



Sector Differences in Employee's Perceived Importance of Income and Job Security: Can These be Found Across the Contexts of Countries, Cultures, and Occupations?

Justin B. Bullock, Jesper Rosenberg Hansen & David J. Houston

To cite this article: Justin B. Bullock, Jesper Rosenberg Hansen & David J. Houston (2018) Sector Differences in Employee's Perceived Importance of Income and Job Security: Can These be Found Across the Contexts of Countries, Cultures, and Occupations?, International Public Management Journal, 21:2, 243-271, DOI: [10.1080/10967494.2018.1425226](https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2018.1425226)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2018.1425226>



Accepted author version posted online: 10 Jan 2018.
Published online: 01 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 209



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



SECTOR DIFFERENCES IN EMPLOYEE'S PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INCOME AND JOB SECURITY: CAN THESE BE FOUND ACROSS THE CONTEXTS OF COUNTRIES, CULTURES, AND OCCUPATIONS?

JUSTIN B. BULLOCK
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

JESPER ROSENBERG HANSEN
AARHUS UNIVERSITY

DAVID J. HOUSTON
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

ABSTRACT: *Most empirical research has shown that people working in the public sector perceive job security as more important than people working in the private sector, while the inverse is the case for job income. However, it is not known if these relationships hold globally while controlling for occupation and national context. We combine ISSP data from respondents in 25 countries with Hofstede's cultural dimensions and World Bank data to examine whether the previous generally accepted claims hold while taking into account workers' occupation, as well as national, cultural, and economic conditions. We find evidence that even when taking into account all these factors, government workers place a higher value on job security than private workers, but contrary to the generally accepted claim, we find no statistically significant difference between government and private workers in their high-income motives when taking the occupation and national context into the models.*

INTRODUCTION

Employee motivation is an important concern for management, regardless of occupational and national context. Worker contributions to an organization derive from both intrinsic and extrinsic sources (Frey and Osterloh 2002; Ryan and Deci 2008).

Due to differing organizational missions and tools available to managers, a common theme in public administration literature is that public employees¹ rank work motives differently than do private sector workers (Perry 2000; Perry and Wise 1990; Rayner et al. 2011). For this reason, research attention has focused on the differences in attitudes between public and private sector employees. The general depiction that emerges is that obligation-based intrinsic motives are regarded more highly by public employees, along with job security, but high income seems to be a more important concern for private employees (e.g., Crewson 1997; Houston 2000, 2011; Perry and Hondeghem 2008). Understanding whether these differences hold empirically is still important today, after several decades of New Public Management (NPM) ideas, which downplay the distinction between public and private organization. It is therefore relevant to test whether these differences in worker attitudes hold up across countries that have experienced different NPM-style changes.

Several limitations characterize the public administration research on work motives. First, the primary focus has been on the intrinsic work motives subsumed under the concept of public service motivation. Even when considered in these studies, extrinsic motives are treated as a secondary theoretical concern (e.g., Houston 2000, 2011). The fact that individuals are motivated both by intrinsic and extrinsic factors requires understanding the importance that employees assign to both types of motives. However, there is only limited research focusing on extrinsic motives, though these may be even more important to understand, as several NPM reforms have been related to these motives. Two recent studies highlight the fruitfulness of studying these extrinsic motives. Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey (2015) find greater variation across countries in the perceived importance of high income as a motive for public employees relative to private workers, while the relative importance of PSM-related motives is much more consistent across countries. Van de Walle, Steijn, and Gilke (2015) also demonstrate the utility of studying extrinsic work motives cross-nationally in their study on job sector preferences.

Second, the majority of research comparing work outcomes is comprised of single-nation studies carried out in the North American and West European national contexts (e.g., Buelens and Van den Broeck 2007; Houston 2000; Lyons, Duxbury, and Higgins 2006; Vandenberghe 2008). Yet, so much of the world remains beyond the reach of these studies, which may obscure meaningful differences in cultural and economic circumstances, and how these differences may interact with different extrinsic motivations. While there has been an increased interest in cross-national studies in public administration generally (Van de Walle, Steijn, and Gilke, 2015; Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey 2015; Bullock, Wenger, and Wilkins, 2014; Van de Walle, Van Roosbroek, and Bouckaert, 2008; Jaskyte 2016), cross-national research on work motives has primarily focused on work motives associated with public service motivation (see, e.g., Houston 2011, 2014; Dur and Zoutenbier 2014; Kim 2017).

Third, the multi-nation studies that have been conducted are limited by minimal efforts to model national context. Most importantly, the importance of national culture for sector differences in worker attitudes has largely been overlooked, with Kim (2017) and Jaskyte (2016) being some of the few exceptions. In contrast to the paucity of research on culture and worker attitudes in public administration, among business management scholars there is a growing interest in national culture for studying organizational behavior

(Gelfand, Erez, and Aycan 2007). For instance, research in business management has observed considerable variation across countries in the importance the respondents assign to various job characteristics and has found this variation to correlate with national cultural attributes (Huang and van de Vliert 2003; Kaasa 2011). It is for this reason that Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey (2015) call for research to examine national culture as a determinant of worker attitudes across employment sectors.

Economic factors are another aspect of national context that may be related to the importance of extrinsic work motives. For instance, it has been found that economic conditions are correlated with the attractiveness of public sector employment in a country (Groeneveld, Steijn, and Van der Parre 2009). Steers and Sanchez-Runde (2002) argue that lower-order needs are often ignored in cross-cultural studies, though these could be expected to vary as a function of economic conditions, as lower-order needs are likely to be more important in less economically developed countries. While several studies have examined the relevance of national economic factors for work motives (Huang and van de Vliert 2003; Klonski 2011), these studies have not specifically focused on public sector workers.

Fourth, studies often do not consider whether sector differences for these extrinsic motives vary across occupational groups that may have different norms. International studies of sector differences typically do not consider whether an employee's occupational group has an influence on whether these sector differences can be found across countries (e.g., this is not done in the most recent studies by Kim (2017), Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey (2015), or Van de Walle, Steijn, and Jilke (2015), but it was considered in Bullock, Wenger, and Wilkins (2014) by using a sample that included matching based on helping occupations, and Houston (2014), who controlled for occupational focus). However, occupational group differences could be expected to have an influence on extrinsic values; these values may become less important for occupational groups with higher status. For example, more professional occupation groups may emphasize intrinsic values more highly and place less emphasis on extrinsic values (Hauff and Kirchner 2015). And, as the distribution of occupational groups differs across sectors, this is important to include in sector difference studies (Rainey 2011).

Fifth, and finally, there is a need for more quantitatively sophisticated comparative research in public administration and management (Jaskyte 2016), as the quality of existing research is generally low (Eglene and Dawes 2006; Fitzpatrick et al. 2011). The use of individual-level data gathered using national samples, along with aggregate-level indicators, is often examined with tools that do not accommodate a nested data structure. Instead, multilevel analysis tools must be used that are not yet common in public administration research.

To address these limitations of comparative public administration research on work motives, data from the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2005 "Work Orientations III" module are examined. The focus of the study is on attitudes of public (here, government) and private sector workers towards the importance of job security and high income. National samples from 25 countries are analyzed using multilevel ordinal logistic regression analysis. In addition to employment sector, other individual-level characteristics are included in the models as well.

National context is operationalized using Hofstede's (1980a) multi-dimensional measure of national culture. Even though the original dimensions of national culture were

identified by Hofstede several decades ago and have limitations, they are still relevant and valid today (Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson 2006; Taras, Kirkman, and Steel 2010). Hofstede's work remains the most influential framework for national cultural values (Sivakumar and Nakata 2001). Even so, this framework has received scant attention in the public administration and public management literature. The utility of the Hofstede cultural dimensions for public administration can be seen in research on PSM (Kim 2017) and in a comparison of work motives in six countries (Jaskyte 2016). We will also utilize national economic variables to operationalize national economic context. Taken together, the contexts of occupation, national culture, and economic conditions may account for the traditionally observed difference between public and private workers on the questions of the importance of job security and high income. The pages that follow present a summary of research literature that informs relevant hypotheses, provides a description of the data and methods employed, presents estimated multilevel regression models, and discusses the implications of the findings.

