

THE JOB ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES AMONG PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
SCHOOL TEACHERS IN ALBANIA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MIGENA BUKA

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

APRIL 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Reyhan Bilgiç  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Reyhan Bilgiç (METU)

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer (METU)

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Canan Ergin (TUBITAK)

---

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last Name :

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE JOB ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES AMONG PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS IN ALBANIA**

Buka, Migena  
M.S., Department of Psychology  
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Reyhan Bilgiç

April 2005, 98 pages

In the present study, the attitudinal differences between the public and private school teachers in Albania were investigated. The attitudinal variables were: job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and one behavioral intention: turnover intention. Data was gathered from totally 429 teachers working in public (N = 254) and private (N = 175) schools in Albania, in high and secondary schools. Of them, 73% were females (N = 315) and 27% were males (N = 114). The sample mean age was found to be 39 and it varied from 22 to 63 years.

Results supported only the hypothesis that stated that the private school teachers are more satisfied with their jobs as compared to their colleagues working in the public sector. Although the hypothesis regarding job involvement and organizational commitment were not supported, it was found that there were significant differences between the teachers working in the public and private schools, with respect to these variables. In the last hypothesis, significant difference was expected for the turnover intention between the public and private sector teachers, however this hypothesis was not supported also. The results are discussed along with the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

**Keywords:** Public–private sector differences, job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, turnover intention.

## ÖZ

### KAMU VE ÖZEL SEKTÖR OKULLARINDA ÇALIŞAN ÖĞRETMENLER ARASINDAKİ TUTUM FARKLILIKLARI

Buka, Migena  
Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü  
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Reyhan Bilgiç

Nisan 2005, 98 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, Arnavutluk'ta bulunan resmi ve özel okullarda çalışan öğretmenler arasındaki işle tutum ve davranış farklılıkları araştırılmıştır. Bu tutumlar iş doyumu, işle bütünleşme, ve örgütsel bağlılık; davranış ise işten ayrılma niyetidir. Veriler, kamuya (N = 254) ve özel sektöre ait (N = 175) ortaokul ve liselerde çalışan toplam 429 öğretmenden toplanmıştır. Katılımcıların %73'ünü (N = 315) kadınlar, %27'sini (N = 114) erkekler oluşturmuştur. Katılımcıların yaşları 22 ile 63 arasında değişmekte ve yaş ortalaması 39'dur.

Bulgular sadece, özel sektörde çalışan öğretmenlerin, kamu sektöründe çalışan öğretmenlere göre daha fazla iş doyumuna sahip olacağı yönündeki ilk hipotezi desteklemiştir. Örgütsel bağlılık ve işle bütünleşme ele alan hipotezler desteklenmemekle birlikte, bu değişkenler bakımından iki grup arasında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu bulgusu elde edilmiştir. Son olarak, işten ayrılma niyeti bakımından gruplar arasında fark olacağı yönündeki hipotez de desteklenmemiştir. Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular, araştırmanın sınırlılıkları ve gelecekteki araştırmalar için öneriler çerçevesinde tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu-özel sektör farklılıkları, iş doyumu, işle bütünleşme, örgütsel bağlılık, işi bırakma niyeti.

**To ARLI & BLEDI...**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I express sincere thanks to my thesis advisor Reyhan Bilgiç, who guided me through the difficult steps of completing this thesis. Without her feedback and suggestions, I would not be able to complete satisfactorily the thesis.

I also would like to express my appreciation to Canan Sümer for her invaluable comments and suggestions, and her trust toward me, throughout all my undergraduate and graduate years.

Many thanks go to Başak Ok for her help with my statistical analysis, and Nagihan Taşdemir for her help with the abstract translation. I also express deep gratitude, to Bukuroshe and Bektash Shorri, Albert Shehu and Bardhyl Maliqi for their help during the data collection. Moreover, I would like to thank my friends Suela Bala and Ayça Oyal for their support, especially in the last steps of the thesis.

Last, but certainly not least my deepest gratitude is for my family, without who I would not be here, at all. I am extremely grateful to my parents **Zhaneta** and **Agim** for their unconditional love, support and encouragement throughout all my life. Many thanks to my sister **Sonila** for being always besides me, and to my brother **Erjon** who helped me very much when I felt things were not working out, as they should, and was a source of support, calmness, joy and lekësh. Many thanks for my grandmother **Lemane**, for her help in her own way. My warmest thanks go to my beloved husband **BLEDI** for being with me anytime anywhere. And my last gratefulness is for my son **ARLI**, for making me feel unsubstitutable and for being my strongest motivator of all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 Public–Private Organization.....	3
1.2.1 Definition of Public–Private Organizations.....	3
1.2.2 Consequences of Public–Private Organization.....	6
1.3 Job Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions.....	11
1.3.1 Job Satisfaction.....	11
1.3.2 Job Involvement.....	13
1.3.3 Organizational Commitment.....	15
1.3.4 Turnover Intention.....	18
1.4 Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment: Distinct Variables or Overlapping Ones?.....	21
1.5 Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention: The Relationship Among These Variables.....	24
1.6 Purpose and significance of the study.....	31
1.7 Hypothesis.....	35
2. METHOD.....	38
2.1 Participants .....	38
2.2 Procedure .....	38



2.3 Measures.....	39
2.3.1 Job Satisfaction Instrument.....	40
2.3.2 Job Involvement Instrument .....	40
2.3.3 Organizational Commitment Instrument.....	42
2.3.4 Turnover Intention Instrument.....	42
2. RESULTS.....	44
3.1 Overview.....	44
3.2 Cleaning the Data.....	44
3.3 Factor Analysis.....	45
3.4 Reliability Analysis .....	50
3.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	51
3.6 Correlation Analysis.....	52
3.7 ANCOVA and Hypothesis Testing.....	53
3.8 Discriminant Function Analysis.....	58
3. DISCUSSION.....	65
4.1 Overview.....	65
4.2 Results of Hypothesis Testing.....	65
4.3 Limitations of the Study .....	74
4.4 Strengths of the Present Study.....	75
4.5 Suggestions for Future Research.....	76
REFERENCES.....	77
APPENDICES.....	
A. JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY.....	85
B. JOB INVOLVEMENT INSTRUMENT.....	86
C. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT. INSTRUMENT.....	87
D. TURNOVER INTENTION INSTRUMENT.....	88
E. THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ALBANIAN.....	89
F. THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH.....	94

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLE

1. Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction.....	46
2. Rotated Component Matrix for Organizational Commitment .....	48
3. Reliability of Scales .....	50
4. Correlations among DVs in the Public Schools.....	52
5. Correlations among DVs in the Private Schools .....	52
6. Correlations among DVs in the Total Sample.....	53
7. Correlations Among Possible Covariates.....	54
8. ANCOVA Results.....	57
9. Estimated Marginal Means.....	58
10. Tests of Equality Group Means for the DVs .....	59
11. Means and SDs of Public and Private School teachers for the DVs.....	60
12. Tests of Equality Group Means for the Subscales .....	61
13. Means and SDs of Public and Private School teachers for the Subscales of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction.....	62
14. ANOVA Results for Organizational Commitment.....	63
15. Within Subjects Differences for the Public School Teachers.....	64
16. Within Subjects Differences for the Private School Teachers.....	64

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Organizations are dominant components of our contemporary society (Hall, 2002), which are found surrounding and leading our everyday life, more than one can imagine at the first thought. The supermarket where we do our everyday shopping, the cinema where we watch a film, the school we attend, the yoga group where we spend our free time, etc. are all examples of organizations. Despite being so widespread and important, their investigation as a field study has started in the beginning of the 1940s with the work of Merton's students, such as Selznik, Gouldner etc. (Scott, 2001). Commencing with the definitions from the past it can be observed how organizations have evolved over time.

Barnard (1938) defined organizations as “a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons”. Weber (1947) extended this definition and inserted some new concepts. He stated that corporate group which differs from the other forms of social organization involves “social relationship which is either closed or limits the admission of outsiders by rules [...] so far as its order is enforced by the action of specific individuals whose regular function this is, of a chief or “head” and usually also on administrative staff”.

A more contemporary definition comes from Etzioni (1964), who states: “...organizations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. Corporations, armies, schools, hospitals, churches, and prisons are included; tribes, classes, ethnic groups, and families are excluded.”

One of the latest definitions is provided from Hall (2002) who defines organizations as:

*An organization is a collectivity with a relatively identifiable boundary, a normative order (rules), ranks of authority*

*(hierarchy), communication systems, and membership coordinating systems (procedures); this collectivity exists on a relatively continuous basis in an environment, and engages in activities that are usually related to a set of goals; the activities have outcomes for organizational members, for the organization itself, and for the society. (italics from the original)*

As it can be easily observed, the definition of the organizations has grown and expanded with the passing of time. Every definition encompasses more and more variables while trying reach the ultimate one. The qualitative change that is made time after time makes studying of the organizations difficult and complex. Within one study it is impossible to include all of the variables of interest, therefore different studies have investigated different variables. Some of these variables are: size, publicness of the organization (whether it is public or private), profit versus non profit organization, the extent to which an organization is democratic, and the degree of market power or environmental dominance that an organization possesses. (Hall, 2002)

Whether all of the above-mentioned variables are adequate or not, and whether there could be better defining variables for an organization is beyond the scope of this thesis. It is thought that the public-private distinction brings important differences not only in organizational structure, diversity of goals, and resources (Parker & Bradley, 2000) but in job attitudes and behavioral intentions as well. The scope of this thesis is to investigate the differences that come along with this distinction with respect to: job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and turnover intention.

## **1.2 Public – Private Organizations**

### **1.2.1 Definition of Public – Private Organizations**

Organizational theoretical framework and practical issues have started to be investigated almost 70 years ago. However, the public–private distinction apparently has not been considered very important, consequently resulting in less literature as compared to other variables, such as: job attitudes, job performance, behavioral intentions etc (Brown, 1996).

Certain researchers maintain that there is no such distinction as “public–private” (Bozeman, 1987). In fact, Bozeman (1987) claimed that all the organizations could be viewed as public. Baldwin (1987) conducted a fairly broad cross sectional study of public and private managers (N = 234), and he asked about job security, leadership turnover, and goal clarity. Although he found a significant difference between these variables across sectors, this difference was not impressive and sector accounted for only a modest amount of variance. He suggested that the fact that the differences between public and private sector were not really substantial and it might be an indication that the descriptive literature may have overestimated or exaggerated this difference.

Another similar idea put forward by Palmer and Dunford (2001) was that the public–private distinction existed before, but is blurring with the passing of time. They reached this conclusion after conducting a study with public and private sector managers in Australia. They looked at public and private sector organizational practices and found that these practices were quite similar to each other. They suggested that this similarity might stem from the fact that both types of organizations are facing with the same demanding environment.

Looking at these studies, one may think that public private distinction is redundant and there are no differences related to it. As Boyne, Jenkins and Poole (1999) put it: although there is available

evidence that does not provide clear support for the view that public and private management are fundamentally dissimilar in all important respects, it does not mean that there are no differences between public and private organizations. In fact, many more researchers not only accept that there is such a distinction as public–private, but have given various definitions and investigated it in relations with different variables. One of the most well-known distinctions is that profit-making business firms are commonly known as representatives of the private sector, whereas nonprofit services or government regulatory agencies are representatives of the public sector. (Lanchman, 1985)

Another similar definition of public–private is given by Corneo and Rob (2003) where they state that the differences between these sectors lie in their priorities. While, public firms try to maximize welfare, the private ones try to maximize their profits. The former is interested to the community in general and tries to increase its workers' profits and utilities, whereas the latter is more concerned with its own profits and its own welfare as a firm.

The public–private distinction that is based on a single dimension was not considered to be sufficient. A multidimensional definition approach was firstly used by Ben and Gauss (1983, cited in Perry & Rainey, 1988). They suggested that public–private distinction varied along at least three dimensions: a) interest, distinguishing whether benefits or losses are communal or restricted to individual. This dimension is close to the one mentioned by Rob and Corneo (2003). Public organization affects more people and its benefits or losses may be more important than the benefits or losses of a specific private organization. b) access, referring to the openness of facilities, resources or information. The private organizations are more closed to people as compared to the public ones. Sometimes they even implement specific rules to attract people from only one specific category, whereas the public sector organizations are not

allowed to do such a thing as they, by default, are opened to all people. c) agency, which refers to whether a person or organization is acting as an individual or as an agent for the community as a whole. The public sector organizations' representatives act in the name of more people, as compared to the private organizations' representatives. Although all of the above-mentioned dimensions are related to one another, they represent different aspects of public and private organizations.

Another distinction was defined by Perry and Rainey (1988) themselves. They again made the distinction along three different dimensions: a) ownership, which refers to whom, owns the organization; b) funding, which refers to the organ which supports financially the organization; and c) mode of social control, which refers to whether the organization operates in free market economy, or is directed by some kind of higher authority which imposes its own rules and decides the organization's course of action. They came up with eight different types of organizations, which are the hybrids of the combination of these 3 dimensions. These categories designate a series of points ranging across a general dimension of governmental versus private control, from bureaus whose ownership and funding are public and the mode of control is polyarchic at one extreme; to private enterprises which have private ownership and funding and market mode of control at the other end. Since these three dimensions are not strictly dichotomous, one can argue that there may be even more than the eight types of organizations with respect to the percentage of governmental or private control. However, Perry and Rainey (1988) recognize this drawback and suggest that one looks only at the predominance of these dimensions rather than the exact control exerted by either government or private sector. In this way, one can easily define what kind of organization one is talking about. The above-mentioned definitions and the hybrids that come from them, show clearly how difficult it is to operationally define the public-private distinction.

### **1.2.2 Consequences of Public–Private Organization**

In general, when the classification is based on a single characteristic, one of its greatest threats is oversimplification (Hall, 2002). However, classification is inescapable, and the present study will be based on one dimension distinction. If one knows the potential risks of this kind of classification, then one can avoid the most “dangerous” parts of the oversimplification and draw realistic conclusions. In this section, some of the studies regarding public–private distinction and their conclusions will be examined.

Before starting with the studies, the question “Why is public–private distinction so important and why should it be studied?” will be answered. One of the reasons is that the publicness of the organization imposes conduct of research, since it is related to different antecedents and consequences for the employees. Another reason is the inattention to difference between profit oriented firms and public agencies. This can lead to overgeneralization in the organization theory (Perry & Rainey, 1988). Additionally, their potential relevance to understanding the proper roles of the public and private sectors, the implications of imposing public purposes on private corporations, and the transferability of management techniques, such as management by objectives and merit pay system between business and government are considered as crucial in organizational studies (Perry & Rainey, 1988).

Lanchman (1985) studied chief executive officers’ (CEOs) perceptions of their role environments in both public and private sector, in Israel. The sample consisted of 141 CEOs all men, who fully completed the interview. Lanchman measured the influence of 5 main segments of the organizational environment: 1. government agencies; 2. government policies; 3. labor unions; 4. market; and 5. owners, by simply asking the question “how much influence do the above–mentioned bodies have on your decision autonomy?” and the answers varied on a scale from 1 (high



influence) to 15 (low influence). He also measured time span of discretion by the frequency with which CEOs reported control with scores varying from 1 (low discretion) to 7 (high discretion). The last measure of Lanchman was job satisfaction measured with an intrinsic satisfaction scale that included 8 Likert type items ( $\alpha=0.76$ ) and extrinsic satisfaction scale that included 10 Likert type items ( $\alpha=0.82$ ). The results were quite surprising and unexpected. It was found that CEOs of industrial enterprises perceived their role environments similarly, regardless of sector affiliation. Time span discretion discriminated between CEOs but in the reverse direction from the one hypothesized. Public sector CEOs were found to have a higher degree of discretion than their private sector colleagues. The last hypothesis about job satisfaction was fully supported: public sector CEOs were less satisfied with both their intrinsic and extrinsic rewards when compared to the employees working in the private organizations.

