

“JUST WORK? JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER ACROSS SECTORS”

by

Keely S. Jones

Assistant Professor

University of Georgia

Please direct all correspondence to:
Keely S. Jones
Department of Public Administration and Policy
204 Baldwin Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
kjones1@uga.edu

Introduction

Traditionally understaffed and under-funded nonprofit organizations can be challenging work environments. As a result, those employed in these organizations are thought to select the sector because they value a set of alternative incentives unique to nonprofit work (DiMaggio and Anhier, 1990; Rose-Ackerman, 1996). One primary set of incentives is a greater level of altruism or a focus on collective benefits, which manifests itself in employees valuing progress towards the organization's mission above more personalized extrinsic rewards such as payment or prestige. Another set of intrinsic incentives relates to nonprofit organizational culture and the potential flexibility of this working environment. Yet at the same time, there is also a perceived trend that workers tend to transition in and out of the nonprofit sector more frequently, leading to a high amount of turnover. This is again linked to incentives. In this case, income constraints or a lack of advancement opportunities eventually lead workers to switch sectors (Preston, 1993).

Despite the pervasiveness of these perceptions about nonprofit workers, there is little generalizable research that compares these potential differences in incentives on job tenure between workers in the three sectors. Instead, current research on nonprofit employment focuses on wage and compensation differentials, finding only marginal disparities between pay scales within specific industries (Ruhm and Borworski, 2003). As a result, this paper compares the impact of distinct sets of incentives between nonprofit, for-profit, and government employees on potential job switching and job satisfaction.

The rapid growth in nonprofit sector employment in the last ten years and the increasing reliance of government on nonprofits for service implementation makes this a particularly relevant question (Salamon, 2005). It also has important implications for nonprofit organizations interested in attracting and retaining highly qualified and motivated employees as well as organizations that replicate business performance-based incentives to do so (Kalleberg et al, 2006)

Literature Review

Incentives and reward systems have been a central focal point for understanding meaning and motivation in work and have a strong impact on employee turnover across sectors (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006). Burnout and turnover are perceived to be a particular problem in the nonprofit sector, in which organizations lack a profit motive and often operate in constrained environments (Preston, 1993). While there is a good deal of work on incentives or motivations for public service in general, there is little work that differentiates between those employed in nonprofit organizations and those working in the government. At the same time there is little research that compares the incentives of for-profit and nonprofit workers and less that compares the dynamics of work motivation across the three sectors.

The existing studies that compare alternative reward systems and employee motivations across sectors present conflicting pictures of voluntary sector versus public or for-profit sector work. While some suggest that incentives for nonprofit work may differ, especially from that of for-profits (Benz, 2005; Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Deckop and Circa, 2000; Goulet and Frank, 2002; Mervis and Hackett, 1983; Preston, 1989),

others find few differences between nonprofit and for-profit work environments (Brickley and VanHorn, 2000).

These structural qualities of nonprofit organizations give them the perception of being altruistic organizations without self-seeking motives. Operating with a nondistribution constraint that forbids private inurement, nonprofits lack the profit motive that drives for profit organizations (Hansman, 1980). And as private voluntary organizations or corporations, nonprofits also lack the coercive capacities of government or the ability to concentrate control and power into the hands of owners (Weisbrod, 1988). Instead, the social mission of the organization becomes the central measure of success and the public acts as a primary stakeholder (Moore, 2005). These structural qualities create fewer opportunities for private benefit for employees and suggest that they too will prioritize the public goals of the organization. Those who pursue careers in the nonprofit sector are assumed to work without the hopes for potential profit or power and instead rely on the social benefit of their work to reward their continued service. To compensate for the lack of profit or power incentives, workers receive alternative benefits such as more flexible work environments, intrinsic rewards, greater satisfaction from their work, the warm glow of altruism, or a feeling of social efficacy (Benz, 2005; Rose-Ackerman, 1996).