EMPLOYMENT SECTOR AND WORK MOTIVES

According to person-environment fit theory, individuals seek out work environments that are compatible with their own personally held values (Kristof-Brown and Billsberry 2013). For this reason, the inherent differences between public and private sector organizations result in attracting workers that differently value certain intrinsic and extrinsic work motives. It has, for instance, been shown that extrinsic motives are important explanations of why people sector switch (Hansen 2014).

For instance, the mission of government organizations provides workers with greater opportunity to be involved in public service and, thus, these organizations are likely to attract individuals with an interest in serving the community (Pandey and Stazyk 2008; Perry 2000; Rayner et al. 2011). Consistent with this hypothesis, first offered by Perry and Wise (1990), research has found that government employees indeed rank more highly in importance the specific obligation-based intrinsic motives subsumed under the label of public service motivation than do workers in private organizations (Houston 2000, 2011; Lyons, Duxbury, and Higgins 2006; Steijn 2008; Kim 2017).

While given less attention, the concept of person-organization fit also suggests that public and private sector employees likely differ in the importance they assign to extrinsic work motives such as high income and job security. The use of pay as a work motive assumes that individuals are utility maximizers engaged in well-defined activities associated with clear reward-performance expectations (Shamir 1991). However, public sector organizations are often characterized by vague and conflicting goals that make it difficult for managers to identify and measure specific employee actions. Additionally, public managers are constrained in their use of monetary rewards (Perry 2000). For these reasons, it is hypothesized that government workers are less likely than private sector workers to regard a high income as an important work motive.

The general conclusion on the importance of income as a work motivator is consistent with the previous hypothesis. Some studies have reported that public employees do indeed place less of an emphasis on income as a work motivator (Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown

1998; Houston 2000; Frank and Lewis 2004), while others have found no such difference (Crewson 1997; Houston 2011, 2014; Lyons et al. 2006). Regardless of whether attitudes differ significantly across employment sectors, salary is important to government employees (Vandenabeele 2008; Wright and Pandey 2008), but perhaps just not as important as it is to private sector workers.

Job security is another extrinsic motive that is thought to be valued differently by public and private sector workers. The Weberian legal-rational type of administration that characterizes public bureaucracies in Western democratic nations assumes a professional public service, the removal of administration from politics, and a public service ethos. This view of public bureaucracy is the most common approach to administrative reform recommended to countries undergoing a transition to democracy (Meyer-Sahling 2004; Neshkova and Kostadinova 2012). In this model, to be a public servant, a bureaucrat must be competent, independent of partisan influence, and secure in employment (Goran 2009). As a result, job security in the public sector is greater than in private employment (Bonin et al. 2007; Clark and Postel-Vinay 2009). Scholars have asserted that risk-averse individuals are attracted to the security offered by public sector organizations (Buurman, Dur, and Van de Bossche 2012; Pfeifer 2011; Roszkowski and Grable 2009). Therefore, it is hypothesized that individuals who highly value job security are more likely to be found working in the public sector than the private sector.

As a consequence, public workers more highly value job security than do private sector employees (Houston 2011; Perry and Hondeghem 2008). While some studies similarly find that individuals who regard job security to be an important attribute of a job are more attracted to public sector employment (Lewis and Frank 2002; Vandenabeele 2008), others observe no correlation between highly valuing job security and sector of employment (Crewson 1997; Karl and Sutton 1998; Lyons et al. 2006).

Occupational Group

There have been several studies arguing that occupation type is important to consider if we are interested in understanding sector differences in motivation; for instance, in regard to PSM (Houston 2011; Andersen and Pedersen 2013). Yet knowledge is limited regarding the influence of occupational type on potential sector difference in extrinsic values. The lack of consideration for including occupation in studies of sector differences may be problematic, as people may select into occupations, which potentially may be the reason for their sector employment choice, since some occupations are more common in different sectors. Therefore, not considering this confounding factor can be problematic in studies of sector differences (Andersen and Pedersen 2013), especially if the selection of occupation also is related to the area of interest for the study of sector differences, such as extrinsic values in our case. For instance, people may select a specific occupation where there is less emphasis on certain extrinsic values. Studies have shown that professionals are less likely to value extrinsic values compared to others (Hauff and Kirchner 2015), and generally, there seem to be important occupational differences in work value, though the literature on this issue is scarce (Shapira and Griffith 1990).

NATIONAL CONTEXT AND WORK MOTIVES

While the literature indicates that public and private sector workers differently value extrinsic work motives, the relevance of national context for these differences has yet to be considered. National cultural and economic conditions both shape work motivation (Klonski 2011) and have been employed as correlates in cross-national business management research, but have yet to find their way into the public administration literature. This section discusses the relevance that these aspects of national context may have for the importance of extrinsic motives.

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Commonly referred to as a “system of shared meaning” (Erez 2008), culture entails the beliefs, norms, and values that distinguish one group from another (Schein 1985). As relatively stable characteristics of a society, culture is passed between generations through social learning (Bandura 1986). It provides members of a society with a common frame of reference for understanding and responding to external stimuli, as well as relating to one another (Hofstede 2001). Thus, Hofstede (1984) defines culture as the “collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another” (21).

The most commonly used measure of national culture, as it pertains to work-related values, was developed by Geert Hofstede (1980a). Based on a survey of over 116,000 IBM employees in 40 countries conducted between 1967 and 1973, Hofstede (1980a) identified four dimensions of national culture: individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. These cultural dimensions have been used extensively since, are still the most frequently used measures of national culture, and have been shown to be valid today (Kirkman, Lowe and Gibson, 2006; Taras, Kirkman, and Steel 2010; Minkov 2013). In addition to a lack of strong alternatives, the use of Hofstede's original cultural dimensions makes our study comparable to the empirical research in business management.

Of Hofstede's four dimensions of national culture, the most frequently studied is individualism-collectivism (Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson 2006; Probst and Lawler 2006). This dimension describes “the degree to which people in a country prefer to act as individuals rather than as members of a group” (Hofstede 1994: 6). Individual interests and preferences are a more important source of motivation for behavior than are those that are dictated by a group (Probst and Lawler 2006). Emphasis is placed on the opportunity to fulfill high-order needs, such as independence, self-reliance, and self-actualization (Huang and van de Vliert 2003). Therefore, the intrinsic aspects of a job are regarded more highly in individualistic cultures (Hofstede 1980a).

In contrast, people in collectivistic cultures define themselves in terms of group memberships (Triandis, McCusker, and Hui 1990), and are socialized to value conformity with social norms and respect of authority (Triandis 1995; Shuper et al. 2004). High-order needs, such as self-actualization, become subordinate to lower-order ones, such as economic security and social affiliation (Hofstede 1980a; Kanungo 1990). “Hence, workers in collectivistic countries are more likely to place great emphasis on extrinsic

aspect of their jobs than workers in individualistic countries” (Huang and van de Vliert 2003:162). We therefore expect the importance people place on extrinsic motives, such as job security and high income, to differ across individualistic and collectivistic countries; however, given the lack of current empirical evidence, and also because there has been discussion on the direction of the relationship (see Hauff, Richter, and Tressin 2015), we do not hypothesize a directional influence across these cultures.

Cultural power distance may also explain differences across countries in the importance assigned by workers to extrinsic motives. Power distance is defined by Hofstede (1980b) as “the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally” (45). High power distance societies are characterized by established levels of hierarchy and the acceptance of power differences by the society at large, including by those who have little power (Erez 2008). Supervisors are not expected to consult subordinates when making managerial decisions, the latter of which are expected to refrain from disagreeing with these decisions (Hofstede 2001; Taras, Kirkman, and Steel 2010). In low power distance cultures, participatory management is more common, as is a desire on the part of workers to possess their own autonomy (Huang and van de Vliert 2003). As a result, intrinsic job characteristics are more highly valued in lower power distance cultures, while “. . . the pursuit of more tangible rewards, such as pay, promotion, and good working conditions, may be the primary goal of most people as they strive for more power and more privileges” in high power distance countries (Huang and van de Vliert 2003:163). We therefore expect that the importance people place on extrinsic values, including high income and job security, is higher for people living in countries with high power distance.