Another study related to job satisfaction in public and private organizations was conducted by Bordia and Blau (1998). They investigated the pay referent comparison and actual pay level satisfaction in different organizations in India. Pay referent comparison refers to the comparison an individual makes to other people, to self-history, etc with respect to the amount one is being paid. In other words, it is not the net amount wage that one is concerned with, but the ratio above/under that this wage represents with respect to other people, other organization may offer etc. They used a total sample of 118 full time employees (N=47 –public sector, N=71 – private sector). They used 10 specific one-item pay referents with the level of responses ranging from: 1—a lot less; 2—a bit less; 3—same; 4—a bit more; and 5—a lot more. For the pay level satisfaction they used both the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The results supported their hypothesis concerning the public-private distinction. More specifically: private sector employees were significantly more satisfied with their pay than the public sector employees. Public

sector employees did have a significantly lower mean on the system pay referent level comparison as compared to private sector employees.

Besides job satisfaction, other studies have investigated other attitudinal and personality differences with respect to public and private distinction. One such study is that of Bourantas and Papalexandris (1999). They conducted a study in Greece (N=917) to look at whether the personality traits did really influence employees' choice of private and public organizations. The measure they used was constructed by a number of personality traits or individual characteristics associated with job attitudes, which were as follows: growth need strength, need for security and pay, locus of control, sense of competence, activity, protestant work ethics, intolerance to ambiguity, political ideology, and need for clarity. Public sector employees were found to be more external in their locus of control and showed lower tolerance to ambiguity, sense of competence and activity compared to their private sector colleagues. Moreover, they had less need for clarity and growth and were less "market" oriented than the private sector employees. In the rest three personality characteristics (security needs, pay needs and protestant work ethics) there were found no significant differences between the public and private sector employees. These findings imply that besides environmental and structural characteristics of the two sectors, which may be the source of attitudinal differences, it might also be that persons attracted to the public sector have different personality characteristics from those attracted to the private sector.

A different field where public and private differences were found was reward allocation, as stated by Fischer (2004). He conducted two studies investigating the use of reward allocation principles based on equity, equality, need and seniority in public and private organizations, in Germany and the UK. The first study, which was a laboratory study, involved 87 students from UK and 70 from Germany. The second study

was conducted on full time employed adults in the UK and Germany (respectively 130 and 184) in order to replicate the findings of the first study. He used “Reward Allocation Questionnaire” which contained 15 questions and was constructed by Fischer himself. Among the other findings, Fischer reported that employee equity of reward allocation was significantly more important in private organizations as compared to public sector ones. This may be due to the fact that private sector organizations are interested in maintaining a highly efficient and effective workforce; otherwise the organization will not be able to maintain a competitive advantage in the future, in the market. Whereas the public sector was found to apply at a lower level the equity principle. However, no difference was found between the two sectors with respect to equality principles. In other words, although private firms are more equitable, this does not mean that the public firms are more egalitarian. Another finding was that the employee need for financial support was found to be an important factor in reward allocations in private firms, but not in the public firms. This may be due to the fact that private firms are more flexible in their reward allocation politics. Moreover, they cannot afford to lose one or more employees and instead of the ones, who leave, hire and train new ones. This may turn out to be more costly in time and money as well.

Related to personality differences, the self-selection process was considered important and it was looked how it might affect public-private organization choice. Becker and Connor (article in press), conducted a cross-cultural study and looked into whether there really were systematic differences while comparing public and private sector managers and if there were differences, were these differences due to self-selection or due to socialization process. They conducted their analysis to 2 different samples: Canadian (577 subjects) and Japanese (270 subjects) making a total of 847 subjects. The values were measured by using Rokeach Values Survey (RVS), form D (Rokeach, 1973). They found that there were

significant differences between public and private sector managers with respect to their values, but these differences did become less similar with the length of the tenure in that role. Becker and Connor explained that this difference occurred as a result of socialization process more, as compared to self-selection process.

In Turkey, public and private sector differences were found also with respect to the organizational rationality, as reported by Ölmez, Sümer, and Soysal (2004). Their study compared public, private and multinational organizations in Turkey, using their own developed questionnaire which was based on the theories of the sociologist Max Weber. This questionnaire assessed four types of organizational rationality, namely: efficiency, predictability, calculability, and the amount of control that existed in different organizations. One of the important and relevant findings of this study was that amongst Turkish organizations, private organizations scored significantly higher in all the organizational rationality dimensions than the public organizations.

To sum up, it can be concluded that public and private sector organizations are quite different from each other. As it will be shown in the coming sections, these differences can be observed in different dimensions, such as: organizational structure, different hierarchical culture, diversity of goals, access to resources, nature of organizational constraints (economic versus political) etc. (Parker & Bradley, 2000); job attitudes, such as: job satisfaction (Solomon, 1986); job insecurity (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999); organizational commitment (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999); job involvement; behavioral intentions (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999; Porter, Steers, Mowday, Boulian, 1974); decision-making autonomy (cited in Cho & Lee, 2001) etc. As it is impossible to look into all the above-mentioned variables of interest in one single study, in the present study it will be looked into only some of the job attitudes, namely: job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment and turnover intention for the school teachers

employed in public and private schools in Albania.

Teaching is a very important profession since the impact it has with respect to the new generation is immediate and notable. With the opening of the private sector in education in Albania, it has to be investigated whether the teachers are committed to their organization or to the job; what is that makes a teacher more satisfied to his/her job; what are the possible reasons that make a teacher thinking of leaving the job and similar questions. As these variables are estimated among the most important ones, these were chosen among the other ones to be investigated in this study.

### **1.3 Job Attitudes and Behavioral Intention**

In the following parts, the interest variables will be examined one by one, their relationship with other variables and the relations among them will be the focus. Starting with job satisfaction, it will be continued with job involvement, organizational commitment and it will be ended with turnover intention variable. Each of these variables will be looked in a general light and only few studies will be mentioned to have a general idea about what these variables are. The next section is dedicated to whether these variables are distinct from each other, or are the same construct named differently. Although there have been a lot of studies, sometimes it seems they are talking about the same variable, so it seems logical to talk about the differences and distinctiveness of these variables. The next section will consider the relationship that exists among these variables with respect to public and private distinction, and in the last part, the hypothesis of the present study will be stated.

#### **1.3.1 Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is understood to be one's affective response to the job viewed either in its entirety (global satisfaction) or with regard to particular aspects (facet satisfaction) i.e. pay, supervision etc. (Tett, Meyer,

& John, 1993) As mentioned above, one of the most important factors that determine the employee satisfaction with respect to particular aspects (facets) is the satisfaction with pay as found by Wallace and Schwab (1974) who reported that pay satisfaction was positively related to pay level.

Solomon (1986) compared 120 Israeli public-sector top managers to 120 Israeli private-sector top managers. Both samples were evenly divided between manufacturing and service organizations and they constituted a good representative sample of Israeli work organizations. He gave the participants two questionnaires: the first one was Job Characteristics Questionnaire which consisted of 20 items including job reward policies, interpersonal job aspects, autonomy, feedback role stress etc; and Organizational Climate Questionnaire which consisted of 19 items about reward structure, decision-making practices etc. Also he asked about perceived existence and satisfaction with the various job and organizational climate. Among the other findings Solomon (1986) reported that private sector managers reported higher levels of satisfaction than public sector managers.

A relevant study for the school teachers employed in public and private organizations is carried out by Ayalla and Zehava (1999). They found that public sector school teachers were more concerned with intrinsic job features; whereas private sector school teachers were more concerned with financial (extrinsic) job features. Thus, it can be implied that private sector employees will be more satisfied with their job, if their pay level or fringe benefits (and other extrinsic rewards) are at a satisfactory level, as compared to the public sector employees who stress the importance of other job features, such as: job conditions, coworkers etc.

### **1.3.2 Job Involvement**

Job involvement is not a new topic nor under researched judging by the number of studies and the settings. However, there is much disagreement on defining and accepting what job involvement really is. Reviewers of job involvement research have criticized the lack of conceptual clarity in the research area (Brown, 1996). Since job involvement construct was introduced by Lodahl and Kejner (1965), it has been a flourishing area with respect to conducting studies related to it and a variety of personal and situational characteristics in a diversity of work settings. Lodahl & Kejner, (1965) firstly presented job involvement as the internalization of values about goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the individual. Later on, job involvement was defined as “the degree to which a person is psychologically identified with his work or the importance of work in his total self image”. It was also defined as “the degree to which a person’s work performance affects his self–esteem” (Ruh, White, & Wood, 1975). Another definition was given by Kanungo (1982) who defined job involvement as “a generalized cognitive state of psychological identification with the job”. Nowadays, it is accepted that there are four main categories the definitions of job involvement mainly stress. These categories are: 1) work as a central life interest; 2) active participation in the job; 3) performance as central to self–esteem; and 4) performance consistent with self–concept (Ramsey, Lassk, & Marshall, 1995).

Job involvement is a multidimensional attitude, (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965) which is related to other very important factors in the work setting, so it deserves a special attention in studying it. Highly job involved people are older; they are less considerate as leaders but like to be involved more in administrative works; have more highly interdependent jobs and are more satisfied with the work itself (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

In a study conducted by Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) they investigated the relationship between motivator and hygiene satisfaction variables [this division was done by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) when they came up with “two-factor theory”] to job involvement. The participants were 96 male civil service supervisors. They were given Wernimont Scale (1966) and job involvement scale (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). They found that motivator, but not hygiene satisfaction variables, did correlate significantly and positively with job involvement. In other words, job involvement increases with increasing levels of satisfaction from the motivator variables. The deduction to be made from this study is that by accepting Herzberg two-factor theory, one can influence job involvement only by manipulating intrinsic or work-content variables, such as recognition, achievement, work itself etc. Whereas, it emerged that there was no relationship between job involvement and hygiene or extrinsic satisfaction variables, such as working conditions, job security etc.

Riipinen (1997) conducted a study for the school teachers of secondary schools in Finland. He investigated the relationship between job involvement and need congruence fulfilling. The latter was defined as the organization fulfilling of an employee’s need(s). He found that job involvement could be based on need fulfillment congruence, or not based on need fulfillment. This led the author suggest that, qualitatively speaking, there are two different types of job involvement. This is a different standpoint as compared to the traditional view that need congruence is crucial for high levels of job involvement. Once more this study strengthens the view that one should be very careful at measuring job involvement, since it is shown to have many different definitions and measurement scales.

In general, the effects of specific job characteristics and supervisory behaviors on job involvement have been studied in considerable details,



but the effect of type of organization has not been considered often enough (Brown, 1996). It has been found from previous studies, that job involvement is differently related to job characteristics (Solomon, 1986; Lawler, 1970) and individual differences (Bourantas & Papalexandris, 1999) in public and private organizations, therefore this variable deserves special attention.

### **1.3.3 Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment has become one of the most fashionable variables studied in the last three or four decades. Like every other psychological construct it is quite hard to have a universally accepted definition. However, it has been defined and measured in several different fashions. The various definitions and measures have the common point that organizational commitment is considered to be a bond or a linkage of the individual to the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Organizational commitment may be defined as relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a specific organization. It can be characterized by three factors: 1) a strong belief in and acceptance of organization's goals and values; 2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on the behalf of the organization; and 3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. (Porter, et al., 1974). Much of the interest about organizational commitment is the belief that highly organizationally committed employees are theorized to engage in more citizenship activities, display higher job performance etc (Jaros, 1997) and other similar desirable behaviors.

Steers (1977) conducted a study to look into the antecedents and the outcomes of organizational commitment. He carried out his study among two diverse sample of employees in separate organizations, namely in a hospital (N=382) and in a research laboratory (N=119) where research scientists and engineers were employed. They measured several variables,

which were as follows: job characteristics, work experience, organizational commitment (questionnaire by Porter, 1974), desire and intent to remain in the organization (single item measures of participants desire to remain and intent to remain were obtained on a 7–point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly disagree). Additionally, to the demographic information, such as: age, education, tenure, etc. Steers (1977) measured need strength of attachment, affiliation, autonomy, dominance, and the behaviors of the participants. He found that the antecedents (as he proposed) were important and significantly related of organizational commitment, for both samples. These antecedents were divided into three groups, which were as follows: personal characteristics, job characteristics and work experience. As for the outcomes of the organizational commitment, it was found that commitment was strongly and positively related to the intent to remain in the organization for both samples. Hence, it can be derived that commitment is strongly and negatively related to turnover intention. Moreover, commitment was found to be inversely related to employee turnover, in the hospital sample.

Since the studied organizations were public ones, (they were not profit oriented in the conventional sense), Steers (1977) suggested that there might be an operating self–selection process. Moderate or low performers feel comfortable and committed in a non–threatening environment, while high performers seek challenge somewhere else. Thus, the public organization tends to end with a more stable but less productive or creative workforce. However, if this is really the way that the process goes, this phenomenon has to be studied more, in order to be found out.

One of the greatest contributions to the literature about organizational commitment is the work of Meyer and Allen (1990), who extended the definition of the construct and studied it further. Organizational commitment can take different forms: the first form they talk about is the *nature* of commitment that defines the relationship

between an employee and some other entity (i.e.: organization) and it can vary. The second form involves efforts to distinguish among *entities* to which an employee becomes committed (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p 8).

Meyer and Allen (1990) proposed a three–component model of organizational commitment. They suggested the organizational commitment is the sum of *affective* component, which refers to the employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization; the *continuance* component, which refers to the commitment based on the costs that an employee associates with leaving the organization; and *normative* component, which refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization. Put it in other words: *affective* commitment occurs when employee *wants to stay*; *continuance* commitment occurs when the employee *needs to stay*; and the *normative* commitment occurs when the employee feels s/he *ought to stay* in the organization.

They conducted two studies: in Study I, Allen and Meyer (1990) developed a scale from 256 participants that were full–time, non–unionized employees in 3 organizations: 2 manufacturing firms and 1 university. They developed a scale, which had 3 subscales with 8 items each, corresponding to the three types of commitment: affective, continuance and normative commitment. Study II was conducted to look at the usefulness of the developed scale and whether these three components were significantly different from each other in terms of antecedents. The second sample consisted of 337 full–time non–unionized employees in 3 organizations: one retail department store, one hospital and one university library. The results revealed that the affective and continuance component of organizational commitment were empirically distinguishable construct with different correlates. However, although affective and normative components were statistically distinguishable, they seemed to be somehow related to each other. This study suggests that while studying the

organizational commitment, one has to operationally define it and measure it accordingly.

In another study, Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) found that the three-component conceptualization was valid not only for organizational commitment but for occupational commitment as well. This study further supported the strength and the well establishment of the 3-dimension theory of affective, normative and continuance commitment.

A recent study showed that the three-component model of organizational commitment was generalizable to a non-Western culture using data from South Korea (Lee, Allen, Meyer, & Rhee, 2001). They concluded that the three commitment constructs are likely to generalize to non-Western cultures, but that there might be a need to refine the measures for cross-cultural research.

#### **1.3.4 Turnover Intention**

Turnover intention is conceived to be a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization (Tett, et al, 1993). From this definition, it can be inferred that turnover intention leads to voluntary turnover rather than organizational dismissal. Each form of commitment should be negatively correlated with employees' intention to leave the organization and with voluntary turnover behavior (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Since turnover is more under individual control, it provides more accurate results and they are less difficult to predict than actual turnover (Pare & Tremblay, 2000). Another reason for studying turnover intention, rather than actual turnover rates or the other related variables, is that it seems to be associated with actual turnover much more, than when compared to other job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Huang, Chuang, & Lin, 2003). Furthermore, collecting turnover intention statements is related to lower costs as compared to real turnover actions.

Although turnover may be linked to positive outcomes, such as: increase in organizational performance, conflict reduction in the organization, benefit of organizational mobility, organizational innovation and adaptation (Staw, 1980), turnover is generally seen as a negative outcome and quite costly to the organizations. Staw (1980) tried to reverse the negative point of view of the researchers' about turnover by mentioning its good sides as well. He argued that despite its negative connotation turnover was not always dysfunctional. In fact, turnover could turn out to be a far better choice as compared to keeping the employee in the organization. But, since turnover is related with organizational immediate costs (i.e.: selecting, hiring, training etc), operational disruption, demoralization of organizational membership etc., the practicing organizational psychologists and the organizations in general tend to reduce turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989). They are trying to reach this aim through different routes, and one of these routes is understanding the employees' turnover intentions and act accordingly. Based on this need, the researchers are looking into the relationships that exist between turnover intention and other variables, so that, by controlling one of the variables, they can easily control the interest variable, turnover.