Collectivism (Altruism)

Nonprofit workers are thought place a greater emphasis on the social value of their work and the dynamics of their own participation above concerns of job security, income or advancement (Rose-Ackerman, 1996). Without profit or power, those engaged in nonprofit work are seen as being more altruistic and intrinsically motivated than those

employed in for-profits and perhaps more than those employed in government. Yet altruism is an often contested concept. Economists argue that even unselfish actions have some private benefit such as feelings of good will or warm-glow (Andreoni, 1996). Functionally, altruism manifests itself when individuals place greater value on the public good above the private gain and act in this manner. In this way, nonprofit workers are not necessarily unmotivated by personal rewards as altruism would suggest. Instead their selected set of incentives includes values that are considered to have greater public rather than private benefit. In essence, nonprofit workers have more of a collectivist perspective on their work, considering progress toward public goods as personal rewards (Frank, 1996). A collectivist mindset can be linked to several concepts thought to promote a greater interest in the public above private good; social capital, religious belief, and political ideology.

Social capital is a fundamental part of the nonprofit sector. Voluntary organizations that foster interaction between individuals are thought to be a primary site where collective interests are discussed and formed. Research shows that greater levels of social capital encourage increased voluntarism, political participation, and higher levels of institutional trust (Putnam, 1993;2000). In this way, higher levels of social capital can lead individuals to value collective outcomes above personal gain. The more people come into contact with one another, the more likely they are to see their own interests tied to that of the group (Tocqueville, 1835). Indeed, Jones (2006) finds that a greater number of social ties increase the amount of time individuals volunteer in formal organizations. And in the aggregate, Saxton and Benson (2005) find that a greater number of nonprofit organizations are predicted to form in areas with higher levels of

social capital. In this way, higher levels of social ties and public trust should complement nonprofit work.

Similarly, religious teachings often stress a collectivist mindset and emphasize the importance of thinking of others, often above oneself. Indeed, one study found that spirituality or “calling” to public work played a major role in public service motivation (Houston and Cartwright, 2007). Likewise, many nonprofit organizations were originally religious in nature or linked to religious congregations (Chaves, 1991; Hall, 1992). And if we consider that churches are a major part of the voluntary sector itself and play a large role in social provision, religious motivation plays an important role in nonprofit sector work (cite). Thus, nonprofit workers with stronger religious beliefs should have a collectivist mindset that leads them to value social outcomes above personal benefits.

While social capital and religious beliefs lead people to be more collectivist, empathy reflects the degree to which a collectivist mindset resonates with an individual and is likely to produce actions that place the public good above their own personal interests. Being able to relate to people, view their circumstances, and act as if this situation of others was one’s own are hallmarks of nonprofit work, which is often thought to require more caring and understanding individuals (Cite). As a result, nonprofit workers are often more empathic, understanding, or soft-hearted.

Helping behavior is also linked to a more collectivist mindset. Engaging in informal or formal helping displays a regard for the welfare of others and a consistent sacrifice of time or money towards the public good. Informal and formal helping are also linked to higher levels of social capital and religious motivation (Putnam, 2000). And most formal helping takes place within the nonprofit sector through voluntary

organizations designed to allow private individuals to help provide services to others. Thus, engaging in additional formal and informal helping should validate and supplement the work nonprofit employees do for payment in that workers make little distinction between being paid for and doing this work voluntarily.

Finally, collectivism often manifests itself in political views. Ideas about how public goods should be distributed and regulated and how individuals should care for others often cluster around certain political ideologies. Because the nonprofit sector shares some of its roles with government and its practices often translate into government policies, a strong belief in government provision for public goods is linked to nonprofit work. Widespread government provision is usually more embraced by the political left. Thus nonprofit workers who have more collectivist or leftist leaning political views should emphasize collective more than personal outcomes.

In sum, the greater emphasis on collective outcomes found in nonprofit work should provide a central incentive for nonprofit employees with higher levels of social capital, stronger religious beliefs, higher levels of empathy, greater helping behavior, and left leaning political views. These indicate a collectivist mindset often perceived as altruism that is more likely to be valued by long-term nonprofit workers. Workers that value collectivism more highly are more likely to stay in nonprofit jobs.