Less frequently studied are the cultural dimensions labelled uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity. Hofstede (1980b:45) defines uncertainty avoidance as “the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors.” Distinct from risk avoidance, it is “associated with preferences for clear rules and guidance” (Hofstede 2001:149). Values and behaviors that promote certainty and conformity are promoted in high uncertainty avoidance cultures (Erez 2008). “Hence, the need to avoid uncertainty is related to the need to have a certain place in society, recognition and belonging” (Kaasa 2011:859). It is closely associated with career stability (Taras, Kirkman, and Steel 2010). A greater emphasis is placed on esteem needs, while self-actualization is accorded a lower priority in these cultures (Kaasa 2011). In terms of extrinsic job characteristics, we therefore expect that job security is more highly valued by individuals in high uncertainty avoidance countries. While the link between job security and uncertainty avoidance is fairly straightforward, the theoretical linkages to uncertainty avoidance and importance of high income are slightly murkier. However, to the extent that high income helps to serve as financial security against uncertainty, we also expect that high income is more highly valued in high uncertainty avoidance countries.

The masculinity-femininity dimension refers to the extent to which masculine compared with feminine values are dominant in a society. Hofstede (1980b:46) identifies “assertiveness, the acquisition of money things” as masculine values. In contrast, preference for a “friendly atmosphere, position security, physical conditions, [and] cooperation”

illustrates feminine values (Hofstede 2001:281). In terms of the implications for extrinsic work motives, the more masculine values dominate a society, the greater emphasis will be placed on high income.

Economic Circumstances

Beyond culture, economic conditions are aspects of national context that may correlate with variation among nations in terms of the importance of high income and job security as important motives for workers. While research has yet to examine the importance of national economy on the level of importance that workers in a nation assign to work motives, it is reasonable to expect that poor economic conditions would heighten the importance of high income and job security as extrinsic work motives. The more difficult the economic conditions a nation experiences, the more unstable becomes the labor market, thereby increasing concerns about personal financial circumstances and keeping a job. It is for this reason that it is hypothesized that the stronger a nation's economy, the less importance workers will place on the extrinsic work motives of high income and job security.

A socio-economic explanation for cross-national variation in work motives builds on Maslow's (1954) need-gratification theory. Referring to a hierarchy of needs, physiological and safety needs are the lowest level of needs individuals seek to fill. Only when survival needs are met can an individual focus on higher-level needs, such as love, esteem, and self-actualization. For instance, Inglehart's (1997) modernization thesis posits that economic development results in a movement away from emphasizing survival values, to an emphasis on self-expressive values. In economically developed countries, most individuals enjoy a level of economic wealth and security that has resulted in survival needs being taken for granted and self-expression values being more highly regarded. In contrast, in less economically developed countries, day-to-day concerns with meeting food, shelter, and safety needs are more prevalent. Thus, in these latter countries, survival cannot be taken for granted. It is for this reason that Inglehart (1997) contends that economic development has resulted in a shift in the motives that people engage in work from instrumental to more self-expressive motives.

Huang and van de Vliert (2003) associate the lower-level, instrumental needs with extrinsic work motives, while the higher-level, self-expressive needs are akin to intrinsic motives for work. Thus, extrinsic work motives are thought to be more important in poorer countries and less important in wealthier, more economically developed countries where material outcomes are taken for granted (Kaasa 2011).

As shown earlier, these contextual factors could be expected to have a huge influence on extrinsic values and are therefore important to have ruled out as explanations for potential sector differences. Our interest in this article is therefore to test, in a comprehensive manner, the two classical hypotheses about sector differences in the importance of job security and high income, while we simultaneously consider the potential influence of differences across several contexts (i.e., countries, cultures, economic factors, and occupational differences). We therefore propose the following two hypotheses:

- H1: Government employees value job security more highly compared to private employees, also when considering controlling for the influence of countries, cultures, economic factors, and occupational groups.

- H2: Government employees value high income less compared to private employees when controlling for the influence of countries, cultures, economic factors, and occupational groups.

In sum, research suggests that the typical government worker possesses a different motivational profile than does the typical private sector employee. More specifically, the extant literature suggests that government employees more highly value job security vis-à-vis private employees, while the latter more highly value a high income. Additionally, it is expected that these two extrinsic work motives will generally be valued differently across nations. Geert Hofstede's multi-dimensional measures of national culture have been identified as one likely correlate of work motive preference across nations, and national economic conditions have been identified as other likely correlates. The analysis presented in the following tests the previously stated hypotheses regarding sector differences in high income and job security in an international comparative study using survey data.

DATA AND METHODS

For this project, we use data from three separate sources: the 2005 Worker Orientations module of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP),² the Hofstede dimensions, and 2004 World Bank data on World Development Indicators.

The ISSP serves as the source of the individual-level variables used in the analysis. Standardized questionnaires are constructed by ISSP members with an emphasis placed on topics that are relevant to all countries. National samples are drawn from the adult population in each participating country using multi-stage, stratified, probability sampling designs.³

The 2005 Worker Orientations module was administered to over 40,000 individuals in 31 countries.⁴ However, this analysis is limited to respondents currently employed in either government or the private sector. Those employed in a state-owned firm (including publicly owned companies), or who are self-employed, fall into another category. The purpose of this exclusion is to focus specifically on the differences between those who work for the government and those who work for private firms. Additionally, due to missing data, only 25 of the countries participating in the year of the ISSP are included in the analysis.⁵

Dependent Variables

For this article, we examine two dependent variables. These two dependent variables are High Income Motives and Job Security Motives. These variables are constructed from the ISSP and are self-reported measures of individuals' extrinsic work motives. Both dependent variables are measured on 5-point Likert-type scales with responses ranging from "not important at all" (1) to "very important" (5). Respondents were given the item: "For each of the following, please tell me how important you personally think it is in a job. How important is. . . ." Responses to the items for job security and high income are used in this study.

While there are concerns with employing single-item responses, particularly with regard to measurement errors, these are the best indicators available for studying extrinsic work motives in such a large international context. Furthermore, this is the strategy used by much of the previous research in this area, which also helps us compare our results to the findings of previous research, including that of Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey (2015). Summary statistics for these variables are displayed in Table 1.

Independent Variables

Three sets of independent variables are included in the models: individual-level variables derived from the ISSP data, the Hofstede cultural dimensions, and the World Development Indicators. Regarding individual-level variables, we created a dichotomous variable assigned a value of 1 for being a government worker, while those who work for a private firm are assigned a 0. Also, the broad occupation group in which the respondent works is included through the use of a set of binary variables. Respondents were classified into one of four general occupational categories using the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88) compiled by the International Labour Organization. The following major ISCO-88 groups are classified as professional occupations: (1) legislators, senior officials, and managers; (2) professionals; and (3) technicians and associate professionals. A second occupational type is labeled “clerks” and is comprised of the following major groups: (4) clerks; and (5) service workers and shop and market sales workers. Manufacturing is a third occupational category and

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Job security	14242	3.51	0.68	1	4
High income	14246	3.11	0.79	1	4
Age	14274	40.86	12.13	16	87
Supervisor	14060	0.31	0.46	0	1
Education	13633	12.90	3.55	0	20
Government employee	14349	0.28	0.45	0	1
Married	14236	0.61	0.49	0	1
Professional	13486	0.43	0.50	0	1
Clerical	13486	0.28	0.45	0	1
Manufacturing	13486	0.21	0.40	0	1
Other occupation	13486	0.09	0.28	0	1
PDI	25	48.92	22.22	13	94
IDV	25	58.88	22.20	18	91
MAS	25	49	23.20	5	95
UAI	25	67.76	23.42	23	104
Consumer price index	25	97.24	2.23	88.74	100.27
GDP per capita	25	19149.77	12604.53	1153.02	39830.40
Employment rate	25	56.18	6.32	39.2	64.3