Dalton, Krackhardt, and Porter (1981) supported Staw's view and further expanded the concept by recategorizing the variable from *voluntary* versus *nonvoluntary* to: *functional* versus *non functional* and *unavoidable* versus *controllable*. They conducted the study to 190 bank branches, for a total number of participants N = 1389, during a period of 7 months. The measures Dalton et al (1981) used, consisted of termination forms, from which it was possible to determine whether the employee left or was dismissed; and another form for each bank teller, from which it was possible determine the quality (inadequate or excellent), the repleceability (easy or difficult) of the employee. In addition, they asked whether the reason of leaving was controllable, or unavoidable. They found that in the

previous studies, the negative connotation of turnover was unnecessarily magnified. Actually, when the organizations determined the percentage of functional unavoidable turnovers, the percentage of dysfunctional controllable leaves dropped significantly. In other words, the recategorization of turnover shrinks the possibility of its negative implication. This study draws attention to the researchers to look and define very carefully the type of turnover they are studying and measuring.

Generally behavioral intentions are studied as consequences of job attitudes. In the study conducted by Doran, Stone, Brief, and George (1991) they looked into the behavioral intentions as the antecedents of job attitudes. They conducted a longitudinal study with an initial sample of 332 retail salespeople, however, they ended up with a total of N=126. Doran et al (1991) measured: intent to leave (3-item Intent to Leave Scale), financial requirements, job satisfaction (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire), and demographic variables. They found that the greater the workers' intentions to leave were at the onset of the employment, the lower their subsequent job satisfaction was. Moreover, this relationship was moderated by workers' external financial requirements. More specifically, the intent-to-leave – job-satisfaction relationship was stronger when the external financial requirements were lower.

This study shows that behavioral intentions are strongly are significantly related to job attitudes. Besides functioning as consequences of job attitudes, behavioral intentions may be the cause and trigger certain job attitudes as well. If one enters a public (or private) sector organization with the intent to leave and find another job as soon as possible, this will result in lower job satisfaction, which in turn is related to other job attitudes. So, the employers should make sure that the potential employee is sure and wants to work in that specific public (or private) organization.

#### **1.4 Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment: Distinct Variables or Overlapping Ones?**

As it is the case with all psychological variables, there is no single widely accepted definition for a construct. The above-mentioned concepts are no exception to this rule. When firstly Lodahl and Kejner (1965) developed the job involvement scale, they found that job involvement and job satisfaction were so much related to each other (4 out of 5 dimensions, they measured, overlapped). As such, one could argue that job involvement and job satisfaction variables were the same thing, named differently.

In another study conducted by Morrow and McElroy (1986) it was questioned whether five different variables used to measure work commitment were the same variables or different ones. The variables they looked into were: protestant work ethic, career salience, job involvement, work as a central life interest, and organizational commitment. In fact, especially organizational commitment has been used commonly to measure for the worker commitment. This may stem from the fact that they use the word *work* and *job* interchangeably within the various measures of commitment. Morrow and McElroy (1986) had a sample of 563 participants who had supervisory responsibilities and were employed in a large public agency. The five forms of work commitment were measured by using the conventional instruments that were developed by their inventors. After making a factor-analysis, they found that protestant work ethic and organizational commitment were independent forms of work commitment. Job involvement, career salience and work as central life interest were characterized by a notable amount of redundancy. The authors suggested that this redundancy could be eliminated via psychometric selection of measurement instruments.

However, this view did not hold for long. Later on, when a vast amount of studies were conducted on this topic, it was found that all the above-mentioned variables were quite different from each other (in fact, in

a later study, around 1990, Morrow and McElroy accept by themselves that the distinction among them is “real”). Even before those later studies, Lawler and Hall (1970) conducted a study whose main aims were to: 1) find the theoretical and empirical relationship among three types of job attitudes, namely job involvement, job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation; 2) to find the relationship of various job design characteristics to these attitudes. The sample they used consisted of 291 scientists who were employed in 22 research and development laboratories. To measure the job attitudes, Lawler and Hall gave the participants a 16-item questionnaire which consisted of: 6 items measuring job satisfaction (developed by Porter et al, 1964), 6 items measuring job involvement (developed by Lodahl & Kejner, 1965) and 4 items measuring the intrinsic motivation. Moreover they measured the participants’ job factors, scientists’ perception of their jobs (through group interview), job behaviors by asking the participant to self report their amount of effort on the job and job performance. As a result, Lawler and Hall found that the job attitudes not only differed significantly from each other and were loaded on different factors, but they were differently related to job characteristics and job behavior measures. Job involvement was related to certain job characteristics and was positively related to self-rated effort. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, was related to other job characteristics, such as, amount of control the job allowed the holder and the degree to which it is seen to be relevant to holders’ valued abilities.

Another study that looked into the constructs of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment was conducted by Brook, Russell, and Price (1988) with sample of 577 full time employees in a medical center. They used was a multiple item survey, which contained six job satisfaction items (scale developed by Price & Mueller, 1986) ten job involvement items (index developed by Kanungo, 1982) nine organizational commitment items (version of organizational commitment



questionnaire developed by Porter, et al 1974). Results revealed that the measures of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment were empirically distinct concepts.

A similar study with the same variables was conducted by Mathieu and Farr (1991) who investigated the discriminant validity for the following variables: job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment. However, the sample was different from the one of Brook et al (1988). This sample consisted of 194 bus drivers and 311 engineers, making a total of 505 participants. Mathieu and Farr (1991) used a multiple item survey, which included six job satisfaction items from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al, 1967), six job involvement items (scale developed by Lodahl & Kejner, 1965), and nine items for the organizational commitment (the short form of organizational commitment developed by Porter et al, 1974). For the bus drivers they also looked at role strain, role conflict, role ambiguity, job scope, job tension, and human relations management. They used almost the same scales for the engineers, but for measuring job satisfaction they used a 15-item scale (developed by Hakman & Oldham, 1974). The analysis of discriminant validity of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment showed that these concepts were distinct and different from each other. This conclusion was derived after finding out that the three-factor model composed of these three variables, was a better fit than several two-factor model, or one single factor model.

In a recent cross-sectional study conducted by Landsman (2001), among the other variables she looked into job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to stay among public childcare employees. She conducted the analysis from quite a large sample (N=990). The participants were employees of state public child welfare agency and were mailed the questionnaires. The questionnaire contained mostly single item questions concerning: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to stay

in the organization (which is considered to be the other extreme of turnover intention dimension), job security, role conflict, role ambiguity etc. Landsman maintained that despite the fact that she mostly used single item measures, these measures were quite reliable. Casual findings were established by using structural equations with latent variables. The first and most important finding was that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to stay were all distinct from each other. Moreover, she found that job satisfaction positively and significantly affected organizational commitment and intention to stay in the organization. Another finding was that organizational commitment affected intention to stay in the organization positively and significantly.

As a last word, depending on above mentioned studies, it can be concluded that despite some overlapping and correlations among job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment, these variables are distinct and different from each other and deserve being studied on their own.

### **1.5 Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention: The Relationship Among These Variables.**

Porter et al. (1974) investigated organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians, and the relations between these variables. The measures were taken during 10 and half months, from the psychiatric technicians working in a state hospital, where the turnover rate was quite high. Their initial sample comprised 60 participants. They measured organizational commitment by Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (developed by themselves), which consisted of 15 items, which represented statements to be answered on a 7–point Likert type scale. They also measured job satisfaction by Job Descriptive Index. Their most important finding, as resulted from discriminant analysis, was

that there was a significant relationship between certain attitudes held by the employee and the turnover. More specifically organizational commitment was found to better discriminate between stayers and leavers than did any of the various components of job satisfaction. This study was conducted in a public sector organization and as Porter et al (1974) suggested, whether the same relationship pattern exists for the private sector organization as well, it remains to be found out.

Blau and Boal (1989) studied whether they could predict turnover behavior by using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively. They used a sample of insurance personnel employed in various offices around US (N=106). The measures Blau & Boal used were as follows: Kanungo's (1982) six-item job involvement; Porter, Crampon, and Smith's (1976) 15-item scale of organizational commitment; job withdrawal cognitions (Mobley, 1977) and turnover. They found that job involvement and organizational commitment correlated significantly and positively to each other but correlated significantly and negatively to turnover behavior. The main finding was that job involvement and organizational commitment interacted significantly to predict turnover, beyond employee sex, marital status, tenure, job withdrawal cognitions and main effects of job involvement and organizational commitment. More specifically, highly job involved and highly organizationally committed employees did quit their job significantly less, as compared to low job involved and low organizationally committed employees. Also high job involved and low organizationally committed employees did quit their job significantly more than low job involved and high organizationally committed employees. In other words, in this study it was found that job involvement and organizational commitment did not contribute equally to turnover prediction: organizational commitment was found to be a more powerful predictor of turnover as compared to job involvement.

Meyer, Paounonen, Gellatly, Goffin, and Jackson (1989) conducted a study to examine the relations between performance, affective commitment, continuance commitment and job satisfaction. Their study group was first level managers (N=88) in a large food service company. They measured organizational commitment with 8-item Affective Commitment Scale ( $\alpha=0.84-0.88$ ) and Continuance Commitment Scale ( $\alpha=0.70-0.84$ ) (used by Meyer & Allen, 1984); job satisfaction by using the Index of Organizational Reactions (Smith 1976), which assessed satisfaction with supervision, company identification, kind of work, amount of work, coworkers, psychical work conditions, financial rewards and career future; and performance. Meyer et al (1989) found a positive relationship between affective commitment and performance. They also found that continuance commitment and performance were significantly and negatively related. From this study it can be inferred that although affective and normative commitment measure the same construct, they measure different facets of the construct.

Deciding to leave a job may float in one's head continuously (turnover intention) but really doing so is quite difficult. Not all the turnover intentions finalize into quitting of the job. And in fact, the researchers have questioned whether the turnover intentions are really translated into voluntary turnover (Gerhart, 1990). In one study, Gerhart (1990) tried to define the paths that lead from turnover intention to voluntary turnover. More specifically he looked at general labor conditions, perceive ease of movement as the individual level variables of general ability, experience and tenure. His data was collected from youth cohort (N=1395), 95% of which worked 30 hours or more per week, in three consecutive years: 1979, 1980, and 1981. His measure of general job satisfaction was a series of statements that included facets of Job Descriptive Index and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. He also measured with single item, the intention to stay and the perceived ease of

movement. As a result, Gerhart (1990) found that the intention to stay was positively related to perceived ease of movement and job satisfaction. Another interesting finding was that longer tenure correlated positively with intention to stay, which might result from higher commitment. This study clearly shows that the intention to leave the organization (individual factor) has to be combined with several external factors, so that the employee voluntarily quits the job.

While a lot of researchers try to show the relationship of job characteristics with respect to employee outcomes, basing their studies to incumbent self-report on job characteristics, Spector and Jex (1991) emphasized that one should not rely so extensively on those self reports. They studied 129 jobs, with a total sample N=232 state civil service employees. Besides the classical way of analyzing the self-reports, they studied the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, and took into consideration the ratings of job descriptors. They conducted analysis to look at the convergent validity of these measures and found that although the job satisfaction, intention to quit etc. correlated highly with self-reported measures, they had a modest convergent validity with the other above-mentioned measures. This finding is important, because lot of researches reflecting employee outcomes (i.e.: job satisfaction, turnover intention) may not be showing the true relationship with job characteristics, with which, by default, are heavily interdependent.

Hom, Walker, Prussia and Griffeth (1992) conducted a meta-analytic study and looked at turnover theory, turnover base rates, time lags between turnover, and job satisfaction. They had wide range of findings with respect to different variables, but the most relevant to the present study are as follows: they found a relationship (although not very strong) between turnover intentions and quitting and this relationship was found to be moderated by the time when measures are taken. Moreover, they found that search intentions influenced quit intentions and job satisfaction, and

this relationship ended with the termination of the job. As stated by Hom et al. (1992) turnover intentions directly increase decisions to give up one's job and significantly influence that employee's job satisfaction level by lowering it.

George and Jones (1996) proposed a three-way interaction between turnover intention, job satisfaction and the mood. Their sample size varied from 336 to 306 because of missing data. They measured job satisfaction with a 20-item short form of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al, 1967); value attainment – with an 18-item scale (Rokeach Value Survey, 1973); positive mood – with 10-item scale (positive and negative schedule by Watson, 1988) and lastly the turnover intentions with 3-item scale with a 7-point response format. The findings were quite interesting considering the way this triple interaction functioned. Job satisfaction and turnover intention relationship was strongest when employees' jobs did not help them attain terminal values and positive moods were experienced; whereas it was the weakest, when jobs helped employees to attain terminal values and again positive moods were experienced. While the latter finding might sound logical, the former finding may have its roots at the fact that positive mood is related to higher level of self-efficacy, and the person being more optimistic about getting another more satisfying job etc.

Udo, Guimaraes, and Igbaria (1997) looked at the relationships among different variables of job including job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. Besides these variables, they were interested in other variables as well, such as role conflict, role ambiguity, task significance etc. They collected data through mailing the questionnaires to a specific sample, which was randomly chosen from a list of regional chapters of manufacturing associations. Although they had only a 21% return rate, they considered the size of their sample (N=216) large enough to conduct statistically meaningful analysis. They conducted 27 different path analyses, out of which 10 were found to

be significant. Job involvement was found to have a significant positive effect on organizational commitment and intention to stay. Furthermore job involvement had a direct effect on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was found to have significant positive effect on organizational commitment and intention to stay, and lastly organizational commitment also affected positively job satisfaction. The most important finding of this study was stated to be: organizational commitment is the most immediate determinant of plant managers' intention to stay with their organizations. Whereas, job involvement and job satisfaction variables were found to have indirect effects on turnover intention.

Another study, which gives supportive evidence about the above findings was conducted by Van Scotter (2000). He investigated the relationships of task performance and contextual performance with turnover, job satisfaction and affective commitment. He examined in a longitudinal study, two samples of Air Force mechanics (total N=1410). It was found that the employees, who were found to be more committed at the first time the survey was given, remained more in the organization than the ones who were less committed. Thus, it can be implied that higher organizational commitment leads to lower turnover intention and consequently less turnover behaviors.

Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, and Brymer (2000) examined service employees' behavioral intentions and attitudes and proposed a path model of how they are related to each other. From their findings to be mentioned are: perceived organizational support strongly and significantly influenced job satisfaction and organizational commitment; despite the strong correlation, job satisfaction was found to have a limited predictive impact on organizational commitment. Moreover, the intent to quit was influenced by both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Barrows and Wesson (2001) conducted a study in Canada to lawyers

employed in public and private firms. They mailed a questionnaire that comprised the full version of Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997). Their questionnaire also contained items for burnout, respondents' ability to strike the balance between demands of their work and personal lives, their own effectiveness and the organization's effectiveness, and leadership. They found that in general the private sector lawyers were more satisfied. This satisfaction did not stem only from the pay but they were more satisfied with other things such as fringe benefits, rewards, coworkers, recognition of a well-done job, promotion etc. The only point where there was no difference was the nature of the work from which both public and private sector lawyers reported the same level of satisfaction regardless the other conditions.

In the study conducted by Ayalla and Zehava (1999), they looked into the differences of job insecurity, organizational commitment, intention to quit, and organizational support among Israeli school teachers, working in public and private secondary schools. Their sample consisted of 228 secondary school teachers. They measured job insecurity by a modified version of Ashford (1989) instrument. Organizational commitment was measured by a 9-item scale adopted from Mowday et al (1979); tendency to quit was measured with a 5-item scale adopted from Walsh et al (1985). Among their findings, to be mentioned are: job insecurity was found to affect the public school teachers by decreasing the level of organizational commitment, and increasing the tendency to quit; whereas the high levels of job insecurity affected the private school teachers only by increasing their tendency to quit. This means that job insecurity has an adverse impact on the attitudes of public sector school teachers and little effect on the attitudes of private sector school teachers.