H1: Nonprofit Sector workers exhibit higher collectivist values and a stronger belief in these values will lead to greater satisfaction and longer tenure in nonprofit workplaces.

H1-1: Greater social capital = higher satisfaction and longer tenure

H1-2: Stronger religious belief = higher satisfaction and longer tenure

H1-3: Greater empathy= higher satisfaction and longer tenure

H1-4: More helping behavior = higher satisfaction and longer tenure

H1-5: Left leaning politics = higher satisfaction and longer tenure

Additional Intrinsic Rewards

Along with a greater emphasis on social outcomes, there are additional incentives offered by nonprofit workplaces that are thought to attract and retain workers.

Nonprofit workplaces are seen as providing greater flexibility, more self-directed work, and additional non-monetary benefits to attract and retain personnel (Almond and Kendall, 2000; Hohl; Kalleberg et al, 2006; 1996; Rose-Ackerman, 1996). Yet there are few studies that focus on the non-monetary benefits and intrinsic rewards provided by nonprofit organizations and how these impact worker retention across the three sectors (Benz, 2005; Leete, 2007). Lanfranchi et al (2006) find that nonprofit workers find greater utility in intrinsic rewards above wage or external measure of employer loyalty. In addition, the perceived importance of the work itself is often cited as an intrinsic reward (Wright, 2007) as is its challenging nature. Nonprofit workers are thought to place greater emphasis on personal efficacy and skill development as well as opportunities for advancement and learning (Lanfranchi et al, 2006; Onyx and MacClean, 1996).

Likewise the structure of the working environment itself also provides an intrinsic incentive (Bruelens and Van den Brock, 2007; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007;). Self-directed teamwork, flexible work schedules, opportunities for training, and freedom to complete tasks are all benefits more frequently used in public and nonprofit organizations (Kalleberg et al, 2006). Yet at the same time nonprofit workplaces are also constrained

for resources much more than for-profit or government organizations. This is often considered a main reason for individuals to leave nonprofit organizations and experience greater burnout than government or for-profit employees. As a result, workplaces must equip workers to the level at which they feel some degree of efficacy in their work. Thus nonprofit workplaces with higher degrees of freedom and flexibility that also maintain adequate resources should be more likely to retain employees. Indeed, Kalleberg et al, (2006) find that larger nonprofit organizations are more likely to successfully use intrinsic incentive systems.

H2-1: Nonprofit sector workers will be employed in more flexible work environments

H2-2: Nonprofit workers will be employed in organizations that are no different in how they use employee skills.

H2-3: Nonprofit workers will be employed in organizations that offer fewer opportunities for advancement.

H2-4: Nonprofit workers will be employed in organizations that offer additional fringe benefits. Workers with better fringe benefits will be more likely to find their jobs very satisfying and less likely to considering leaving.

H2:5 Nonprofit workers employed in organizations with more praise motivation

H2:6 Nonprofit workers employed in organizations with more freedom to make decision

Extrinsic Rewards - Compensation and Benefits

There has been the most focus on the difference in compensation between the three sectors with little consensus (Leete, 2007). Nonprofit workers are thought to receive less pay and in exchange, count progress towards the mission as a form of compensation (Handy and Katz, 1998; Hansman, 1980, Preston, 1989; Rose-Ackerman, 1996). Modeling pay differentials across the three sectors, Ruhm and Borkoski (2003) find that on average, nonprofit workers do make slightly less than their government or for-profit counterparts. Yet when occupational categories are taken into account, Leete (2001) finds little difference in wages between the sectors.

To compensate for the inability to offer higher wages, some suggest that pay for performance systems solve many profit-driven incentive problems in the nonprofit context. Being rewarded for behavior that advances the organization's goals is seen as a way to increase performance and encourage greater employee investment (Frey, 1993). Yet there is evidence that such systems may be more complicated in the nonprofit context, particularly when nonprofit workers are more intrinsically than extrinsically motivated and goals are difficult to measure and strategically manage (Brandl and Guttell, 2007; Decktop and Circa, 2000; Speckbacher, 2003; Thuevsen, 2004). Thus, extrinsic or discrete rewards such as level of pay, bonuses, and promotion should not be as important to nonprofit workers. Instead, the perception of being compensated fairly or the level of wage equity within the sector or somehow constrained financially as a result of the particular employment situation should be more influential in workplace decisions (Leete, 2000; Rabin, 1998).

