control of organizational behaviour and belief.” Pp. 1-54 B. M. Staw and G. R. Salancik, eds., *New directions in organizational behaviour*, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.
- Savery, L.K. 1991. “Perceived and preferred styles of leadership: Influences on employee job satisfaction.” *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 6(1): 28-32.
- Smith, P.B., R. Fischer, and N. Sale. 2001. “Cross-cultural industrial/organizational psychology.” Pp. 147-193 C.L. Cooper and I. Robertson, eds., *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 16: New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Solomon, E.E. 1986. “Private and public sector managers: An empirical investigation of job characteristics and organizational climate.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 71(2): 247-259.
- Spector, P.E. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- _____, 2006. Method variance in organizational research. Truth or urban legend?, *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(2): 221-232
- Steijn B. 2008. “Person-Environment Fit and Public Service Motivation.” *International Public Management Journal*. 11(1): 13-27.
- Steijn, B. and P. Leisink. 2006. “Organizational commitment among Dutch public sector employees.” *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 72: 187-201.
- Taylor, J. 2008. “Organizational influences, Public Service Motivation, and work outcomes: An Australian study.” *International Public Management Journal*. 11(1): 67-88.

- Vandenabeele, W. 2007. "Toward a public administration theory of public service motivation: An institutional approach." *Public Management Review* 9(4): 54-56.
- Vandenberghe, C. 2003. "Application of the three-component model to China: Issues and perspectives." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 62(3): 516-523.
- Warr, P., J. Cook, and T. Wall. 1979. "Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 52(2): 129-148.
- Watson, D., L.A. Clark, and A. Tellegen. 1988. "Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54(6): 1063-1070.
- Weiss, D.J., R.V. Dawis, G.W. England, and L.H. Lofquist. 1967. "Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire." *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation Bulletin* 22.
- Yilmaz, C. 2002. "Salesperson performance and job attitudes revisited: An extended model and effects of potential moderators." *European Journal of Marketing* 36(11/12): 1389-1414.
- Young, B.S., S. Worchel, and D.J. Woehr. 1998. "Organizational commitment among public service employees." *Public Personnel Management* 27(3): 339-348.
- Yousef, D.A. 2002. "Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between role stressors and organizational commitment: A study from an Arabic cultural perspective." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 17(4): 250-266.
- _____. 2001. "Islamic work ethic – A moderator between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in a cross-cultural context." *Personnel Review* 30(2): 152-169.

TABLE 1

Differences in private and public sectors the Greece

	Private Sector	Public Sector
Loyalty	To the private sector employer	To the government and the State – the new entrant gives an oath to the Greek Constitution
Employment Contract	Individual-, company- or sector-based	Government-, regional government, local government-based
Employment Status	Contracted employment (mainly fixed term)	Life-time and secured employment
Type of Employment	Full-time, part-time and flexi-time	Full-time
Hours of Work	Typically 40 hours per week, but varies form sector to sector	37.5 hours per week
Policies and Procedures	Determined by each private sector organization	Determined by law and applied to all employees
Wages Determination	Individual, enterprise or branch collective agreements – minimum wages are not guaranteed in all private sectors	National collective agreement – minimum wages are guaranteed everywhere in the public sector
Fringe Benefits	Not provided to everyone	Provided to everyone by law and collective agreements
Wage Progression	Determined by each private sector organization (according to merits, achievements, company needs)	Determined by seniority and educational background

FIGURE 1

Heuristic framework for the analyses

Control Variables

Positive/Negative Affectivity, Age, Gender, Marital Status, Education




TABLE 2

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alpha coefficients) and inter-correlations among the two facets of job satisfaction and the three organizational commitment forms