The study of Ayalla and Zehava (1999) is similar to the one proposed here, in several aspects: first, it has studied the group study that has been chosen in the present study – the teachers. Moreover teachers were



employed in two different organizations: public and private. In addition, they were studied with respect to different job attitudes and behavioral intentions. However, there are differences as well: in Ayalla and Zehava's study (1999), only secondary school teachers' differences were examined, whereas in this study secondary school and high school teachers' differences will be studied. Another difference is that the job attitudes in this study are different from Ayalla and Zehava (1999) and the "public-private" will be used as independent variable, rather than dependent variable. Additionally, in the present study job insecurity was not investigated, whereas in Ayalla and Zehava's (1999) study, job insecurity was the focus.

### **1.6 Purpose and significance of the study**

Privatization is not new in education, and it has become a global trend, not merely an American anomaly (Lignos & Richards, 2003). However, in the Eastern Europe Countries during the communism regimes, the private sector was an unknown concept. Albania was one of those countries, which after living for half a century under communism regime and coming out, it started striving for an open market economy. As many other Eastern Europe Countries, it was categorized as a developing country, and it was treated like one. It was only after the collapse of the communist regime that private sector emerged and consequently the terminology public-private started to have a meaning. The transition to a market economy and the changing role of the government, dramatically transformed the environment in which schools used to function. In many cases, these institutions had to adjust their institutional structures, curricula, and relationships with different stakeholders in society to fit the new requirements (Gömbös, 2003).

Being isolated for almost 50 years, Albania has not been studied very much as a culture. But, after the '90s there are some studies that define

Albania as a collectivistic culture. One of these studies is conducted by Bakacsi, Sandor, Andra, and Viktor (2002) who included Albania in the eastern European cluster together with Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Poland, Russia, and Slovenia. This eastern European region is understudied due to its socialist past and was not included in the comparative study of Hofstede in 1980. The region is defined as collectivistic with high power distance and high family and group collectivism (Bakacsi et al., 2002). Albania was found to have participating managers who valued future and performance orientation, but on the other hand they were found to be strongly attached to their culture heritage of deep family and group cohesion.

A similar categorization for Albania was done by Patrick (2004) who reported that the Albanian cultural factors were responsible for the unwillingness of the participants to take responsibility for their own learning. The author delivered an accounting program in Albania and although it was found to be successful, he noticed that the participants showed reluctance to express a spirit of independent learning. Patrick (2004) argued that it is the Albanian history and the context in which it has been operating (referring to the communism regime), that explained the difficulties encountered.

Most developing countries used to provide public education without charge or at minimal cost to their citizens. However, financial limitations started to prevent many developing countries from relying solely on government income to finance the desired educational expansion. To solve this problem the governments adopted policies to a) charge tuition fees to recover at least some part of the cost of providing public education services; and/or b) encourage development of private schools to handle some ratio of the expansion (Glewwe, Patrinos, 1998).

There are studies, mostly conducted in US, that show that public-private organizations differ in various dimensions, such as diversity of

goals, access to resources (Parker & Bradley, 2000); job attitudes (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999; Porter et al 1974); behavioral intentions (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999). Albania is quite different from USA, from a cultural perspective. One cannot be sure of generalizing the findings of an individualistic culture (USA) to a collectivistic one (Albania). Hence, one of the aims of this study is to see whether the same pattern of differences between public and private sectors is true for Albania.

Moreover, the present study intended to further investigate the distinction public–private and the differences in job attitudes that come along with this distinction. It aimed at looking at a specific group of study, which were the teachers. This specific group of study was selected because it is believed that this group is the one that brings radical outcomes with respect to the new generation that will enter the workforce.

Some differences between public and private schools are that private schools are smaller, have different rules regarding discipline, higher expectations regarding homework and those attending private high schools are more likely to enroll in four year education college as compared to those attending public high schools, which either attend a two year college or quit the school (Falsey & Heyns, 1984). This outcome and similar ones are considered extremely important; therefore the focus group of the study is the teachers in secondary and high school in both public and private schools in Albania.

The distinction of public versus private was done according to Perry and Rainey (1988). So, the definition for a public school was: public school is the one which has public ownership and funding; whereas the private school will be the one which has private ownership and funding. When it comes to mode of social control, since education is a main structure, it cannot be defined by the market (no private school can include even a single lesson without the approval of the Ministry of Education), so it was the same for both types of schools: decided by a higher authority.

There was another distinction of public and private concerning the schools, as stated by Lignos and Richards (2003). They made the division depending on: governance, economic government, finance, organization, ownership, and politics. But, besides the fact that this distinction is very specific for the Albanian sample (the private schools are quite new institutions, so they are not as developed as in USA), Perry and Rainey's (1988) division of public and private organizations encompasses the majority of the dimensions mentioned by Lignos and Richards (2003).

This study aimed at examining the public and private school teachers' attitudinal and behavioral differences. The benefits of this study are expected to be noteworthy. Firstly, this study is expected to enlighten the importance of culture in the literature on public– private distinction. Moreover, this study is likely to be an important piece in literature in the comparative research of public and private organizations. This is because of new information that will be offered on job attitudes and turnover intention, plus the investigation of the multivariate relationship network among these variables and personal demographic variables. Moreover, despite the literature that concerns job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment and turnover intention, there are not many studies concerned with the attitudinal differences and behavioral intentions among teachers in public and private sector (Ayalla & Zehava, 1999). From this perspective this study is believed to be an important piece of the whole picture.

To the knowledge of researcher there is no study in Albania that has investigated the difference in job attitudes between public and private schools. So, it should be noted, that the following hypotheses are an attempt to express research issues, rather than to argue any particular personal expectation. Moreover, as previously stated the generalizability from USA (or other countries) findings, to Albanian culture should be done very carefully and skeptically.

## 1.7 Hypothesis

The main hypotheses of the present study are as follows:

Some of the individual components of job satisfaction are: satisfaction with pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and the work itself (Porter et al. 1974). A widely accepted crucial factor for job satisfaction is satisfaction with pay (Wallace & Schwab, 1974; Bordia & Blau, 1998). Private sector managers scored higher in overall job satisfaction as compared to their public sector counterparts (Rainey, 1979; Solomon, 1996). Also, according to Barrows and Wesson (2001), individual respondents' satisfaction levels tend to be fairly uniform across subscales of satisfaction, therefore it can be implied that employees that are more satisfied with pay are generally more satisfied with their job in overall. A very recent longitudinal study conducted in Thailand among public and private hospital nurses, revealed that nurses working in the private hospitals were more satisfied with their job in general when compared to the nurses working in the public hospitals (Tyson & Pongruengphant, 2004). Following these findings:

*HYPOTHESIS I: Public school teachers are less satisfied by their job, as compared to their counterparts in the private schools (also this distinction is seen across the facets of job satisfaction and especially in pay satisfaction, private sector employees are more satisfied than the public sector ones).*

Although the common sense tells that job involvement and job satisfaction are positively related to each other, there is a ground to believe that this is not a general trend. Despite the findings in their studies, there are researchers who “warn” about not confounding these two variables and their relationship between them. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) stated that job involvement and job satisfaction are distinct variables. It is possible that some employees are highly involved but not highly satisfied

by their job, as well as there are other employees who are highly satisfied but not high job involved. In Udo's et al. (1997) study their hypothesis that job satisfaction and job involvement are significantly and positively related was not supported. In a common sense, teachers choose their profession, because they want it since the beginning. Consequently, it is expected that they will love it and be highly involved to their job despite the type of organization they work in. Moreover highly educated people are less committed to the organization but more involved with what they do (Steers, 1977). In other words, they love their profession not the organization. Considering the above, the job involvement hypothesis will be as follows:

*HYPOTHESIS II: There is no difference between public and private school teachers with respect to their job involvement.*

Job tenure is relatively higher in the U. S. Postal Service than in private industrial jobs (Staw, 1980). Also longer tenure correlated positively with intention to stay, which may result from higher commitment (Gerhart, 1990). Wasti (2003) conducted a study in Turkey and looked at the organizational commitment and influence of cultural values. Turkey is categorized as a collectivistic culture by Hofstede's study in 1980 so the findings of this country may show a similar pattern to the Albanian sample. Wasti (2003) found that normative commitment was significantly more important to the employees who endorsed allocentric values (collectivistic values measured in the individual levels) as compared to the employees who were idiocentric (individualistic values measured in individual levels) and valued their personal goals and achievements. It was considered that the individual pattern would be the same for the cultural values as well. The organizational commitment would be higher in public sector as compared to private sector.

HYPOTHESIS III: In the overall, *public school teachers are more organizationally committed to the organization as compared to their colleagues in the private schools.*

Porter et al, (1974) have found that older employees have less turnover intentions as compared to younger ones. Since in the private schools of Albania, the majority is young teachers, the turnover intention is expected to be higher. Moreover, since organizational commitment is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions (Steer, 1977; George & Jones, 1996; Ayalla & Zehava, 1999) and depending on the third hypothesis

HYPOTHESIS IV: *Public school teachers have less turnover intentions as compared to the private school teachers.*

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### 2.1 Participants

Public and private school teachers (N = 429) employed in secondary and high schools in Albania were the participants of the study. The cities where the data was collected from were categorized as: big cities, Tirana and Durres; middle sized cities, Berat and Saranda; and small towns Shijak and Konispol. Data from some of the participants were incomplete but those missing data were dealt while making the analysis. Data was gathered from 429 teachers working in public (N = 254) and private (N = 175) schools in Albania, in high (N = 216) and secondary (N = 213) schools. Of them 73% were females (N = 315) and 27% were males (N = 114). Their age mean was around 39 and it varied from 22 to 63 years. Questions about the teachers' profile (exact, natural sciences, social sciences and others), tenure in teaching, and tenure in that school were asked to get a better profile of the sample.

#### 2.2 Procedure

The aim of the study was to look into the differences of job attitudes and turnover intention between teachers employed in public and private schools in Albania. After selecting the scales that would be used for this purpose, they were independently translated from English to Albanian language by two expert translators. Then, they were synthesized into only one questionnaire by the researcher herself. To ensure the correct presentation of the Albanian questionnaire a bilingual specialist in the field of psychology revised it and corrected few terms so that the questionnaire was user friendly. (for the Albanian questionnaire see Appendix E; for the English version of the questionnaire, see Appendix F)

The questionnaires were distributed and gathered mainly by the



researcher herself. The public schools in Durres and Tirana were chosen randomly from a list obtained from the city's Educational Directorate; in the middle sized cities namely Saranda and Berat, only few schools were reached to the convenience of the researcher; in the small cities Shijak and Konispol all the schools were included in the study. Whereas the private schools included in the study were in Durres and Tirana and there was only one private school in Saranda.

The headmaster was firstly contacted by the researcher explaining the purpose of the study. Although a written permission was obtained from the related city's Educational Directorate, the headmaster of the school had the right not to accept the distribution of the questionnaires within the school hours (like it was the case few times). After getting the permission from the headmaster, the researcher was accompanied to the teachers' room where she once more explained her status and her thesis. Then, the questionnaires were distributed to the teachers. Although the questionnaires could be filled in within 10–15 minutes, generally the teachers asked to give them back later on. So, the researcher came back the next day and some times returned to the same school more that 4 or 5 times. Not being used to this type of study, at the beginning some of the teachers refused to fill them in. However, after talking and explaining to them again the study's purpose, some of them were persuaded to participate. At the end, out of 800 distributed questionnaires only 429 were returned with a return rate of around 54%.

### **2.3 Measures**

Like it is done in many studies (Lawler & Hall, 1970; Steers, 1977; Brook et al 1988; Cropanzano et al 2003 etc), a multiple item survey was given to the participants. The survey included scales for: job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. Moreover questions about individual characteristics, such as gender, age,

and tenure were asked to get a full profile of the public and private sector employees.

### **2.3.1 Job Satisfaction Instrument**

To measure job satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1997) was used. JSS (see Appendix A) has 36 items assessing 9 facets of job satisfaction, namely: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and commitment. The response options ranged on 6-point scale, from disagree very much to agree very much. The responses were coded such that high scores reflect higher levels of job satisfaction. The response choices also included “not applicable” option, because there may be facets that are not applicable to teachers’ job, such as “collaboration with coworkers”. To avoid same pattern response 19 items were reversed.

Validity evidence was found by different studies, which showed that JSS was well correlated to the JDI facets i.e. pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers and nature of the work. Also JSS has shown to correlate with a number of scales and variables that in literature have shown to correlate with other job satisfaction scales, e.g.: age, organizational commitment, organizational level, turnover, intention, turnover, etc. (Spector, 1997, p 11)

JSS was used by Barrows and Wesson (2001) and they suggested that the use of this survey was quite helpful and with good validity and reliability measures.

### **2.3.2 Job Involvement Instrument**

The measure for job involvement was the short form of Job Involvement Scale developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965). Originally it was developed with 40 items that were later reduced to 20 and its short form includes only 6 items (See Appendix B). The response options varied

from 1–completely disagree to 7–completely agree. The responses were coded such that higher scores reflect stronger job involvement.

Split half reliabilities was estimated at 0.73. Correlation between 6–item total and 20–item total is 0.87. Moreover, 6–items account for a total variance of 76%. In other words, using the short form of JIS seemed quite reasonable from a statistical perspective, as it seems to yield almost the same results as its long form.

There are other scales that are used to measure job involvement, but Lodahl and Kejner’s scale was found to be short, practical and quite user friendly. This scale incorporates multiple conceptual dimensions of involvement and is the most commonly and widely used measurement scale (Brown, 1996; Ramsey et al., 1995). Moreover, the frequently used 6–item version of the scale explicitly measures psychological identification dimension of involvement and it is conceptually similar to the Kanungo’s (1982) scale. According to the findings for the measurement of job involvement of Brown’s (1996) meta–analytic study, there were no substantive differences between the mean correlations of all studies (N = 212) that used Lodahl and Kejner 20–items scales, Lodahl and Kejner shortened form 6–item scale and Kanungo’s (1982) scale. In the overall, the results suggested that the studied job involvement scales tended to measure the same thing and had approximately equal empirical validity with respect to a range of related variables.

Some of the researchers that have used this scale and reported their finding on the basis of it are: Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968); Lawler and Hall (1970); Ruh et al. (1975); Mathieu and Farr (1991), Keller (1997) etc. Being so widely used and since until now the reported findings are generalizable to other fields as well, Lodahl and Kejner (1965) job involvement scale was chosen for this study.

### **2.3.3 Organizational Commitment Instrument**

In different studies it has been found that affective commitment and normative commitment are similar to each other. Although statistically different, normative commitment and affective commitment have been found to strongly correlate (Meyer & Allen, 1990). Moreover, other research has shown that these two dimensions overlap with each other (Pare & Tremblay, 2000). When Ko, Price and Mueller's (1997) study is taken into consideration the normative and affective commitment should not be taken as two different separate dimensions, because their divergent validity analysis was not significant. Despite these findings, in this study the affective, continuance and normative commitment was considered and investigated. This was done to gather data in Albania, and see whether these data fit in the general trend captured by Meyer and Allen (1990) and Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) or it is more similar to the collectivistic culture such as South Korea (Ko, Price & Mueller, 1997).

The revised form of Organizational Commitment Scale was used (Meyer & Allen, 1993; see Appendix C). The response items ranged from 1–strongly disagree to 7–strongly agree. The responses to the items were coded such that high scores reflect greater commitment to the organization. Some of the items were reversed, so that the same pattern response is eliminated.