TABLE 2
Correlation Matrix

	<i>Job Sec.</i>	<i>High Inc.</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Supervise</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Govt. Worker</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Profess.</i>	<i>Clerical</i>	<i>Manu.</i>	<i>Other occup.</i>
Job Security	1											
High Income	0.3349	1										
Age	-0.0301	-0.0965	1									
Supervisor	-0.0276	-0.0378	0.0603	1								
Education	-0.1176	-0.1125	-0.0909	0.1802	1							
Govt Worker	0.0302	-0.0677	0.1255	0.0059	0.1800	1						
Married	0.0040	0.0135	0.2792	0.0578	-0.0310	0.0515	1					
Male	-0.0459	0.0426	0.0171	0.1351	-0.0366	-0.1678	0.0659	1				
Professional	-0.0989	-0.1123	0.0625	0.2779	0.4881	0.2039	0.0459	-0.0419	1			
Clerical	0.0570	0.0007	-0.0825	-0.1371	-0.1278	0.0090	-0.0735	-0.2536	-0.5413	1		
Manufacturing	0.0481	0.1043	-0.0131	-0.1052	-0.2917	-0.2186	0.0298	0.3265	-0.4449	-0.3137	1	
Other Occup.	0.0147	0.0477	0.0372	-0.1291	-0.2411	-0.0606	-0.0069	0.0086	-0.2662	-0.1877	-0.1542	1

contains the following major groups: (7) craft and related trade workers; and (8) plant and machine operators and assemblers. The last category is labeled “other” and is made up of two major groups: (6) skilled agricultural and fishery workers; and (9) elementary occupations. Three binary variables are created to represent professional, clerk, and manufacturing occupational categories with the other occupational category serving as the base group in estimated models.⁶ In addition, a set of standard control variables is included in the models. They include the following respondent characteristics: age, education, marital status, sex, and supervisory status. Table 2 displays correlations for the dependent and the individual-level independent variables.

To examine the influence of national context on attitudes toward extrinsic work motives, two sets of nation-level variables are used. National culture is measured using the four Hofstede dimensions of Power Distance (PDI), Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV), Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS), and Uncertainty Avoidance

TABLE 3
Hofstede Data and Economic Indicators

<i>Country</i>	<i>Hofstede Data</i>				<i>Economic Indicators</i>	
	<i>IDV</i>	<i>PDI</i>	<i>MAS</i>	<i>UAI</i>	<i>Employment Rate</i>	<i>GDP Per Capita</i>
Australia	90	36	61	54	60.1	23498.26
Bulgaria	30	70	40	85	45	2036.55
Canada	80	39	52	48	62.2	24936.83
Czech Republic	58	57	57	74	54.3	6588.90
Denmark	74	18	16	23	62.6	30773.71
Finland	63	33	26	59	55.5	25774.06
France	71	68	43	86	50.9	22495.24
Great Britain	89	35	66	35	58.9	27752.91
Hungary	80	46	88	82	46.6	5413.57
Ireland	70	28	68	35	57.6	28937.33
Israel	54	13	47	81	49.2	19366.34
Japan	46	54	95	92	57.7	38793.62
Mexico	30	81	69	82	58.4	5868.92
New Zealand	79	22	58	49	63.8	14853.27
Norway	69	31	8	50	62.6	39830.41
Philippines	32	94	64	44	58.6	1153.02
Portugal	27	63	31	104	57.6	11549.80
Russia	39	93	36	95	55.2	2285.36
Slovenia	27	71	19	88	55.4	11490.68
South Africa	65	49	63	49	39.2	3264.32
South Korea	18	60	39	85	59.4	13303.82
Spain	51	57	42	86	49.4	15408.16
Sweden	71	31	5	29	58.5	30434.45
Switzerland	68	34	70	58	64.3	36003.23
United States	91	40	62	46	61.4	36931.40

(UAI). To capture other country-level variables that might influence workers' motivations, we also use three World Development Indicators: Employment Rate and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (in \$1000). Table 3 displays values for both of these sets of variables for each country.

Statistical Methodology

Multilevel ordinal logistic regression is used to examine the relationship between the importance of extrinsic work motives and the independent variables measured at both the individual and nation levels. The dependent variables are on a scale from 1–5 with 1 indicating that a respondent regards an extrinsic work motive as “not important at all” in a job and 5 indicating that it is “very important.” In both dependent variables, a negligible amount of respondents indicated that job security or high income were “not important at all.”⁷ Thus, the categories 1 (“not at all important”) and 2 (“not important”) were combined. The continuous independent variables included in the analysis are grand-mean centered and the ordinal logistic regression models were estimated in HLM, version 7.01. As a robustness check of the reported results, we also include two appendices, [Appendix 1](#) and [Appendix 2](#), which display the results of nonproportional odds models that do not assume parallel slopes for all variables that were estimated in MLwiN, version 2.36.

RESULTS

Country Means

Before examining our multivariate results, we highlight the differences in average responses for each country with respect to the importance of high income and job security, by employment sector (see Table 4). We also display the results from a one-tailed test in which we hypothesize that government workers will more highly value job security and private sector workers will more highly value high income. For the importance of job security, in 20 of the 25 countries, the mean response is higher in the government than in the private sector, and 11 of these relationships are statistically significant using a one-tailed test at the $p < 0.10$ level. Of all the countries, Bulgarians place the highest importance on job security, while respondents in Denmark assign the lowest importance to it. Furthermore, Denmark has the greatest difference between government and private sector workers, while Switzerland has the smallest difference.

For high income, in 19 of the 25 countries, the mean response is higher in the private sector than in the government, and 10 of these relationships are statistically significant from a one-tailed test at the $p < 0.10$ level. Of all the countries, Bulgarian respondents place the highest importance on high income, while respondents in Switzerland place the least importance on this motive. Additionally, Slovenia has the greatest difference between government and private sector workers, while Portugal has the smallest difference. These differences across countries highlight the importance of estimating a multilevel model to examine these attitudes.

TABLE 4
Mean Response of Job Security and High Income by Country

Country	<i>Job Security</i>				<i>High Income</i>			
	<i>Gov't Worker</i>	<i>Private</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Gov't Worker</i>	<i>Private</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Australia	4.605	4.488	940	0.01	3.752	3.814	938	0.15
Bulgaria	4.904	4.798	439	0.00	4.828	4.785	441	0.85
Canada	4.526	4.485	428	0.29	4.007	4.000	427	0.54
Czech Republic	4.633	4.523	447	0.17	4.167	4.180	446	0.45
Denmark	4.136	3.921	974	0.00	3.541	3.610	973	0.09
Finland	4.52	4.442	610	0.07	3.951	4.017	607	0.14
France	4.584	4.459	925	0.01	3.991	4.090	926	0.02
Great Britain	4.46	4.472	402	0.57	3.818	3.901	400	0.14
Hungary	4.68	4.704	285	0.58	4.400	4.431	285	0.40
Ireland	4.528	4.511	471	0.40	3.853	4.034	470	0.02
Israel	4.843	4.757	412	0.05	4.685	4.569	412	0.95
Japan	4.211	4.128	423	0.24	3.895	3.944	429	0.35
Mexico	4.85	4.693	393	0.00	4.600	4.526	393	0.83
New Zealand	4.354	4.303	593	0.22	3.790	3.859	591	0.19
Norway	4.51	4.396	834	0.01	3.737	3.762	835	0.31
Philippines	4.658	4.627	248	0.36	4.570	4.679	247	0.09
Portugal	4.676	4.613	818	0.07	4.367	4.368	814	0.49
Russia	4.494	4.421	692	0.13	4.591	4.682	692	0.02
Slovenia	4.483	4.469	300	0.45	4.100	4.341	303	0.03
South Africa	4.782	4.697	671	0.03	4.519	4.482	675	0.71
South Korea	4.571	4.667	527	0.89	4.204	4.360	529	0.05
Spain	4.545	4.669	440	0.90	4.455	4.613	437	0.07
Sweden	4.584	4.427	710	0.00	3.941	3.916	714	0.67
Switzerland	4.519	4.512	595	0.46	3.486	3.614	595	0.03
United States	4.503	4.536	861	0.72	3.899	4.024	862	0.02

Multilevel Ordered Logistic Regression Models

Table 5 reports the multilevel ordered logistic regression models for the importance of job security. Model 1 considers the difference between government and non-government workers on this survey item when controlling for four demographic and one work-related respondent characteristic. As expected, government workers regard job security as more important than do respondents employed in private sector firms. The coefficients for the individual-level variables further indicate that job security becomes less important as one ages and becomes more educated, while women and those who are married value job security more highly.