Variables	Mean	S.d.	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Extrinsic satisfaction	4.64	1.01	.84									
2. Intrinsic satisfaction	4.78	1.08	.88	.68**								
3. Affective commitment	4.69	1.28	.84	.50**	.56**							
4. Normative commitment	4.28	1.26	.65	.44**	.45**	.70**						
5. Positive affect	5.09	.78	.82	.11**	.14**	.16**	.16**					
6. Negative affect	2.81	.72	.81	-.12**	-.11**	-.08	-.01	-.30**				
7. Gender	1.50	.50		-.12**	-.04	-.13**	-.07	-.04	.05			
8. Age	2.00	.89		-.01	.10*	.20**	.14**	.04	-.04	.21**		
9. Education	2.37	.93		.00	.04	.01	-.07	.12**	-.09*	-.02	.20**	
10. Marital status	1.76	.58		-.01	.08	.17**	.10*	.02	-.02	.02	.56**	.12**

Notes: N=617, ** p < .01 (two-tailed), * p < .05 (two-tailed), S.d. = standard deviation, α = alpha coefficient

TABLE 3

Hierarchical regression analysis for affective commitment and extrinsic satisfaction

	Affective commitment			
	Step 1		Step 2	
	B	SE B	B	SE B
Extrinsic satisfaction	.62**	.04	.50**	.06
Sector	-.08	.11	-1.31**	.42
Positive affectivity	.14**	.05	.16**	.05
Negative affectivity	.02	.05	-.01	.05
Gender	-.05	.05	-.06	.05
Age	.16**	.06	.16**	.06
Educational background	-.06	.05	-.06	.05
Marital status	.14*	.05	.14**	.05
Sector * Extrinsic satisfaction			.27**	.09
R ²	.31		.32	
Adjusted R ²	.30		.31	

Notes: ** p < .01, * p < .05, N=617, Sector = Private/Public Sector

TABLE 4

Hierarchical regression analysis for affective commitment and intrinsic satisfaction

	Affective commitment			
	Step 1		Step 2	
	B	SE B	B	SE B
Intrinsic satisfaction	.63**	.04	.50**	.05
Sector	-.16	.11	-1.65**	.40
Positive affectivity	.11*	.05	.13**	.05
Negative affectivity	.01	.05	.00	.04
Gender	-.12**	.05	-.12**	.04
Age	.07	.06	.08	.06
Educational background	-.09	.05	-.09	.05
Marital status	.12*	.05	.12*	.05
Sector * Intrinsic satisfaction			.31**	.08
R ²	.35		.37	
Adjusted R ²	.34		.36	

Notes: ** p < .01, * p < .05, N=617, Sector = Private/Public Sector

FIGURE 2

Regression lines for extrinsic satisfaction and affective commitment




FIGURE 3

Regression lines for intrinsic satisfaction and affective commitment



TABLE 5

Hierarchical regression analysis for normative commitment and extrinsic satisfaction

	Normative commitment			
	Step 1		Step 2	
	B	SE B	B	SE B
Extrinsic satisfaction	.54**	.05	.37**	.06
Sector	.13	.12	-1.52**	.43
Positive affectivity	.18**	.05	.20**	.05
Negative affectivity	.09*	.05	.09	.05
Gender	.03	.05	.02	.05
Age	.21**	.06	.21**	.06
Educational background	-.18*	.05	-.10*	.05
Marital status	.04	.06	.04	.06
Sector * Extrinsic satisfaction			.36**	.09
R ²	.24		.26	
Adjusted R ²	.23		.25	

Notes: ** p < .01, * p < .05, N = 617, Sector = Private/Public Sector

TABLE 6

Regression analysis for normative commitment and intrinsic satisfaction

	Normative commitment			
	Step 1		Step 2	
	B	SE B	B	SE B
Intrinsic satisfaction	.49**	.04	.32**	.05
Sector	.08	.12	-1.94**	.42
Positive affectivity	.16**	.05	.18**	.05
Negative affectivity	.08	.05	.08	.05
Gender	-.03	.05	-.03	.05
Age	.14*	.06	.15*	.06
Educational background	-.13*	.05	-.13*	.05
Marital status	.02	.06	.03	.06
Sector * Intrinsic satisfaction			.42**	.08
R ²	.23		.27	
Adjusted R ²	.22		.26	

Notes: ** p < .01, * p < .05, N = 617, Sector = Private/Public Sector

FIGURE 4

Regression lines for extrinsic satisfaction and normative commitment




FIGURE 5

Regression lines for intrinsic satisfaction and normative commitment