### **2.3.4 Turnover Intention Instrument**

Since there are different studies that have used single items measures for the turnover intention of the employees, it seems that this is the shortest and simplest way (Blau & Boal, 1989; Gerhart, 1990; Udo et al., 1997). However, in this study a five–item scale was used. (see Appendix D). The response options ranged from 1–very unlikely to 7–highly likely. The responses were coded such that high scores reflect stronger intentions to leave the organization.

The scale was adapted from Walsh, Ashford and Hill (1985). Although, different studies have shown that single item scales work, a 5-item scale was considered to do better than one-item scale. The same scale was used by Ayalla and Zehava (1999) and they reported a reliability level of  $\alpha = 0.84$ . Whereas, in the present study the turnover intention scale showed to have a reliability  $\alpha = 0.81$  and very good good of fitness index, GFI = 0.97.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

#### 3.1 Overview

First of all, new variables were computed from the means of the items. The total job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, and turnover intention variables were formed. Moreover, the subscales of job satisfaction and organizational commitment were formed (as their developers suggested Spector and Meyer & Allen, respectively) and were used in later analysis. Depending on these new formed variables, data cleaning was done. Then, the reliability of the used scales was checked. Although, the chosen scales are good working tools none of them had been applied to Albania before, so their reliability was crucial for the study. After that, factor analysis was conducted for the job satisfaction and organizational commitment scale. Finally, the relationship between the job attitudes and turnover intentions and the public and private sector were investigated through a series of analysis of covariance.

It is the case to note that this was a non-experimental study, so it is difficult to attribute causality to the IV, in the present study to the organization being public or private. It may be the case that different levels of job attitudes are associated differently with the levels of organization publicness, yet the cause of this relationship remains unclear.

#### 3.2 Cleaning the Data

Firstly subjects who had more than 10% missing values in their questionnaires were deleted ( $N = 8$ ). Since the scales had different number of items, the mean of each was taken to form the new variables. Moreover, depending on the division the developers had done, separate variables representing the 9 facets of JS and the 3 different types of OC were computed. Then, it was looked at the univariate outliers. All the cases that

were found to be univariate outliers were discarded from further analysis. More specifically, 3 normative commitment cases, 9 coworkers cases, 13 nature of work cases, 3 pay cases and 2 conditions of work cases that were found to have a larger  $|z| = 3.3$  were deleted.

After that, it was looked at multivariate outliers by checking the Mahalanobis' distance. All the multivariate outliers ( $N = 6$ ) were deleted as well. The belief that the outliers do more harm than good; not finding the substitution of the missing values with means as the best thing to do; and the fact that the remaining sample was still large enough to conduct statistically reliable analysis were some of the reasons that the deletion was perceived as the best way of dealing with the outliers. So, in the end, the analyses were conducted with data from 385 cases.

### **3.3 Factor Analysis**

Two factor analyses were conducted. The first factor analysis was done to check whether Spector's job satisfaction scale could be divided into 9 facets as the author suggested. Thirty-six job satisfaction scale items were factor analyzed. In fact, it did not seem to form the 9 subscales of job satisfaction. However, later on when they were forced into 3 factors with Varimax rotation, it seemed that the 3 factors distinguished between job satisfaction related to pay and other benefits, nature of the work and work surroundings and communication (see Table 1, for the loadings). Despite these three factors, there were still few items that were wrongly assigned among facets. In the main analysis job satisfaction was calculated by the mean of its items as a representative of overall job satisfaction after taking the approval of its developer, Paul Spector (personal communication, March 2005), as well. Since the scope of the present study was not the adaptation of Spector's job satisfaction scale to Albanian culture, no more analysis were conducted with respect to forming a revised scale of job satisfaction and the other analysis were conducted with the subscales as

proposed by the developer, Paul Spector. However, in the future studies in this field, this study can be used as a useful data source to adapt Spector's job satisfaction scale measurement and to derive a revised form of it, more applicable to the Albanian sample.

TABLE 1  
Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction

	F1	F 2	F 3
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. *	.840		
Raises are too few and far between. *	.712		
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. *	.712		
There are few rewards for those who work here. *	.661		
There are benefits we do not have which we should have. *	.614		
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.608		
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. *	.598		
I have too much paperwork. *	.570		
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. *	.568		
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. *	.517		
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. *	.505		
I feel satisfied with my chance for salary increases.	.503		
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. *		.771	
My supervisor is unfair to me. *		.717	



(Table 1 cont'd)

	F 1	F 2	F 3
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.		.713	
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.		.699	
I like my supervisor.		.688	
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.		.570	
I enjoy my coworkers.			.763
I like the people I work with.			.762
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. *			.535
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance being promoted.			-.42
	<b>F 1</b>	<b>F 2</b>	<b>F 3</b>
Eigenvalues	8.80	3.16	2.40
Percentage of Explained Variance	19.42	14.56	8.20

\* These items were reversely coded.

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Another factor analysis was conducted to look into at whether the short form of organizational commitment did distinguish among different types of commitment namely, affective, normative, and continuance commitment. When it was conducted for the first time, the factor analysis did not come up with a very logical division of the items. However, when the factor analysis was forced to 3 factors with Varimax rotation (see Table 2, for the loadings), with the exception of three items that loaded in wrong factors, the other items fitted perfectly to the subscales that Meyer and

Allen (1990) have proposed. In the main analysis, organizational commitment was calculated as a single variable with the mean of the 18 items. However, ANOVA was conducted for the subscales of organizational commitment as proposed by its developers (Meyer & Allen, 1990) to look at whether there was a difference among the facets of organizational commitment between public and private school teachers. This factor analysis showed that the short version of organizational commitment is applicable to Albania and it showed to be a good measurement tool.

Table 2

*Rotated Component Matrix for Organizational Commitment*

	F 1	F 2	F 3
This organization deserves my loyalty. (NC)	.807		
I owe a great deal to my organization. (NC)	.771		
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it. (NC)	.763		
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now. (NC)	.729		
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. (AC)	.668		
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. (AC)	.561		
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire. (CC)	.512		.452
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. * (AC)	.421		
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now. (CC)		.662	

(Table 2 cont'd)

	F 1	F 2	F 3
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. (CC)		.660	
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives. (CC)		.620	
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere. (CC)	.487	.493	
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to. (CC)		.479	
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now. (AC)		.461	
I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization. * (AC)			.824
I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. * (AC)			.806
I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. * (AC)			.803
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization. (AC)			.444
	<b>F 1</b>	<b>F 2</b>	<b>F 3</b>
Eigenvalues	5.75	2.25	1.40
Percentage of Explained Variance	24.45	13.90	13.15

\* These items were reversely coded.

NC = Normative Commitment

CC = Continuance Commitment

AC = Affective Commitment

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

### 3.4 Reliability Analysis

Reliability analyses were conducted with all the above-mentioned scales. According McIntire and Miller (2000), Cronbach's alpha coefficient over 0.70 is sufficient for a good reliability. The reliability Cronbach's alpha for the used scales and the subscales of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and their means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values were found to be as shown in Table 3. As it can be seen, the reliability alphas of organizational commitment subscales are quite satisfactory while considering that they have only 6 items per subscale. Whereas, only few job satisfaction subscales have arrived at those levels. However, the Cronbach's alpha for the whole job satisfaction scale and the other scales are quite high, satisfactory alphas.

Table 3  
*Reliability of Scales*

	Nr. of Item	Chronbach Alpha	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Jl**	6	0.72	4.65	1.04	2	6.83
Tl**	6	0.81	3.35	1.39	1	7
OC**	18	0.85	4.62	0.90	2.22	6.89
Aff. C.**	6	0.77	4.83	1.09	1.83	7.00
Norm.C.**	6	0.78	4.46	1.21	1.17	7.00
Cont.C.**	6	0.70	4.58	1.07	1.33	7.00
JS*	36	0.89	3.69	0.67	1.92	5.64
Pay*	4	0.54	2.49	1.15	1.00	6.00
Supervision*	4	0.79	4.48	1.22	1.00	6.00
Promotion*	4	0.39	3.75	1.11	1.00	6.00
Frng benefits*	4	0.33	2.88	1.21	1.00	6.00
Rewards*	4	0.65	3.15	1.19	1.00	6.00

(Table 3 cont'd)

		Chron					
		Nr. of	bach	Mean	SD	Min	Max
		Item	Alpha				
JS	ConditionsW*	4	0.35	2.59	0.86	1.00	5.50
	Coworkers*	4	0.43	4.57	0.93	1.75	6.00
	Work Nature*	4	0.66	5.08	0.79	2.75	6.00
	Comuncatrn*	4	0.64	4.23	1.14	1.00	6.00

\* 6 – point Likert type scale  
\*\* 7 – point Likert type scale

### 3.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Since the reliability of the job satisfaction subscales was low, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to look at whether the model proposed by Spector (1997) did fit to the Albanian sample as well. The analysis showed that the model drawn by Spector with its 9 subscales was not very appropriate with a goodness of fit index, GFI = 0.71. After doing some of the suggested adjustments, the model seemed to ameliorate, but still its GFI remained under the levels of 0.90. However, when the overall job satisfaction was checked, through confirmatory analysis of its subscales, GFI was found to be 0.92. This finding strengthened once more the view that the job satisfaction scale on the overall is a good measure, although its subscales do not seem to work that well in the Albanian sample. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed for job involvement, organizational commitment and turnover intention and their GFI were found to be 0.95, 0.85, and 0.97 respectively. With the exception of organizational commitment, the other scales seemed to fit perfectly to their factors.

### 3.6 Correlation Analysis

All the investigated variables were related to each other and had shared variance. The job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment variables were all positively and significantly related to each other, but negatively and significantly related to turnover intention in public, private and in the overall correlations. For the specific values see Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6, respectively.

Table 4

*Correlations among DVs in the Public Schools*

	Pearson's Correlations in Public Schools			
	JS	JI	OC	TI
Job Satisfaction	1.000			
Job Involvement	0.147*	1.000		
Organizational Commit	0.259**	0.163*	1.000	
Turnover Intention	-0.382**	-0.229**	-0.359**	1.000

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

*Correlations among DVs in the Private Schools*

	Pearson's Correlations in Private Schools			
	JS	JI	OC	TI
Job Satisfaction	1.000			
Job Involvement	0.410**	1.000		
Organizational Commit	0.654**	0.589**	1.000	
Turnover Intention	-0.609**	-0.291**	-0.552**	1.000

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6

*Correlations among DVs in the Total Sample*

	Pearson's Correlations in the Total Sample			
	1	2	3	4
Job Satisfaction	1.000			
Job Involvement	0.190**	1.000		
Organizational Commit	0.482**	0.325**	1.000	
Turnover Intention	-0.474**	-0.254**	-0.452**	1.000

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**3.7 ANCOVA and Hypothesis Testing**

To explore whether job attitudes and turnover intention varied as a function of the sector (public versus private) a separate ANCOVA for each of the dependent variables was conducted (see Table 8). MANCOVA was not perceived as the appropriate main analysis for this study, because the four variables had different scales and they cannot be analyzed through MANCOVA. Moreover, the separate effects for each of the dependent variables were judged to be very important (whereas in MANCOVA after the use, the DV becomes covariate). Since there was no prior expectation for the entering of the DVs, it was decided to conduct a separate ANCOVA for each of them. Before conducting the ANCOVA the multivariate assumptions of the DVs were checked and found to be satisfactory. After, ensuring that there were no serious threats of multivariate collinearity, sphericity, and the homogeneity of regression and homogeneity of the covariance, ANCOVA for each of the DVs was conducted.

According to the correlational analysis, age showed to be highly correlated to tenure and tenure in the organization, so, only one covariate was used. (see Table 7 for the specific values). Age was considered to be a

good covariate, not only because it met all the requirements for being a CV but it has been used as a CV in other studies as well i.e.: Pare and Tremblay (2000). Tenure was highly correlated to age and it met all the requirements for being a CV, as well. So, the choice between age and tenure as a CV was perceived as an individual preference.

Table 7  
*Correlations Among Possible Covariates*

	Pearson Correlation		
	Age	Tenure	Tenure in Org.
Age	1.00	0.956**	0.459**
Tenure		1.00	0.462**
Tenure in Organization			1.00

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Firstly, a 2 x 2 between-subjects analysis of covariance were performed on job satisfaction. Independent variables consisted of publicness of the organization (public versus private) and type of school (secondary versus high). The covariate was age. However, since in none of the analysis (the same pattern emerged for organizational commitment, job involvement and turnover intention variables as well) no significant main effect for secondary versus high school was found, this independent variable was merged and only the public and private school independent variable was used.

The first hypothesis claimed that the school teachers employed in public sector would be less satisfied with their work as compared to their colleagues employed in private sector. Results of evaluation of the assumptions of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, homogeneity



of variance, homogeneity of regression, and the reliability of CV were satisfactory. After the adjustment of the covariate job satisfaction did significantly change for the public and private sector, as summarized in Table 8, with  $F(1, 365) = 38,738, p < 0,001$ . The strength of relationship between adjusted job satisfaction and publicness of the organization was found to be  $\eta^2=0,096$ . The adjusted marginal means, as displayed in Table 9, show that public sector teachers were less satisfied with their job than the private sector teachers. This analysis supports the first hypothesis of the study.

In the second hypothesis it was argued that there would be no difference between public and private sector with respect to job involvement. After checking for the assumptions of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression, and the reliability of CV and found to be satisfactory, ANCOVA was conducted. After the adjustment of the covariate job involvement did significantly change for the public and private sector, as summarized in Table 7, with  $F(1, 365) = 8,104, p < 0,005$ . The strength of relationship between adjusted job involvement and publicness of the organization was not very strong though, with  $\eta^2=0,022$ . The adjusted marginal means, as displayed in Table 7, show that public school teachers' job involvement levels were significantly higher than the private school teachers'. Despite the significance of this analysis, the second hypothesis was not supported.

The third hypothesis was that: the private sector teachers would have lower levels of organizational commitment than the public sector teachers. Organizational commitment is considered a very important variable in personnel administration, especially when there are increasing needs for keeping quality employees in the public as well as in the private sector

(Cho & Lee, 2001). Again the results of evaluation of the assumptions of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression, and the reliability of CV were checked and found to be satisfactory. After the adjustment of the covariate, organizational commitment did significantly change for the public and private sector, as summarized in Table 8, with  $F(1,365) = 5,438, p < 0,05$ . The strength of relationship between adjusted organizational commitment and publicness of the organization was weak, however, with  $\eta^2 = 0,015$ . The adjusted marginal means, as displayed in Table 8, show that public sector teachers displayed less commitment to their organization than their private schools colleagues. In other words, this hypothesis was not supported as the significance was found to be in the opposite direction from the one predicted.

Since the normative and affective commitment scales are confused in the collectivistic cultures (Cho & Lee, 2001) these scales were merged. To this new-formed scale its reliability alpha was looked at and another ANCOVA was conducted. The same pattern of difference was found for the public and private school teachers. In other words: the commitment levels were found to be higher for the private school teachers as compared to the private school teachers.

In the last hypothesis, it was argued that the private sector teachers would have higher turnover intentions than the public sector teachers. Results of evaluation of the assumptions of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression, and the reliability of CV were checked and found to be satisfactory. However, after the adjustment of the covariate, turnover intention did not change significantly for the public and private sector, as it is shown in Table 7, with  $F(1,365) = 0,003, p > 0,05$ . The strength of relationship between adjusted turnover intention and publicness of the

organization was found to be very close to zero. The adjusted marginal means, as displayed in Table 7, are not significantly different from each other. This analysis again did not support the hypothesis concerning turnover intention. In other words, it was found that there was no difference between public and private sector teachers with respect to their turnover intentions.

Table 8  
*ANCOVA Results*

	SS	Df	F	Sig.	Eta <sup>2</sup>
JS	15.19	1	38.74	0.000	0.096
JI	7.72	1	8.10	0.005	0.022
OC	4.39	1	5.44	0.020	0.015
TI	0.006	1	0.003	0.956	0.000

By checking the means of each of the DVs (see Table 9), the main findings of the study can be summarized as: teachers employed in the public schools were found to be less satisfied by the work, more involved to the job, less committed to the organization they work as compared to the teachers employed in private schools. In addition, no difference between these teachers in different sectors was found with respect to turnover intentions. It seems that they think of leaving their job, at the same levels no matter which organization they are employed.