However, the difference in attitudes between government and non-government workers may reflect the mix of occupations that characterize these two employment sectors. For this reason, model 2 includes a series of binary variables to represent the type of occupation in which a respondent is employed. Even when controlling for occupational category,

TABLE 5
Multilevel Ordinal Logistic Regression Models—Job Security

	1	2	3	4	5
Fixed Effects					
<i>Individual-level variables:</i>					
Government worker	0.289*** (1.34)	0.317*** (1.37)	0.319*** (1.38)	0.320*** (1.38)	0.321*** (1.38)
Age	-0.005** (0.99)	-0.004* (1.00)	-0.004* (1.00)	-0.004* (1.00)	-0.004* (1.00)
Education	-0.059*** (0.94)	-0.043*** (0.96)	-0.043*** (0.96)	-0.043*** (0.96)	-0.043*** (0.96)
Married	0.074* (1.08)	0.078* (1.08)	0.078* (1.08)	0.077* (1.08)	0.076* (1.08)
Male	-0.117* (0.89)	-0.148** (0.86)	-0.141** (0.87)	-0.151** (0.86)	-0.152** (0.86)
Supervises	-0.002 (1.00)	0.045 (1.05)	0.045 (1.05)	0.045 (1.05)	0.045 (1.05)
Professional		-0.223*** (0.80)	-0.221*** (0.80)	-0.222*** (0.80)	-0.223*** (0.80)
Clerical		-0.030 (0.97)	-0.030 (0.97)	-0.030 (0.97)	-0.033 (0.97)
Manufacture		0.071 (1.07)	0.071 (1.07)	0.070 (1.07)	0.070 (1.07)
<i>Country-level variables:</i>					
Individualism			0.003 (1.00)		-0.010** (0.99)
Power distance			0.010 (1.01)		
Masculinity			-0.007 (0.99)		
Uncertainty avoidance			0.006 (1.01)		
Employment rate				-0.032* (0.97)	-0.038** (0.96)
GDP/capita				-0.021** (0.98)	-0.017* (0.98)
Intercept	0.436***	0.516***	0.509***	0.518***	0.521***
Threshold 2	2.564***	2.568***	2.569***	2.568***	2.568***
Threshold 3	3.587***	3.592***	3.593***	3.592***	3.592***

(Continued)

TABLE 5
Continued

	1	2	3	4	5
Random Effects (Variance Components)					
Intercept	0.278***	0.281***	0.297***	0.186***	0.247***
Male	0.056***	0.059***	0.062***	0.060***	0.061***
Age	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.00001***	0.0001***	0.0001***
Education	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***
Level-1 N	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461
Level-2 N	25	25	25	25	25
Log-likelihood	-29,103.5	-29,075.8	-29,116.9	-29,087.3	-29,099.8

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

government workers regard job security to be more important as a work motive than do non-government workers. In terms of occupational category, the only statistically significant difference that emerges is that respondents in professional occupations regard job security to be less important than those in the base category ("other occupations"). Thus, professionals stand apart from the other occupational categories on this extrinsic work motive.

In terms of explaining differences across countries in the importance of job security, model 3 considers Hofstede's cultural dimensions and suggests that national culture is not a useful explanation, as none of the estimated coefficients for the four dimensions is statistically significant. However, in the present sample of 25 countries, these dimensions are correlated with one another (individualism-power distance: $r = -0.69$; individualism-uncertainty avoidance: $r = -0.65$; power distance-uncertainty avoidance: $r = 0.57$). While these bivariate correlations do not meet the common threshold of 0.80 that is indicative of high collinearity, the small number of level-2 degrees of freedom makes the correlations between these variables problematic. This assertion is borne out by models (not reported here) that include each one of the cultural dimensions on its own, in which three of the Hofstede dimensions emerge as statistically significant. These additional models indicate that the more individualistic a country's culture is, the less important is job security, as we also expected. In contrast, the more that a country's culture is characterized by power distance ($p = 0.024$) and uncertainty avoidance ($p = 0.047$), the more important is job security generally to respondents in a country. This is also in accordance with our expectations in the theory section. Only the masculinity cultural dimension is statistically insignificant ($p = 0.684$) when it is the only country-level variable.

The relevance of national economic conditions for explaining variation across countries is addressed in model 4. The statistically significant negative coefficient for GDP/capita indicates that the wealthier a country is, the less importance respondents in a country assign to job security. This finding is consistent with Inglehart's modernization thesis. Similarly, higher employment rates in a country are associated with less importance being assigned to job security by respondents. This finding is consistent with the stated hypothesis that attitudes toward job security reflect the immediate economic conditions a country faces. Yet again, the model shows that government employees value job security more than private employees, which is consistent with the other models supporting our hypothesis.

As a robustness check, we conducted additional analyses (model 5) that consider both the cultural and economic explanations for variation across countries on the importance of job security. Individualism is the only cultural dimension included in this composite model, along with the economic factors. This cultural dimension was selected for inclusion in this last model because it is the most frequently studied of the Hofstede dimensions. The level of economic wealth and the employment rate are both relevant to the importance of job security as an extrinsic work motive in the same manner as observed in model 4.

Attitudes toward the importance of high income are examined by the models reported in Table 6. As hypothesized, model 1 indicates that government workers are less likely to regard high income as important in a job than are workers in private firms. In terms of demographic characteristics, the importance of this work motive declines with age and education, while males and those who are married place a greater emphasis on high

TABLE 6
Multilevel Ordinal Logistic Regression Models—High Income

	1	2	3	4	5
Fixed Effects					
<i>Individual-level variables:</i>					
Government worker	-0.078* (0.93)	-0.056 (0.95)	-0.057 (0.94)	-0.056 (0.95)	-0.055 (0.95)
Age	-0.011*** (0.99)	-0.011*** (0.99)	-0.011*** (0.99)	-0.011*** (0.99)	-0.011*** (0.99)
Education	-0.028*** (0.97)	-0.019*** (0.98)	-0.018*** (0.98)	-0.018*** (0.98)	-0.018*** (0.98)
Married	0.091** (1.09)	0.094** (1.10)	0.093** (1.10)	0.093** (1.10)	0.093** (1.10)
Male	0.104*** (1.11)	0.060 (1.06)	0.062 (1.06)	0.060 (1.06)	0.061 (1.06)
Supervises	0.028 (1.03)	0.076* (1.08)	0.077* (1.08)	0.077* (1.08)	0.078* (1.08)
Professional		-0.224** (0.80)	-0.224** (0.80)	-0.231** (0.79)	-0.233** (0.79)
Clerical		-0.140* (0.87)	-0.141* (0.87)	-0.143* (0.87)	-0.143** (0.87)
Manufacture		0.004 (1.00)	0.005 (1.01)	0.004 (1.00)	0.004 (1.00)
<i>Country-level variables:</i>					
Individualism			-0.013 (0.99)		-0.017*** (0.98)
Power distance			0.016 (1.02)		

(Continued)

TABLE 6
Continued

	1	2	3	4	5
Masculinity			0.010 (1.01)		
Uncertainty avoidance			0.007 (1.01)		
Employment rate				-0.055** (0.95)	-0.006*** (0.94)
GDP/capita				-0.051*** (0.95)	-0.034*** (0.97)
Intercept	-0.765***	-0.634**	-0.635***	-0.633***	-0.632***
Threshold 2	2.707***	2.714***	2.715***	2.714***	2.715***
Threshold 3	4.390***	4.401***	4.402***	4.401***	4.402***
Random Effects (Variance Components)					
Intercept	1.144***	1.173***	0.638***	0.355***	0.273***
Education	0.001***				
Supervisor	0.018**				
Professional		0.103***	0.106***	0.101***	0.099***
Manufacture		0.105***	0.105***	0.106***	0.106***
Level-1 N	12,462	12,462	12,462	12,462	12,462
Level-2 N	25	25	25	25	25
Log-likelihood	-31,249.9	-31,096.8	-31,117.8	-31,071.1	-31,077.5

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

income. However, model 2 indicates that once occupational category is controlled for, the sectoral difference disappears. This finding suggests that it is the focus of one's job, not its locus, which is relevant for this extrinsic work motive. Respondents in professional and clerical occupations are less likely than those in the "other" occupational categories to regard high income as important. Furthermore, in model 2, the coefficient for respondent sex is no longer statistically significant, yet respondents who have supervisory responsibility are more likely to regard high income to be important as compared to those who do not have such responsibility.