Table 9

*Estimated Marginal Means*

	Public School		Private Schools	
	Means	St. Error	Means	St. Error
Job Satisfaction*	3.53	0.04	3.94	0.05
Job Involvement**	4.80	0.07	4.50	0.08
Organizational C.**	4.53	0.06	4.76	0.072
Turnover Intention**	3.35	0.10	3.34	0.11

(Table 9 continued)

---

All the means are calculated by taking into account the covariate: AGE

\* 6 – point Likert type scale

\*\* 7 – point Likert type scale

---

### **3.8 Discriminant Function Analyses**

To double-check our findings, a direct discriminant function analysis was conducted to look into the factors that did actually discriminate between public and private sector. Predictors were job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment and turnover intention, whereas groups were public and private school teachers. It was found that job satisfaction and job involvement did significantly distinguish between the two sectors, whereas turnover intentions and organizational commitment failed to achieve a statistically significant level for distinguishing between public and private sector organization (see Table 10).

Table 10

*Tests of Equality Group Means for the DVs*

	Wilks					L S M
	Lambda	F	df1	df2	Sig.	
Job Satisfaction	0.957	17.09	1	383	.000	0.675
Job Involvement	0.900	42.65	1	383	.000	-0.427
Organizational						
Commitment	0.992	3.163	1	383	.076	0.184
Turnover Intention	1.000	0.154	1	383	.695	0.041

L.S.M = Loadings of Structural Matrix

The pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and the standardized canonical discriminant function showed that job satisfaction and job involvement loaded high in the discriminant function. It has to be noted that job involvement contributed in the negative direction as compared to job satisfaction. This may be interpreted that job satisfaction and job involvement are negatively related to each other as variables. In contrast, the other predictors, turnover intention and organizational commitment contributed very little in discriminating between the two sectors. However, it appeared that the first two variables constituted a good discrimination function, which placed almost 71% of the cases in their correct groups. This percentage is much higher as compared to 50% that would be correctly classified if this discriminant function was not used.

Table 11 shows the means and the standard deviations of the predictors with respect to public and private schools. As it can be seen, in the overall, the public school teachers are less satisfied with their job (Mean = 3.51, SD = 0.51) than the private sector teachers (Mean = 3.94, SD = 0.77). On the other hand, the job involvement levels are higher for public school teachers (Mean = 4.39, SD = 1.04) than for the private school teachers (Mean = 4.40, SD = 0.98).

Table 11

*Means and SDs of Public and Private School teachers for the DVs*

	Public		Private		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Job Satisfaction*	3.510	0.506	3.936	0.769	3.694	0.667
Job Involvement**	4.389	1.044	4.407	0.979	4.653	1.038
Organizational Com.**	4.553	0.840	4.718	0.968	4.624	0.900
Turnover Intention**	3.335	1.298	3.391	1.499	3.359	1.387

\* 6 – point Likert type scale  
\*\* 7 – point Likert type scale

Another discriminant function analysis was conducted to look at which subscales of the job satisfaction and organizational commitment variable did discriminate between public and private sector. In this analysis, the groups were the same as for the previous one (public versus private), but the predictors changed. Instead of the overall job attitudes, the subscales of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (as suggested by their developers) were used. For the job satisfaction subscales, it was found that pay, supervision, promotion, fringe benefits, rewards, conditions of work, coworkers, and communication did significantly discriminate. Whereas, for the organizational commitment subscales only normative subscale did significantly distinguish between the sectors (See, Table 12 for the loadings of the variables on discriminant function).

Table 12

*Tests of Equality Group Means for the Subscales*

	W' L	F	df1	df2	Sig.	L. S.M
Affective C.	1.00	0.02	1	352	0.88	0.01
Normative C.	0.97	10.81	1	352	0.00**	0.28
Continuance C.	1.00	0.02	1	352	0.89	-0.01
Pay	0.80	87.21	1	352	.00**	0.80
Supervision	0.98	6.41	1	352	0.01*	0.22
Promotion	0.97	11.45	1	352	0.00**	0.29
Fringe Benefits	0.92	32.08	1	352	0.00**	0.49
Rewards	0.96	13.38	1	352	0.00**	0.31
Conditions of Work	0.94	24.38	1	352	0.00**	0.42
Coworkers	0.99	5.04	1	352	0.03*	0.19
Nature of Work	0.99	0.63	1	352	0.43	-0.07
Communication	0.95	17.78	1	352	0.00**	0.36

\* p < 0.05  
\*\* p < 0.001  
W' L = Wilks' Lambda  
L.S.M = loadings of structural matrix

The pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions showed that pay, supervision, promotion, fringe benefits, rewards, conditions of work, coworkers, and communication, and normative subscale did significantly distinguish between the sectors. Although these subscales were found to have a significant discriminating power, not all of them did load really high on the function (see Table 12). What is surprising is that affective commitment did not contribute at all at the distinction of the two sectors. Yet, it appears that these variables well discriminate for the public and private sector. Based on the discriminant function, it was found that 72% of the cases were classified in their correct groups. If no discriminant

function was used, this percentage would drop at the levels of 51%. To sum up, it emerged that both of the used discriminant functions constituted good discriminant functions.

In Table 13, means and standard deviations of the organizational commitment and job satisfaction are shown. These subscales were used as predictors to look into how much did they discriminate between public and private schools. As it can be seen, in the overall, the public school teachers are less committed (normative) to their organization (Mean = 4.26, SD = 1.13) as compared to the private sector teachers (Mean = 4.69, SD = 1.29). When it comes to the subscales of job satisfaction, with the exception of nature of work subscale which not only was not found statically significant in discriminating between public and private schools, but it also seems that it is the only facet where public school teachers show higher levels (Mean = 5.11, SD = 0.71) than the private school teachers (Mean = 5.04, SD = 0.90). However, this facet did not achieve significant level of statistical meaningfulness. In all the other job satisfaction subscales the private school teacher scored higher than their public sector employed colleagues.

Table 13

*Means and SDs of Public and Private School teachers for the Subscales of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction*

	Public		Private		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Affective Commt.**	4.811	1.055	4.829	1.144	4.819	1.094
Normative Commt.**	4.264	1.125	4.687	1.291	4.449	1.217
Continuance Commt.**	4.583	1.003	4.567	1.127	4.576	1.058
Pay*	2.023	0.848	3.053	1.226	2.474	1.149
Supervisor*	4.303	1.186	4.634	1.265	4.448	1.231
Promotion*	3.561	1.058	3.958	1.141	3.735	1.111
Fringe Benefits*	2.575	1.125	3.279	1.202	2.883	1.209



(Table 13 cont'd)

	Public		Private		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Rewards*	2.975	1.131	3.434	1.221	3.176	1.192
Conditions of Work*	2.412	0.723	2.845	0.925	2.602	0.844
Coworkers*	4.466	0.833	4.686	1.009	4.562	0.919
Nature of Work*	5.108	0.711	5.039	0.899	5.078	0.798
Communication*	3.984	1.094	4.479	1.098	4.200	1.121

\* 6 – point Likert type scale  
\*\* 7 – point Likert type scale

But, since the affective and continuance commitment did not contribute to any distinction a follow up ANOVA was conducted, with the organizational commitment subscales. The same results were obtained: only normative commitment did significantly discriminate between the two sectors (See Table 14).

Table 14  
*ANOVA Table*

	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Affective C.	0.04	1	0.04	0.040	0.841
Normative C.	19.76	1	19.76	14.02	0.000
Continuance C.	0.06	1	0.06	0.053	0.818

Mixed design ANCOVA was conducted to look at the patterns of differences between the job attitudes within the public and private school teachers. It was found that the patterns of job attitude differences were almost similar between the public and private schools. There were significant differences between job satisfaction and job involvement (Mean

= 4.13 and Mean = 4.78, respectively) for the public school teachers. It is important to note that the job involvement level is higher. But in the private sector besides the fact that there was no significant difference between job satisfaction (Mean = 4.61) and job involvement (Mean = 4.50), what is different from the public school teachers is the fact that job satisfaction is higher than job involvement. The other patterns are found to be similar between the public (see Table 15) and private school teachers (see Table 16).

Table 15

*Means for the Within Subjects Differences for the Public School Teachers*

	<b>JS</b>	<b>JI</b>	<b>OC</b>	<b>TI</b>	<b>Adjusted Means</b>
<b>JS</b>					4.13
<b>JI</b>	0.67*				4.78
<b>OC</b>	0.41	0.27			4.53
<b>TI</b>	0.78*	1.45*	1.18		3.35

\* significant at df = 184, p < 0.515

Table 16

*Means for the Within Subjects Differences for the Private School Teachers*

	<b>JS</b>	<b>JI</b>	<b>OC</b>	<b>TI</b>	<b>Adjusted Means</b>
<b>JS</b>					4.62
<b>JI</b>	0.11				4.50
<b>OC</b>	0.14	0.26			4.76
<b>TI</b>	1.28*	1.16*	1.42		3.34

\* significant at df = 184, p < 0.515

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **4.1 Overview**

The aim of the study was to look at the differences in job attitudes and turnover intentions among teachers employed in public and private schools in Albania. After deciding which job attitudes would be investigated the proper measurement tools were found and adapted in Albanian. Following the collection of the data, hypothesis of the study were tested and results were presented. In the subsequent section, firstly the results of the study are discussed, and then the limitations and the strengths of the study are put forward, and lastly suggestions for future research are stated.

#### **4.2 Results of Hypothesis Testing**

Of the four hypothesis of this study, only one of them was supported. Job satisfaction was found to be in higher levels in private sector as compared to the public sector. Buchanan (1974) found that public sector employees scored lower in overall job satisfaction. The results of another study conducted by Bourantas and Papalexandris (1993) in Greece showed that general satisfaction was significantly higher in the private organizations as compared to public organizations. A similar finding was reported from Turkey by Ergin (1997). She found that private sector employees scored significantly higher in the Job Descriptive Index (job satisfaction instrument) than the public sector employees.

One of the most important discriminant variables between the sectors in the present study was pay satisfaction. Therefore, not only the first main hypothesis was supported, but also the present study presented evidence that pay satisfaction constitutes one of the most crucial variables in job satisfaction. Supportive evidence is given by Bordia and Blau (1998), who

showed that pay satisfaction increases the overall job satisfaction. Despite the fact that the above-mentioned studies were not conducted in schools, they show a general trend that overall job satisfaction is significantly higher in private organizations than in public organizations.

The present study showed that not only pay satisfaction was related to higher levels of overall job satisfaction (Bordia & Blau, 1998) in the private sector, but the other facets which were supervision, promotion, fringe benefits, rewards, conditions of work, coworkers, and communication were related as well. These dimensions did significantly contribute to the distinction of public and private schools. The only facet that did not discriminate between public and private was nature of work. In fact, this is an expected result as the reliability of the 4-item subscale was very low. Past research suggests that organizations may increase certain benefits from high employee investment. In a meta-analytic review, Brown (1996) examined 249 independent samples derived from 212 studies that examined relationships between potential antecedents, consequences, and correlates of job involvement. Disattenuated correlations (corrected for measurement and sampling error) suggested that employees who were highly involved in their jobs were more satisfied with their jobs in general ( $r = 0.45$ ), as well as more satisfied with the specific facets of work ( $r = 0.53$ ), supervision ( $r = 0.26$ ), coworkers ( $r = 0.21$ ), pay ( $r = 0.11$ ) and promotion ( $r = 0.24$ ) opportunities. In addition, highly invested individuals reported more affective organizational commitment ( $r = 0.50$ ) and fewer turnover intentions ( $r = -0.31$ ) than their less invested counterparts. Weaker findings also suggested that more involved employees exert greater effort on the job.

Barrows and Wasson (2001) found that the private sector lawyers were more satisfied in general. This satisfaction did not stem only from the pay but they were more satisfied with other things such as fringe benefits,

rewards, coworkers, recognition of a well-done job, promotion etc. The only point where there was no difference was the nature of the work from which both public and private sector lawyers reported the same level of satisfaction regardless the other conditions. This finding, which is the same as found in this study, may have two implications. Either, nature of work is not a well-found job satisfaction subscale (as the reliability analysis suggests) or the employees of public and private sector are equally satisfied to their jobs with respect to their nature of work.

Another point to be mentioned is the teachers who refused to complete the questionnaires may represent an important part of the sample. Generally the ones who consent to fill in a questionnaire are the ones who are more satisfied with the job, more optimistic in an overall life perspective etc. Therefore, in the present study, an under representation of the extreme fraction of very unsatisfied teachers may have occurred.

Contrary to the expectations the other three hypotheses were not supported. Following, some possible reasons for this are presented.

The first and may be the most important reason may be that the literature review and the hypotheses were based on studies conducted mostly in US. Different cultures show different pattern of job attitudes and turnover intentions, so generalizing from those studies may have not been the best thing to do. However, there were some studies coming from more collectivistic cultures, such as Turkey, India or Korea, and their view was taken into consideration as well.

The first hypothesis that was not supported concerned job involvement. While no difference was expected between these two sectors, a significant difference came out and showed that public sector teachers were more job involved than the private school teachers. This difference may root to the cognitive dissonance theory. Public school teachers do not

experience a high prestige related to their profession, they displayed lower levels of satisfaction with pay and the job in the overall, but still they continue teaching at the same school under the same conditions. Their economic situation does not allow them quit their job. Also, the teachers in public sector do not really decide on their own whether to move from a school to another, rather these movements are established by a higher authority (the local Directorate of Education). Under these circumstances it is easier for them to get involved with their profession and love it, anywhere they might be practicing it. Whereas the private school teachers can move from one school to another on their wish, once their contract is over. They know that if they work well they will have better chances of continuing to stay in the same organization, but this does not mean more involvement, it only means more organizational commitment.

Another reason may be the used scale may have not been appropriate for the teachers. As Ramsey et al. (1995) found even when job involvement showed good validity and reliability, it had an unstable dimensionality. They suggest that job involvement may be occupation specific. If this is true, then the job involvement scale for teachers should be different from the Lodahl and Kejner (1965) scale that was used in the present study. Job security is positively and significantly related to job involvement (Probst, 2000). Public employees enjoy greater job security than private sector employees for three main reasons as revealed by Baldwin (1987). The reasons are as follows: 1) public sector employees are more protected from abuse or arbitrary punitive actions; 2) the employees in public sector have many routes for appeals in any administrative mistreatment against them, whereas the private sector employees are almost immediately fired by the will of the supervisor; 3) the bureaucratic route to take a disciplinary act against a public sector employee is so long that few would take it, on the other hand the same route for a private sector employee is a shortcut with immediate consequences. Logically, by having

more job security, the public sector employees may have higher levels of job involvement than the private sector employees.

The general prediction is that job involvement is more strongly related to situational factors and job attitudes in private organizations. The private sector employees expect more from their employers than the public sector employees (Brown, 1996). This finding may apply to the present study as well: the school teachers employed in the private schools find it more difficult to get highly involved to their job, if their job and situation characteristics are not appealing to them. Since the school teachers in public schools are aware of the fact that job characteristics cannot be changed by their supervisor on their will, therefore this relationship is not significant. This, may have resulted in public school teachers being more job involved even when working under the same job conditions.

The other hypothesis had to do with the organizational commitment. Comparisons of public and private employees in their levels of organizational commitment are important because studies often describe public organizations as having more “public” and diffused goals compared to their counterparts in many private firms (Cho & Lee, 2001). It was hypothesized that public sector employees would display higher levels of organizational commitment than the private sector employees. Although there was a significant difference between these two sectors, it was in the opposite side from the hypothesized one. Actually, private school teachers were found to be more organizationally committed than the public school teachers.