Once again, national culture appears not to be useful for explaining differences across countries in attitudes (see model 3). However, in models not reported here, when each cultural dimension is included as the sole country-level variable, only masculinity remains statistically insignificant ($p = 0.358$). Similar to what was found for job security, individualism ($p < 0.001$) is negatively related to the importance of high income, while power distance ($p < 0.001$) and uncertainty avoidance ($p = 0.002$) are positively correlated. These findings are in accordance with our theoretical expectations.

Model 4 indicates that economic conditions are useful for explaining cross-national differences in the importance of high income. Higher rates of employment are associated with less importance assigned to high income, as was expected. Furthermore, the negative relationship between GDP per capita and the importance of high income is accounted for by the modernization thesis. Again, as an extra robustness check, we also conducted extra analyses that consider both cultural and economic explanations for cross-national differences in the importance of a high income (in model 5). Model 5 includes both cultural and economic explanations for cross-national differences in the importance of high income. The model shows that the more individualistic a country is, the less importance is assigned to a high income by respondents, and the employment rate remains a significant negative correlate of high-income attitudes. However, the key result is that government employees still are not significantly different from private employees in regard to the importance of high income when controlling for occupational group and national context.

DISCUSSION

The previous analysis provides mixed support for our hypothesis. Sector differences on the importance of job security persist throughout our models, while sector differences for the importance of high income disappear when controlling for occupation group. For high income, this sectoral difference appears to result from the occupational mix of the two sectors. These occupation groups therefore seem important to consider in regard to understanding sector differences. This is an important finding for the research area of sector differences, an area with little consensus (Boyne 2002; Baarspul and Wilderom 2011).

In regards to explaining cross-national differences, we find that cultural values can have an impact on the importance assigned these extrinsic values. When included as the only nation-level variable, individualism is negatively related to both the importance of job security and high income. Future studies may also benefit from including other culture measures, as we, for instance, experienced that there was a high correlation between three of the dimensions, which made the results a bit unstable.

Yet, the most important finding that emerged, when including these culture dimensions, relates to the sector differences in the two extrinsic values. In regard to job security, we still find sector differences after including cultural dimensions. While still regarded as useful, debate over Hofstede's culture dimensions considers whether their predictive power was stronger for the time frame in which they were constructed than they are today (Taras, Kirkman, and Steel 2010; Peterson and Søndergaard 2011). As our study did not find very strong evidence for the other Hofstede dimensions, it would be worthwhile to explore other measures of national culture.

A more robust finding is that economic factors have an influence on the importance that people assign to extrinsic values. Economic factors such as GDP per capita and the employment rate have a negative effect on the importance of high income and job security, which could be interpreted to mean that improved general economic conditions in a country reduce the importance of a high income and job security for individuals. This finding is consistent with needs-based theory, as lower-level needs must be fulfilled prior to a focus on higher-level needs.

Third, we also include an occupational category code to see if the sector differences are robust. We include a control for professionals, which also seems to be a strong predictor of the extrinsic values we examine; e.g., people with professional occupations seem to value both job security and high income less than other groups. When doing so, we find that job security is still more highly valued by government employees, though we see the occupation groups differ in relation to the perceived importance of job security. In regard to the importance of high income, we see that taking occupation groups into consideration leaves us with a nonsignificant finding with respect to sector. These occupation groups therefore seem very important to consider in regard to understanding sector differences. Intuitively this makes sense, as income often differs widely across sectors—and sector may often be an important explanation of income. So, our main result with respect to job security is that sector differences in job security are robust after including cultural, economic, and occupation groups. Yet, for the importance of high income, our results are more complex, and it seems important to take the context into consideration in regard to country, cultural, and economic factors, but also occupation group. Therefore, there is still a need to understand these cross-country differences. Also, in regard to single-country studies of sector differences, it seems highly important to take the context into consideration when it comes to understanding the generalizability of the results.

Compared to earlier research that also used the ISSP data to look at sector differences in income or/and security across countries (e.g., Houston 2011, 2014; Bullock, Stritch, and Rainey 2015), this article advances research in this area by controlling for occupational group and a wider range of variables that address national context. Moreover, our multilevel ordinal logistic regression models include a wider range of countries included than previous research on extrinsic work motives. By including occupational groups, Hofstede's dimensions, and a range of World Bank economic indicators, our study provides a more thorough examination in extrinsic value.

Finally, it is also important to note the limitations of our study. The biggest limitation pertains to the data. It is important to note that our results are based on only 25 countries and that some of the world's largest countries—such as China, India, and Brazil—are not included in this ISSP data. One of the biggest concerns is that the nuanced meaning

behind a survey question will slightly differ from both translation and cultural issues. The ISSP does, however, attempt to mitigate these concerns. While the International Social Survey Programme puts a wide array of processes in place to limit cross-national biases across the survey questions, many scholars still worry about the potential bias present in large-N cross-national surveys.

Additionally, we believe that our use of fairly straightforward, single-item constructs also helps in mitigating the concerns with nuances that might be lost in translation.⁸ We are further limited by the static nature of the Hofstede data.⁹ Despite these limitations, we believe our modeling technique and our use of multiple international datasets help to mitigate these concerns. In any case, the analysis presented helps to construct a bridge between the field of public management and cross-cultural studies. Even finding a relatively weak relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and attitudes toward work values is important for developing this line of inquiry. This article emphasizes the need for further work on understanding the importance of national context to the importance of extrinsic work values.

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this article is to examine whether government employees perceive job security as more important than do private employees, and whether government employees perceive high income as less important compared to private employees. Furthermore, we are especially interested in whether these sector differences can also be found across countries when taking into account occupation and nation, Hofstede's cultural dimension, and economic factors in countries. Using the ISSP data, we find that government employees more highly value job security than do private employees. Also, in most countries, we found that government employees value high income less than do private employees. However, there are some countries where the opposite pattern exists. In the multilevel ordered logistic regression models that utilize data for 25 countries, we find evidence that job security is generally more valued by government employees, even when controlling for respondent occupational category, as well as national culture and economic conditions. In contrast, the results for the importance of high income are not as consistent. In general, government employees value high income less in comparison to private employees. However, this association is not as pronounced after controlling for occupational group and national context.

The study illustrates that cross-national research on extrinsic work motives must control for national context and especially respondent occupation. Professionals generally value job security and high income less than others. It seems that the level of individualism has an effect on whether people value these extrinsic factors, as in countries with low individualism both job security and high income are more highly valued. We also see that economic factors can explain how highly people value these extrinsic factors—a low employment rate and lower GDP per capita make both job security and income more important. Future research on worker attitudes should take these contextual factors into account. It is likely that national context has a greater influence than attitudes when it comes to extrinsic work motives.

NOTES

1. Throughout this article, for the sake of consistency, we use the term “public.” However, it is important to note that, for our data, “public workers” only includes individuals who are specifically working for the government. We also note this in our results tables.
2. Details on the ISSP can be found at <http://www.gesis.org/en/issp/issp-home/>.
3. For a discussion of data quality, see Scholz et al. (2008).
4. The ISSP treats Germany as two separate entities: East Germany and West Germany. Thus, there are data from 31 countries, as Germany is a single country.
5. Belgium (Flanders), Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, and Latvia are not included in the Hofstede data. Taiwan is not included in the 2004 World Development Indicators. No government employees are included in the German sample.
6. Respondents in the major group 0 (armed forces) are excluded from the analysis.
7. 0.26% for Job Security and 0.29% for High Income.
8. The ISSP addresses some of these concerns in the following publication on their website: http://www.gesis.org/fileadmin/upload/forschung/publikationen/zeitschriften/za_information/ZA-Info-46.pdf#page=95
9. See our earlier discussion of concerns about the Hofstede data.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, L. B. and L. H. Pedersen. 2013. “Does Ownership Matter for Employee Motivation When Occupation is Controlled For?” *International Journal of Public Administration* 36(12):840–856.
- Baarspul, H. C. and C. P. Wilderom. 2011. “Do Employees Behave Differently in Public-vs Private-Sector Organizations? A State-of-the-Art Review.” *Public Management Review* 13(7):967–1002.
- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social Foundations of Thoughts and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bonin, H, T. T. Dohmen, A. Falk, D. Huffman, and U. Sunde. 2007. “Cross-Sectional Earnings Risk and Occupational Sorting: The Role of Risk Attitudes.” *Labour Economics* 14(6):926–937.
- Boyne, G. A. 2002. “Public and Private Management: What’s the Difference?” *Journal of Management Studies* 39:97–122. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00284
- Buelens, M. and H. Van den Broeck. 2007. “An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations.” *Public Administration Review* 67(1):65–74.
- Bullock, J. B., J. M. Stritch, and H. G. Rainey. 2015. “International Comparison of Public and Private Employees’ Work Motives, Attitudes, and Perceived Rewards.” *Public Administration Review* 75(3):479–489.
- Bullock, J. B., J. B. Wenger, and V. M. Wilkins. 2014. “Attitudes about Hard Work: A Global Perspective on the Beliefs of Government Employees.” *International Public Management Journal* 17(1):25–44.
- Buurman, M., R. Dur, and S. Van de Bossche. 2012. “Public Sector Employees: Risk Averse and Altruistic?” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 83(3):279–291.
- Clark, A. and F. Postel-Vinay. 2009. “Job Security and Job Protection.” *Oxford Economic Papers* 61(2):207–239.
- Crewson, P. E. 1997. Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4):499–518.

- Dur, R. and R. Zoutenbier. 2014. "Working for a Good Cause." *Public Administration Review* 74(2):144–155.
- Eglene, O. and S. S. Dawes. 2006. "Challenges and Strategies for Conducting International Public Management Research." *Administration and Society* 38(5):596–622.
- Erez, M. 2008. "Social-Cultural Influences on Work Motivation." Pp. 501–538 in *Work Motivation: Past, Present, and Future*, edited by R. Kanfer, G. Chen, and R. D. Pritchard. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fitzpatrick, J., M. Goggin, T. Heikkila, D. Klingner, J. Jason, and C. Martell. 2011. "A New Look at Comparative Public Administration: Trends in Research and an Agenda for the Future." *Public Administration Review* 71(6):821–830.
- Frank, S. A. and G. B. Lewis. 2004. "Government Employees: Working Hard or Hardly Working?" *American Review of Public Administration* 34(1):36–51.
- Frey, B. S. and M. Osterloh. 2002. "Motivation—A Dual-Edged Factor of Production." Pp. 3–26 in *Successful Management by Motivation: Balancing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Incentives*, edited by B. S. Frey and M. Osterloh. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Gelfand, M. J., M. Erez, and Z. Aycan. 2007. "Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 58: 479–514.
- Goran, P. 2009. "Administrative Reforms in Post-Communist Countries: Similarities and Differences." *Politička Misao* 46(5):105–120.
- Groeneveld, S. M., B. Steijn, and P. Van der Parre. 2009. "Joining the Dutch Civil Service: Influencing Motives in a Changing Economic Context." *Public Management Review* 11(2):173–189.
- Hansen, J. R. 2014. "From Public to Private Sector: Motives and Explanations for Sector Switch." *Public Management Review* 16(4):590–607.
- Hauff, S. and S. Kirchner. 2015. "Identifying Work Value Patterns: Cross-National Comparison and Historical Dynamics." *International Journal of Manpower* 36(2):151–168.
- Hauff, S., N. F. Richter, and T. Tressin. 2015. "Situational Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of National Culture." *International Business Review* 24(4):710–723.
- Hofstede, G. 1980a. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 1980b. "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?" *Organizational Dynamics* 9(1):42–63.
- Hofstede, G. 1984. "National Cultures Revisited." *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 22(1): 22–28.
- Hofstede, G. 1994. "Management Scientists are Human." *Management Science* 40(1):4–14.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Houston, D. J. 2000. "Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4):713–727.
- Houston, D. J. 2011. "Implications of Occupational Locus and Focus for Public Service Motivation: Attitudes toward Work Motives across Nations." *Public Administration Review* 71(5): 763–773.
- Houston, D. J. 2014. "Public Service Motivation in the Post-Communist State." *Public Administration* 92(4):843–860.
- Huang, X. and E. van de Vliert. 2003. "Where Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Fails to Work: National Moderators of Intrinsic Motivation." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24(2):159–179.
- Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Jaskyte, K. 2016. "Work Values of Public, Nonprofit, and Business Employees: A Cross-Cultural Evidence." *International Journal of Public Administration* 39(3):184–193.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., T. K. Massey Jr., and R. G. Brown. 1998. "Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study." *Public Productivity and Management Review* 21(3):230–50.
- Kaasa, A. 2011. "Work Values in European Countries: Empirical Evidence and Explanations." *Review of International Comparative Management* 12(5):852–862.
- Kanungo, R. N. 1990. "Work Alienation in Developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern Realities." Pp. 193–208 in *Management in Developing Countries*, edited by A. M. Jaeger and R. N. Kanungo. London, England: Routledge.
- Karl, K. A. and C. L. Sutton. 1998. "Job Values in Today's Workforce: A Comparison of Public and Private Sector Employees." *Public Personnel Management* 27(4):515–27.
- Kim, S. 2017. "National Culture and Public Service Motivation: Investigating the Relationship using Hofstede's Five Cultural Dimensions." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 83(IS):23–40.
- Kirkman, B. L., K. B. Lowe, and C. B. Gibson. 2006. "A Quarter Century of Culture's Consequences: A Review of Empirical Research Incorporating Hofstede's Cultural Values Framework." *Journal of International Business Studies* 37(3):285–320.
- Klonski, R. 2011. "Work Motivation, Culture, and Economic Development: Is Work Motivation Shaped by its Socio-Economic Context?" *International Journal of Management & Information Systems* 15(4):91–99.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L. and J. Billsberry. 2013. "Fit for the Future." Pp. 1–18 in *Organizational Fit: Key Issues and New Directions*, edited by A. L. Kristof-Brown and J. Billsberry. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lewis, G. B. and S. A. Frank. 2002. "Who Wants to Work for Government?" *Public Administration Review* 62(4):395–404.
- Lyons, S. T., L. E. Duxbury, and C. A. Higgins. 2006. "A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees." *Public Administration Review* 66(4):605–618.
- Maslow, A. H. 1954 *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Meyer-Sahling, J. H. 2004. "Civil Service Reform in Post-Communist Europe: The Bumpy Road to Depoliticisation." *West European Politics* 27(1):71–103.
- Minkov, M. 2013. *Cross-Cultural Analysis: The Science and Art of Comparing the World's Modern Societies and their Cultures*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Neshkova, M. I. and T. Kostadinova. 2012. "The Effectiveness of Administrative Reform in New Democracies." *Public Administration Review* 72(3):324–333.
- Pandey, S. K. and E. C. Stazyk. 2008. "Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation." Pp. 80–98 in *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. L. Perry and A. Annie Hondeghem. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L. 2000. "Bringing Society in: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2):471–488.
- Perry, J. L. and A. Hondeghem. 2008. "Editor's Introduction." Pp. 1–14 in *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L. and L. R. Wise. 1990. "The Motivational Bases of Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 50(3):367–373.
- Peterson, M. F. and M. Søndergaard. 2011. "Traditions and Transitions in Quantitative Societal Culture Research in Organization Studies." *Organization Studies* 32(11):1539–1558.
- Pfeifer, C. 2011. "Risk Aversion and Sorting into Public Sector Employment." *German Economic Review* 12(1):85–99.