To this point, it seems that the literature is mixed. While some of the researchers suggest that public sector employees are more organizationally committed, like Gerhart (1990), other investigators claim the opposite. One of them is Buchanan (1974) who found that public employees are lower on organizational commitment, as compared to their colleagues in the private

sector. This finding was supported by Buchko's (1992) study results. He conducted a six-years longitudinal study to public and private owned firms and found out that in private firms whose owners were the employees themselves were more committed to the organization, had lower turnover intention, and were less likely to exit the organization.

The above finding was replicated by a study conducted in Greece, by Bourantas and Papalexandris (1993). They had a total sample of N = 935 employees from private (N = 159) and public (N = 776) sector. The results of one-way analysis of variance showed that there was a significant difference between public and private sector managers with respect to their organizational commitment. Private sector managers were more committed to their organization, as compared to their public sector colleagues.

In a study conducted by Cho and Lee (2001) in Korea it was shown that the organizational commitment is the sum of two factors, which correspond to Meyer and Allen's affective and normative commitment. The results of the study were that public sector employees showed lower levels of affective commitment than the employees in the private firms, but no significant difference was found among the sectors with respect to normative commitment. Also in different studies, it is found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are significantly positively related to each other (Udo et al, 1997; Jaros, 1997 etc). Since the first hypothesis of this study was supported, logically it can be derived that the private sector school teachers will have higher levels of organizational commitment due to their higher overall job satisfaction. Summarizing all of the above information about job involvement, private school teachers may find it easier to commit to the organization rather than the profession.

Another finding of the present study was that among the organizational commitment facets only normative commitment did significantly discriminate between public and private sector. This finding



was not expected as the literature has generally presented that affective commitment is more important at distinguishing different job attitudes (Brown, 1996; Somers, 1995 etc). However, Cho and Lee (2001) found that in Korea (a collectivistic culture) the normative and affective commitment were highly correlated and not statistically distinguishable. Since these two subscales may be confounded in the collectivistic cultures (although this was not the case for the present study), whether it is the normative or the affective subscale that makes the difference between the public and private schools it is not very important. Consistent with the present study, similar findings for the organizational commitment were reported from Turkey, by Karabay (2004). She found that the normative organizational commitment levels were significantly higher in the private sector than in the public sector. Considering that both of the cultures, Albania and Turkey are collectivistic ones, this finding is consistent and it may be generalizable to all the collectivistic cultures.

The fact that in the present study, the normative subscale did significantly distinguish between the two sectors (rather than the affective subscale) has been explained by Wasti (p217). She suggested that normative commitment is more dominant in the collectivistic cultures. Although normative commitment does not emerge from the affective reasons, it is in direct proportion with the allegiance of the employees. From a sample of 83 Turkish employees, she found that normative commitment was affected by family and collectivistic cultural norms.

The last hypothesis regarded turnover intention. According to the literature turnover intention are not necessarily turned into turnover behavior. Even though quitting may not prove reasonable due to a lack of suitable external opportunity or other limitations, psychologically the person may still intend to leave the organization (Huang et al., 2003). Related to this, turnover intentions may just be at the same amount in

people's head but turning it into a voluntary behavior is quite more difficult. Had the present study assessed the real turnover behavior as well, most probably there would be a significant difference between the sectors. In fact, according to an annual report of Durres Educational Directorate (personal contacts, January 2005) movements of teachers' hiring and turnover in private schools occur more in number and more often than in public schools (in terms of rough numbers).

A similar finding has been reported by Cho and Lee (2001) who conducted a study in Korea. They looked at the managers' perceptual and attitudinal differences in public and private firms. Among the other findings they stated that there was no significant difference between public and private managers on their intention to leave the organization. This may be a general trend on collectivist cultures, or developing countries where leaving the job may not be as easy as in the developed countries. This may occur because it is more difficult to find another job as easily as in developed countries, or simply they cannot afford losing one's job without being sure that another one is available to them.

Another explanation for turnover maybe that it is not related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment the way it was thought, therefore it could not be predicted accordingly. Jenkins (1993) found that the relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and organizational commitment was influenced by personality. He found that low monitors (employees who did not consider the opportunities that might arise outside the organization) had less turnover intention if organizational commitment was high; whereas high monitors (employees who are very attentive to the outside organization opportunities) had lower turnover intentions if the job satisfaction was at high levels.

In another study conducted by Somers (1995) it was found that affective commitment was the sole predictor of turnover. But in the present

study affective commitment did not significantly discriminate between public and private schools. Therefore, it might not be possible to correctly predict employees' turnover intention.

One last possible explanation may be the relationship the variables had according to different sectors. Job satisfaction has been found to significantly predict turnover intentions and to be significantly and negatively related to it (Shaw, 1999). In another study, Gaertner and Nollen (1992) found that overall job satisfaction was one of the strongest discriminators of stayers and leavers in a private company. Moreover, as Hom et al (1992) found in their meta-analytic study, there was a casual flow from low job satisfaction to job withdrawal cognitions. In other words, higher levels of job satisfaction were found to predict lower levels of turnover intention. On the other hand, job involvement has been found to be negatively and significantly related to turnover intentions (Brown, 1996; Udo et al. 1997). An interaction between these variables was found by Blau and Boal (1987) whose results showed that someone who is both involved in one's job and committed to one's company will tend to stay with their company and to have low absenteeism. In the present study the private school teachers were found to be more satisfied with their job in general, whereas the public school teachers were found to be more involved to their jobs. If the above mentioned variables predict turnover intention at the same amount, then having no difference in turnover intention among the school teachers in different schools is just the logical consequence of the findings of this study.

### **4.3 Limitations of the Study**

One of the problems might have been the scales. They were translated from English to Albanian very accurately, but the language differences may have been a serious problem. One such problem were the reversed items, and the participants were not sure how to answer them. In English the use of two negatives in one sentence makes the sentence positive in meaning. But in Albanian language the use of two negatives strengthens its negative connotation. So, during the translation process, something might have escaped from the eye of the researcher and made that few of the items were mistakenly understood and answered, such as in job satisfaction scale.

Another problem was that the teachers in Albania are not used in completing such questionnaires and they did not felt sure that the questionnaire results would be used only for academic purposes. The permission taken form the Educational Directorate seemed to work in the reverse direction than it was supposed to: instead of ensuring teachers that that was just a study, it strengthened the belief that the questionnaire results would be shared with the Educational Directorate, therefore, a large of teachers refused to complete the questionnaires or even take a look at them. Despite the researcher's efforts to convince these teachers, the refusals were very firm. This refusal might have created a second sample (underrepresented in this study) that might hold different attitudes from the ones that actually accepted to participate in the study and completed the questionnaire.

A different problem in the study was the lack of literature in Albania. Not having any previous academic background where to ground the hypotheses, it proved to be very difficult for the researcher to make good hypothesis. It was like walking in the dark, trying to find the best path possible. A better literature review with Albanian records would have proved into much better hypotheses and results.

#### **4.4 Strengths of the Present Study**

Despite the fact that three of the hypotheses were not supported, it is believed that this study has contributed to the literature in general, and to Albania in particular. First of all, it was conducted in a real environment, which certainly increases the generalizability of its findings (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). As it was mentioned before, one of the aims of the study was to look at Albania's pattern of job attitudes as compared to US. So, even with some of the hypotheses not supported, it just may show that the model in Albania might be different, so it leads to opportunities to further explore the job attitudes.

To the knowledge of the author there is no similar study in Albania, so it brings a lot of new things. As previously stated the lack of similar literature makes it difficult to make good hypotheses and to conduct a close-to-perfect study. However, as a first step study, this has brought new findings and the coming researchers will have the chance of improving.

Despite the fact that different organizational subscales did not significantly contribute to the public and private distinction, the classification of organizational subscales was found to be the same as presented by its developers Meyer and Allen (1990).

Although the original job satisfaction scale was found to have 9 subscales, this study suggested that the 9 facets of Spector's scale might not work outside USA border. A similar finding was reported in Singapore as well (personal contact, March 2005).

Overall, this study added some more information about a collectivistic culture and opened wide opportunities to further ameliorate the present researcher's study and her method.

#### **4.5 Suggestions for Future Research**

By looking at the findings of this study there are several suggestions to be kept in mind for future research. As it was previously stated, ensuring the teachers that the questionnaires will be used only for research purposes may alter some of the present findings. Not being sure that this was just an academic study might have led them to adjust their answer in a social desirable way. Furthermore, inclusion of more teachers from other cities would ensure a more robust sample and more generalizable findings. Another suggestion for future research is the investigation of other professions as well. This study was limited only to the teacher profession, whereas other professions may show different pattern of differences. By making use of the present findings, one may derive a shorter form of JS scale, which may be more applicable and more appropriate for Albanian sample.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1 – 18.
- Ayalla, R & Zehava, R (1999). Job insecurity among Israeli school teachers: Sectoral profiles and organizational implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (2), 139 – 168.
- Bakacsi, G., Sandor, T., Andras, K., & Viktor, I. (2002). Eastern European cluster: tradition and transition. *Journal of World Business*, 37 (1), 69 – 80.
- Baldwin, J. N. (1987). Public versus private: Not that different, not that consequential. *Public Personnel Management*, 16 (2), 181 – 193.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The function of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barrows, D. & Wesson, T. (2001). A comparative analysis of job satisfaction among public and private sector professionals. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*. Retrieved June 2004, from <http://www.innovation.cc/peer-reviewed/job-satisfaction2.htm>
- Becker, B. W. & Connor, P. E. (in press). Self-selection or socialization of public-and private-sector managers? A cross-cultural values analysis.
- Blau, G. & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, 15 (1), 115 – 127.
- Bordia, P. & Blau, G. (1998). Pay referent comparison and pay level satisfaction in private versus public sector organization in India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9 (1), 155 – 167.
- Bourantas, D & Papalexandris, N. (1993). Differences in leadership behavior and influence between public and private organizations in Greece. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 859 – 871.
- Bourantas, D. & Papalexandris, N. (1999). Personality traits discriminating between employees in public-and in private-sector organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10 (5), 858 – 869.

Boyne, G. A., Jenkins, G. & Poole, M.(1999). Human resource management in the public and private sectors: An empirical comparison. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 407–20.

Bozeman, B. (1987). All organizations are public: Bridging public and private organizational theories. San Francisco, CA, USA.

Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7 (2), 139 – 145.

Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta – analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120 (2).

Buchanan, B. (1974). Government managers, business executives, and organizational commitment. *Public Administration Review*, 34 (4), 339–347.

Buchko, A. A. (1992). Employee – ownership, attitudes and turnover: An empirical assessment. *Human Relations*, 45 (7), 711 – 733.

Cho, K. H. & Lee, S. H. (2001). Another look at public–private distinction and organizational commitment: A cultural explanation. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9 (1), 84–102.

Corneo, G. & Rob, R. (2003). Working in public and private firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87 (7–8), 1135 – 1152.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (1), 160 – 169.

Dalton, D. R., Krackhardt, D. M., & Porter, L. W. (1981). Functional turnover: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66 (6), 716 – 721.

Doran, L. I., Stone, V. K., Brief, A. P., & George, J. M. (1991). Behavioral intentions as predictors of job attitudes: The role of economic choice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (1), 40 – 45.

Ergin, C. (1997). Bir iş doyumunu ölçümü olarak “İş Betimlemesi Ölçeği” uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Derneği*, 12(39), 25 – 36.



Etzioni, A. (1964) *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Fasley, B. & Heyns, B. (1984). The college channel: Private and public schools reconsidered. *Sociology of Education*, 57, 111 – 122.

Fischer, R. (2004). Organizational reward allocation: a comparison of British and German organizations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28 (2), 151 – 164.

Gaertner, K. N. & Nollen, S. D. (1992). Turnover intention and desire among executives. *Human Relations*, 45 (5), 447 – 465.

George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (3), 318 – 325.

Gerhart, B (1990). Voluntary turnover and alternative job opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (5), 467 – 476.

Glewwe, P. & Patrinos, H. A. (1998). The role of private sector in Vietnam: Evidence from the Vietnam Living Standards Survey. *Living Standards Measurements Study Working Paper*, No, 132, The World Banc, Washington D.C.

Goodman, S. A. & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person – organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55 (2), 254–275.

Gömbös, E. (2003). Private colleges in Hungary—Seeking students and striving for recognition: The example of the International Business School of Budapest. *Higher Education in Europe*, 28(4), 421 – 434.

Retrieved April 2005, from:

<http://journalsonline.tandf.co.uk/media/G45CJRPM6K0YYVA04T2L/Contributions/5/K/D/A/5KDAH99LWDRGCUF0.pdf>

Hall, R. H. (2002). *Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes*. 8<sup>th</sup> edition. New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Huang, C. I., Chuang C. H. J., Lin, H. C. (2003). The Role of Burnout in the Relationship Between Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Turnover Intentions. *Public Personnel Management*, 32 (4), 519–533.

Hom, P. W., Walker, F. C., Prussia, G. E., & Griffeth, R. W. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 890 – 909.

Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51 (3), 319 – 337.

Jenkins, M. (1993). Self – monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14 (1), 83 – 91.

Karabay, E. Z. (2004). Çalışanların örgütsel adaletin dört ayrı boyutuna ilişkin algıları ve bu algıları ile örgüte duyulan bağlılığın üç farklı yönü arasındaki ilişkiler. Unpublished master thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (4), 539 – 545.

Ko, J. K., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer & Allen's three – component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (6), 961 – 973.

Lanchman, R (1985). Public and private sector differences: CEOs' perceptions of their role environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28 (3), 671 – 680.

Landsman, M. J. (2001). Commitment in public child welfare. *Social Service Review*, September 2001, 386 – 419.

Lawler, E. E. & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54 (4), 305 – 312.

Lee, R. T. & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimension of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (2), 123 – 133

Lee, K., Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P., & Rhee, K-Y. (2001). The three-component model of organizational commitment: An application to South Korea. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50 (4), 596 – 614.

Lignos, P. & Richards, C. E. (2003). Emerging forms of school

organization. *Teachers College Records*, 105(5), 753 – 781.

Lodahl, T. M. & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49 (1), 24 – 33.

Mathieu, J. E. & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (1), 127 – 133.

Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta – analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (2), 171 – 194.

McIntire, S. A. & Miller, L. A. (2000). Foundations of psychological testing. Boston: Mc Graw Hill.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (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. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. California: Sage Publication, Inc.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It is the nature of commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (1), 152 – 156.

Morrow, P. C. & McElroy, J. C. (1986). On assessing measures of work commitment. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 7, 139 – 145.

Ölmez, E. A., Sümer, H. C., & Soysal, M. (2004). Organizational rationality in public, private and multinational firms in Turkey. *Information Knowledge Systems Management*, 4 (2), 107 – 118.

Palmer, I. & Dunford, R. (2001). The diffusion of managerial innovations: a comparison of Australian public and private sector take – up rates of new organizational practices. *International Public Management Journal*, 4 (1), 49 – 64.

Pare, G. & Tremblay (2000). The measurement and antecedents of turnover intentions among IT professionals. CIRANO Scientific Series – 33.

Retrieved April 2005:

<https://depot.erudit.org/retrieve/292/2000s-33.pdf>

Parker, R. & Bradley, L. (2000). Organizational culture in the public sector: Evidence from six organizations. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13 (2), 125 – 141.

Patrick, J. D. (2004). Still awaiting orders: reflections on the cultural influence when educating in Albania. *Accounting Education*, 13 (3), 347 – 365.

Perry, J. L. & Rainey, H. G. (1988). The public–private distinction in organization theory: A critique and research Strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 13 (2), 182 – 201.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 (5), 603 – 609.

Probst, T. M. (2000). Wedded to the job: Moderating effects of job involvement on the consequences of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5 (1), 63 – 73.

Ramsey, R., Lassk, F. G., & Marshall, G. W. (1995). A critical evaluation of a measure of job involvement: The use of Lodahl & Kejner (1965) Scale with salespeople. *Journal of Personal Sellings and Sales Management*, 15 (3), 65 – 74.

Rainey, H. G., Backoff, R. W & Levine, C. H. (1976). Comparing public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 36, 233 – 244.

Riipinen, M. (1997). The relationship between job involvement and well-being. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131 (1), 81 – 89.

Ring, P. S. & Perry, J. L. (1985). Strategic management in public and private organizations: implications of distinctive contexts and constraints. *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (2), 276 – 286.

Ruh, A., White, K., & Wood, R. (1975). Job involvement, values, personal background participation in decision – making and job attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 300 – 312.

Scott, D., Bishop, B. W., & Chen, X. (2003). An examination of the relationship of employee involvement with job satisfaction, employee cooperation and intention to quit in U.S invested enterprise in China. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11 (1), 3 – 19.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Sage Publication Inc. California.

Shaw, J. D. (1999). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The moderating role of positive affect. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139 (2), 242 – 244.

Solomon, E. E. (1986). Private and public sector managers: An empirical investigation of job characteristics, and organizational climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 247 – 259.

Somers, M. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16 (1), 49 – 58.

Spector, P. E. & Jex, S. M. (1991). Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (1), 46 – 53.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. California, Sage Publications Inc.

Staw, B. M. (1980). The consequences of turnover. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 1 (4), 253 – 273.

Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46 – 56.

Susskind, A. M., Borchogrevink, C. P., Kacmar, M., & Brymer, R. A. (2000). Customer service employees' behavioral intentions and attitudes: An examination of construct validity and a path model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 19 (1), 53 – 77.

Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: path analyses based meta – analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46 (2), 259 – 294.

Tyson, P. D. & Pongruengphant, R. (2004). Five-year follow-up study of stress among nurses in public and private hospitals in Thailand. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41(3), 247 – 254.

Retrieved from the internet, April 2005

[http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\\_ob=MIimg&\\_imagekey=B6T7T-49D1XN8-1-B&\\_cdi=5067&\\_user=691352&\\_orig=search&\\_coverDate=03%2F31%2F2004&\\_sk=999589996&view=c&wchp=dGLbVzb-](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIimg&_imagekey=B6T7T-49D1XN8-1-B&_cdi=5067&_user=691352&_orig=search&_coverDate=03%2F31%2F2004&_sk=999589996&view=c&wchp=dGLbVzb-)

zSkWA&md5=4c083d4f7ae86bd3f1c8fe287aec81fa&ie=/sdarticle.pdf

Van Scotter, J. R. (2000). Relationships of task performance and contextual performance with turnover, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10 (1), 79 – 95.

Udo, G. J., Guimaraes, T. & Igbaria, M. (1997). An investigation of the antecedents of turnover intention for manufacturing plant managers. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 17 (9), 912 – 930.

Wallace, M. J. & Schwab, D. P. (1974). Correlates of employee satisfaction with pay. *Industrial Relations*, 13, 78 – 89.

Walsh, J. P., Ashford, S. J., & Hill, T. E. (1985). Feedback obstruction: The influence of the information environment on employee turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 38 (1), 23 – 46.

Wasti, S. A. (2003). Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(3), 303 – 321.

Wasti, S. A. (2000) Örgütsel bağlılığı belirleyen evrensel ve kültürel etmeler: Türk kültürüne bir bakış. 201 – 224. In Z. Aycan (editor): Türkiye’de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamalar.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Weissenberg, P. & Gruenfeld, L. W. (1968). Relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52 (6), 469 – 473.

## APPENDIX A

### Job Satisfaction Survey

1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.
2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.
6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.
7. I like the people I work with.
8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.
9. Communications seem good within this organization.
10. Raises are too few and far between.
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance being promoted.
12. My supervisor is unfair to me.
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.
17. I like doing the things I do at work.
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.
20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.
21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.
22. The benefit package we have is equitable.
23. There are few rewards for those who work here.
24. I have too much to do at work.
25. I enjoy my coworkers.
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
28. I feel satisfied with my chance for salary increases.
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.
30. I like my supervisor.
31. I have too much paperwork.
32. I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.
33. I am satisfied with my chances from promotion.
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.
35. My job is enjoyable.
36. Work assignments are not fully explained.

This scale is taken from Spector (1997), p 75, 76

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Job Involvement Instrument**

1. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
2. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.
3. I am really perfectionist about by work.
4. I live, eat and breathe my job.
5. I am very much involved personally in my work.
6. Most things in my life are more important than work. (r)



## APPENDIX C

### Organizational Commitment Instrument

#### Affective Commitment Scale

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. (r)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (r)
5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (r)
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

#### Normative Commitment Scale

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (r)
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
4. This organization deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to my organization.

#### Continuance Commitment Scale

1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.
6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Turnover Intention Instrument**

1. People on this job often think of quitting.
2. I frequently think of quitting this job.
3. It is highly likely that I will leave the job within next year.
4. I am searching for another job in another organization.
5. I will leave this job as soon as I find any other kind of job.

## APPENDIX E

### Anketa Në Shqip

Anketa e mëposhtme zhvillohet në kuadër të një studimi për përgatitjen e një teze masteri në Psikologjinë Industriale. Anketa është e ndarë në katër pjesë dhe secila trajton një çështje të vecantë, të cilat janë si vijon: kënaqësinë që jep puna, përfshirja në punë, tendencat (synimi) për të lënë punën, dhe përkushtimi ndaj organizatës. Përfundimet e anketave do të përdoren vetëm për qëllime studimi dhe do të ruhet rreptësisht anonimiteti i çdo ankete.

Bashkëpunimi në këtë studim është tërësisht vullnetar dhe nëq dëshironi, jeni të lirë të mos e plotësoni apo ta lini përgjysëm plotësimin e anketës.

Emrat nuk kërkohen, prandaj lutem që të mos lini asnjë pyetje të paplotësuar dhe ti përgjigjeni me sinjeritet, ashtu si e mendoni ju QË ËSHTË në organizatën tuaj, dhe jo SI DUHET të jetë.

#### ANKETË MBI KËNAQËSINË QË JEP PUNA

		JAM PLOTËSISHT KUNDËR	JAM KUNDËR	JAM PËSËRISHT KUNDËR	JAM DAKORT PËSËRISHT	JAM DAKORT GJYSËM PER GJYSËM	JAM PLOTËSISHT DAKORT	NUK KA TË BËJË ME MUA
	Ju lutem qarkoni numrin që i afrohet më shumë mendimit tuaj për secilën nga fjalitë e mëposhtme.							
1	Mendoj se paguham sa duhet për punën që bëj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Në punën time shanset për tu ngritur në detyrë janë shumë të vogla.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Shefi im është mjaft i/e aftë në punën e tij/saj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Nuk jam i/e kënaqur me përfitimet që marr.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Kur e bëj punën mirë marr mirënjohjen që më takon.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Shumë nga rregullat dhe procedurat në punën time vështirësojnë bërjen e një pune të mire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	Më pëlqejnë njerëzit me të cilët punoj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Ndonjëherë ndjej se puna ime është e pakuptimtë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Komunikimi brenda organizatës duket i mirë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	Rritjet e rrogës janë të pakta dhe të largëta në kohë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Ata të cilët punojnë mirë kanë mundësi për tu ngritur në detyrë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		JAM PLOTËSISHT KUNDËR	JAM KUNDËR	JAM PJESËRISHT KUNDËR	JAM DAKORT PJESËRISHT	JAM DAKORT GJYSEM PER GJYSEM	JAM PLOTËSISHT DAKORT	NUK KA TË BËJË ME MUA
	Ju lutem qarkoni numrin që i afrohet më shumë mendimit tuaj per secilën nga fjalitë e mëposhtme.							
12	Shefi im është i padrejtë me mua.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	Përfitimet që merren këtu janë po aq të mira sa ato që ofrojnë organizatat e tjera.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Nuk ndjem i/e vlerësuar për punën që bëj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Përpjekjet e mia për të bërë një punë të mirë pengohen fare rrallë nga drejtuesit e organizatës dhe rregullat e saj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Më duhet të punoj shumë për shkak të paaftësisë së njerëzve me të cilët punoj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Më pëlqejnë gjërat që bëj në punë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Nuk i kam të qarta synimet e kësaj organizate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Mendoj se nuk vlerësohem sa duhet nga organizata kur mendoj sa më paguajnë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	Njerëzit këtu perparojnë po aq shpejt sa dhe në organizatat e tjera.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Shefit tim pak i interesojnë ndjenjat e vartësve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	Përfitimet dhe të mirat ndahen në mënyrë të barabartë mes anëtarëve të organizatës.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	Ka pak shpërblime për ata që punojnë këtu.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	Kam shumë për të bërë në punë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	Jam i/e kënaqur me kolegët e mi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	Shpesh mendoj se nuk e di se çfarë po ndodh me organizatën.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	Ndjem krenar/e për punën që bëj.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	Ndjem i/e kënaqur me mundësitë që na ofrohen për shtesë rroge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	Ka përfitime që na takojnë por nuk na janë dhënë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	Më pëlqen shefi im.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	Kam shumë punë me shkresurina.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	Ndjej që përpjekjet e mia nuk shpërblehen ashtu si duhet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	Jam i/e kënaqur me mundësitë që ofrohen për ngritje në detyrë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	Ka shumë grindje dhe mosmarrëveshje në punë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	Puna ime është e këndshme.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36	Detyrat që jepen në punë nuk shpjegohen plotësisht.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## PËRFSHIRJA NË PUNË

		JAM PLOTËSISHT KUNDËR	JAM KUNDËR	JAM PIESËRISHT KUNDËR	JAM NEUTRAL	JAM PIESËRISHT DAKORT	JAM DAKORT	JAM PLOTËSISHT DAKORT
	Ju lutem qarkoni numrin që i afrohet më shumë mendimit tuaj për secilën nga fjalitë e mëposhtme.							
1	Kënaqësia më e madhe në jetën time vjen nga puna	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Gjërat më të rëndësishme që më ndodhin kanë të bëjnë me punën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Jam me të vërtetë perfeksionist/e në punën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Unë jetoj, ha dhe marr frymë me punën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Jam shumë i/e përfshirë personalisht në punën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Shumë gjëra në jetën time janë më të rëndësishme se puna.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## SYNIMI (TENDENCA) PËR TU LARGUAR NGA PUNA

		SKA ABSOLUTISHT MUNDËSI	S'KA MUNDËSI	KA PAK MUNDËSI	NEUTRAL	KA CA MUNDËSI	KA MUNDËSI	KA SHUMË MUNDËSI
	Ju lutem qarkoni numrin që i afrohet më shumë mendimit tuaj për secilën nga fjalitë e mëposhtme.							
1	Njerëzit në këtë punë mendojnë shpesh për ta lënë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Mendoj vazhdimisht ta lë këtë punë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Ka shumë mundësi ta lë këtë punë brenda vitit të ardhshëm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Po kërkoj një punë tjetër në një organizatë tjetër.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Do ta lë këtë punë sapo të gjej çfarëdo pune tjetër.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## ANKETA MBI PËRKUSHTIMIN NË PUNË

		TOTALISHT KUNDËR	KUNDËR	PJESËRISHT KUNDËR	NEUTRAL	PJESËRISHT DAKORT	DAKORT	PLOTËSISHT DAKORT MUA
	Ju lutem qarkoni numrin që i afrohet më shumë mendimit tuaj për secilën nga fjalitë e mëposhtme.							
1	Do të isha shumë i/e lumtur të kaloja pjesën tjetër të karrierës time në këtë organizatë.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Nuk ndjej ndonjë detyrim për të qëndruar me punëdhënësin tim të tanishëm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Edhe sikur të ishte në të mirën time nuk mendoj se është e drejtë ta lë organizatën time tani.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Qëndrimi në organizatën time tani është çështje domosdoshmërie po aq sa dhe dëshire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Një nga pasojat negative të largimit nga kjo organizatë, do të ishte mungesa e alternativave të vlefshme për një punë tjetër.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Ndjej me të vërtetë që problemet e kësaj organizate janë dhe të miat.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	Do të ndjehesha fajtor/e nëse do ta lija organizatën tani.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Nuk ndjej ti “përkas” organizatës time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Do të ishte shumë e veshtirë për mua të largohesha nga organizata ime tani, edhe po të doja.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	Ndjej se kam shumë pak mundësi për të menduar largimin tim nga organizata.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Kjo organizatë meriton besnikërinë time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Nuk ndjehem “i/e lidhur emocionalisht” me organizatën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	I detyrohem shumë organizatës time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Shumë nga jeta ime do të shkatërrohej nëse unë do të vendosja që të lija organizatën time tani.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Kjo organizatë ka domethënie të madhe personale për mua.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Nuk ndjehem si “pjesë e familjes” në organizatën time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Nuk do ta lija organizatën time tani sepse ndjej detyrim ndaj njerëzve në të.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Nqs nuk do të kisha dhënë kaq shumë nga vetja për këtë organizatë, do të mund të mendoja të punoja diku tjetër.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### **TË DHËNA TË TJERA**

1. Gjinia:        Femër \_\_\_\_\_                    Mashkull \_\_\_\_\_
2. Moshë \_\_\_\_\_
3. Qyteti \_\_\_\_\_
4. Mësues:        9– vjecar \_\_\_\_\_                    Gjimnaz \_\_\_\_\_
5. Lloji i shkollës:    Publike \_\_\_\_\_                    Private \_\_\_\_\_
6. Profili: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Koha e punës në arsim: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Koha e punës në këtë shkollë: \_\_\_\_\_

**☺ ANKETA MBAROI!!! JU FALEMINDERIT PËR BASHKËPUNIMIN!!! ☺**

## APPENDIX F

### The Questionnaire in English

The following questionnaire is prepared as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. The questionnaire consists of four parts, each of which contains a separate topic, which are as follows: job satisfaction, job involvement, turnover intention and organizational commitment. The results of the questionnaires will be only used for academic purposes and the anonymity of each is strictly ensured.

The collaboration in this study is voluntary and if you wish, feel free not to complete it at all, or leave it unfinished.

The names are not asked, so please do not leave any unanswered items and respond as you feel IT IS in your organization, not as it SHOULD BE.

#### JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number that is closest to your opinion for each of the following statements.		DISAGREE VERY MUCH	DISAGREE	DISAGREE SLIGHTLY	AGREE SLIGHTLY	AGREE MODERATELY	AGREE VERY MUCH	NOT APPLICABLE
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7



	Please circle the number that is closest to your opinion for each of the following statements.	DISAGREE VERY MUCH	DISAGREE MODERATELY	DISAGREE SLIGHTLY	AGREE SLIGHTLY	AGREE MODERATELY	AGREE VERY MUCH	NOT APPLICABLE
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	I feel satisfied with my chance for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	I am satisfied with my chances from promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## JOB INVOLVEMENT INSTRUMENT

Please circle the number that is closest to your opinion for each of the following statements.		TOTALLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	COMPLETELY AGREE
1	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	The most important things that happen to me involve my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	I am really perfectionist about my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	I live, eat and breathe my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	I am very much involved personally in my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Most things in my life are more important than work *	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

\* The item was inversely coded.

## TURNOVER INTENTION INSTRUMENT

Please circle the number that is closest to your opinion for each of the following statements.		ABSOLUTELY UNLIKELY	UNLIKELY	SLIGHTLY UNLIKELY	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY LIKELY	LIKELY	HIGHLY LIKELY
1	People on this job often think of quitting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	I frequently think of quitting this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	It is highly likely that I will leave the job within next year.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	I am searching for another job in another organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	I will leave this job as soon as I find any other kind of job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT INSTRUMENT

Please circle the number that is closest to your opinion for each of the following statements		TOTALLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	AGREE	COMPLETELY AGREE
1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. *	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. *	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	This organization deserves my loyalty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. *	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	I owe a great deal to my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. *	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

- 1. Gender:        Female\_\_\_\_\_                    Male\_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Age \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. City\_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Teacher:        Secondary\_\_\_\_                    High\_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Publicness of School:    Public\_\_\_\_\_                    Private\_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Profile:\_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Tenure in teaching:\_\_\_\_\_
- 8. Tenure in this school:\_\_\_\_\_

**☺☺☺ THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS OVER!!! ☺☺☺**  
**☺☺☺ THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!! ☺☺☺**