- Probst, T. M. and J. Lawler. 2006. "Cultural Values as Moderators of Employee Reactions to Job Insecurity: The Role of Individualism and Collectivism." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 55(2):234–254.
- Rainey, H. G. 2011. "Sampling Designs for Analyzing Publicness: Alternatives and Their Strengths and Weaknesses." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(3): i321–i345.
- Rayner, J., H. M. Williams, A. Lawton, and C. W. Allinson. 2011. "Public Service Ethos: Developing a Generic Measure." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(1):27–51.
- Roszkowski, M. J. and E. J. Grable. 2009. "Evidence of Lower Risk Tolerance among Public Sector Employees in their Personal Financial Matters." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 82(2):453–463.
- Ryan, R. M. and R. L. Deci. 2008. "Self-Determination Theory and the Role of Basic Psychological Needs in Personality and the Organization of Behavior." Pp. 654–678 in *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, edited by O. P. John, R. W. Robbins, and L. A. Pervin. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Schein, E. H. 1985. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scholz, E., T. Faaß, J. Harkness, and M. Heller. 2008. *ISSP Study Monitoring 2005: Report to the ISSP General Assembly on Monitoring Work Undertaken for the ISSP*. GESIS-Methodenberichte, 2008/4. Mannheim, Germany: GESIS.
- Shamir, B. 1991. "Meaning, Self and Motivation in Organizations." *Organization Studies* 12(3): 405–424.
- Shapira, A. and T. L. Griffith. 1990. "Comparing the Work Values of Engineers with Managers, Production, and Clerical Workers: A Multivariate Analysis." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 11(4):281–292.
- Shuper, P. A., R. M. Sorrentino, Y. Otsubo, G. Hodson, and A. M. Walker. 2004. "A Theory of Uncertainty Orientation: Implications for the Study of Individual Differences within and across Cultures." *Cross-Cultural Psychology* 35(4):460–480.
- Sivakumar, K. and C. Nakata. 2001. "The Stampede toward Hofstede's Framework: Avoiding the Sample Design Pit in Cross-Cultural Research." *Journal of International Business Studies* 32(3):555–574.
- Steers, R. M. and C. J. Sanchez-Runde. 2002. "Culture, Motivation, and Work Behavior." Pp. 190–216 in *The Blackwell Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management*, edited by M. J. Gannon and K. Newman. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Steijn, B. 2008. "Person-Environment Fit and Public Service Motivation." *International Public Management Journal* 11(1):13–27.
- Taras, V., B. L. Kirkman, and P. Steel. 2010. "Examining the Impact of Culture's Consequences: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(3):405–439.
- Triandis, H. C., C. McCusker, and C. H. Hui. 1990. "Multimethod Probes of Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5):1006–1020.
- Triandis, H. C. et al. 1995. *Individualism & Collectivism: New Directions in Social Psychology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Van de Walle, S., B. Steijn, and S. Jilke. 2015. "Extrinsic Motivation, PSM and Labour Market Characteristics: A Multilevel Model of Public Sector Employment Preference in 26 Countries." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 81(4):833–855.

- Van de Walle, S., S. Van Roosbroek, and G. Bouckaert. 2008. "Trust in the Public Sector: Is There any Evidence for a Long-Term Decline?" *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 74(1):47–64.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2008. "Government Calling: Public Service Motivation as an Element in Selecting Government as an Employer of Choice." *Public Administration* 86(4): 1089–1105.
- Wright, B. E. and S. K. Pandey. 2008. "Public Service Motivation and the Assumption of Person-Organization Fit: Testing the Mediating Effect of Value Congruence." *Administration & Society* 40(5):502–521.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Justin B. Bullock (jbull14@gmail.com) is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Public Administration and Policy at the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia. He recently accepted the position of Assistant Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University. His research interests include public management, public policy analysis, bureaucratic discretion, decision-making theory, and research methodology.

Jesper Rosenberg Hansen (jhansen@mgmt.au.dk), PhD, is associate professor at the Department of Management at Aarhus University. His research focuses on strategic management, leadership, organizational behavior, sector switching, and contracting out in public organizations with a special interest in sector differences.

David J. Houston (dhouston@utk.edu) has teaching interests in the areas of public administration theory, public policy, policy analysis, and research methods. Prior to joining the University of Tennessee Knoxville faculty, he spent five years as a member of the Department of Political Science at the University of Mississippi.

APPENDIX 1

Multilevel Nonproportional Odds Logistic Regression
Models—Job Security

	1	2	3	4	5
Individual-level Variables					
<i>Proportional odds coefficients:</i>					
Government worker	0.303***	0.330***	0.336***	0.331***	0.332***
Age	-0.003*	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002
Education	-0.059***	-0.043***	-0.043***	-0.043***	-0.043***
Supervises	0.003	0.050	0.051	0.052	0.053
<i>Very important or important vs. neither or less:</i>					
Male	-0.408***	-0.427***	-0.429***	-0.426***	-0.427***
Professional		0.064	0.089	0.054	0.093
Clerical		0.443***	0.453***	0.438***	0.456***
Manufacturer		0.505***	0.509***	0.499***	0.499***
<i>Very important vs. all other responses:</i>					
Male	-0.147***	-0.181***	-0.183***	-0.180***	-0.180***
Professional		-0.237***	-0.241***	-0.236***	-0.242***
Clerical		-0.071	-0.071	-0.071	-0.075
Manufacturer		0.044	0.044	0.040	0.040
Country-level Variables					
<i>Proportional odds coefficients:</i>					
Masculinity			0.003		
Uncertainty avoidance			-0.006		
Employment rate				-0.036**	-0.040**
GDP/capita				-0.019**	-0.018*
<i>Very important or important vs. neither or less:</i>					
Individualism			-0.011		-0.012*
Power distance			-0.008		
<i>Very important vs. all other responses:</i>					
Individualism			0.001		-0.007
Power distance			0.004		
Intercept	3.230***	2.982***	2.981***	2.913***	2.894***
Threshold 2	0.509***	0.615***	0.593***	0.544***	0.528***
Random Effects (Variance Components)					
Intercept	0.349***	0.341***	0.304***	0.200***	0.220***
Education	0.004**	0.004**	0.004***	0.004***	0.004***
Level-1 N	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461
Level-2 N	25	25	25	25	25

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

APPENDIX 2
Multilevel Nonproportional Odds Logistic Regression
Models—High Income

	1	2	3	4	5
Individual-level Variables					
<i>Proportional odds coefficients:</i>					
Government worker	-0.080*	-0.056***	0.060	-0.055	-0.055
Age				-0.010***	-0.010***
Education		-0.016**	-0.016**	-0.016**	-0.016**
Male	0.110***	0.076*	0.076*	0.077*	0.076*
Professional				-0.215***	-0.217***
Clerical		-0.111	-0.111	-0.114	-0.115
Manufacturer		0.010	0.012	0.010	0.008
<i>Very important or important vs. neither or less:</i>					
Age	-0.009***	-0.009***	-0.009***		
Education	-0.020***				
Supervises	0.167***	0.198***	0.205***	0.212***	0.214***
Professional		-0.162*	-0.174**		
<i>Very important vs. all other responses:</i>					
Age	-0.011***	-0.011***	-0.011***		
Education	-0.034***				
Supervises	-0.046	-0.008	-0.011	-0.020	-0.019
Professional		-0.253***	-0.244***		
Country-level Variables					
<i>Proportional odds coefficients:</i>					
Individualism			-0.018*		-0.017***
Power distance			0.014		
Uncertainty avoidance			0.007		
Employment rate				-0.056***	-0.066***
GDP/capita				-0.052***	-0.032***
<i>Very important or important vs. neither or less:</i>					
Masculinity			0.001		
<i>Very important vs. all other responses:</i>					
Masculinity			0.008		
Intercept	1.958***	2.059***	1.973***	1.923***	1.903***
Threshold 2	-0.689***	-0.555**	-0.679***	-0.721***	-0.740***
Random Effects (Variance Components)					
Intercept	1.082***	1.076***	0.520***	0.290***	-0.194***
Level-1 <i>N</i>	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461	12,461
Level-2 <i>N</i>	25	25	25	25	25

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.