H4: Discrete levels of payment should not impact tenure or satisfaction.

Given the different goals, incentive structures, and skill requirements of the three sectors, we should expect individuals to stay longer and enjoy their work more in the sector that fits the respective combination they value the most. Individuals who value a flexible work environment, an emphasis on collective outcomes, and similar intrinsic rewards should be more likely to be happier in and less likely to consider leaving nonprofit jobs. In this way, the nonprofit workers will be more satisfied in their jobs and less likely to consider leaving if their most valued incentives match those fostered in the nonprofit context.

Data and Methods

Data on nonprofit workers and working environments is the largest inhibitor of research on nonprofit sector employment. However, the 2002 and 2006 General Social Survey contained a module on work that allowed respondents to self-identify their sector of employment. The GSS is collected every two years and contains a good deal of demographic and socio-economic variables. As a result, it is often used to generalize social behavior and outcomes in the United States.

The variables of interest centered on work, altruism, and social capital. As turnover can be thought of as the degree one is satisfied with their job as well as the likelihood of leaving, both were used as dependent variables. Job satisfaction is a dichotomous variable that indicates individuals who were very satisfied with their present working situation. Nonprofit workers are often found to have the highest levels of job satisfaction across the three sectors (Leete, 2007). The likelihood of turnover is measured by the likelihood of looking for another position this year, which indicates a strong potential for leaving their current station. This would not necessarily be a

switching of sectors, but a move to a different job entirely. This too is a dichotomous variable, with those who are very likely to look for a new position this year coded as one.

Logistic regression is then employed to model the likelihood of each dichotomous variable; the likelihood of being very satisfied with one's job and the likelihood of looking for a new position this year.

Independent variables include measure of a collectivist mindset, intrinsic rewards, and extrinsic rewards. The primary focus is the first variable, collectivism. Like altruism, a collectivist mindset reflects a focus on others, or a higher utility for public rather than private gain that is attributed to nonprofit workers. Several sets of variables are used to represent this concept. First, indicators of social capital include, time spent with others and trust in others. Measure of religiosity includes frequency of religious attendance and strength of affiliation. Helping behavior is represented by volunteering and informal helping. Empathy is constructed by adding the degree of agreement of several statements about how the respondent views others. Finally, political leaning is represented by a scale of the respondent's self-identified political leaning.

Variables reflecting the working environment include flexibility of schedule changes and freedom to carryout one's work on the job. Compensation is measured not in absolute income, but in the perception of being fairly paid versus undervalued. The purchasing power of real income varies across locations and family situations. As a result, a dichotomous variable is used to indicate whether individuals felt that they were paid too little in their current job versus fairly or too much. Non-monetary benefits are measured by a dichotomous variable indicating that a respondent felt very strongly that the fringe benefits provided at their job were good. Other intrinsic rewards such as praise

were represented by the degree to which respondents indicated that they were very likely to be praised by supervisors. Skill use and advancement were indicated by several variables. The first variable indicates that employees believed that their work used their skills a great deal. Advancement was indicated by the respondent's belief that they had an opportunity for a promotion (controlling for years worked). Job security was represented by the degree of security the respondent had in their job.

Additional controls were placed in the model to avoid spurious findings. Age, and years on the job are measured continuously and fulltime employment is indicated by a dichotomous variable.

[Table One about here]

Results

Considering significant differences between the sectors through a series of bivariate logistic regressions, nonprofit workers and workplaces are distinctive in several respects. First, on the whole measures of collectivism are mixed. Nonprofit workers volunteer more slightly more than government employees and quite a bit more than those employed in for-profits. However, they do not engage in informal helping more than government or for-profit employees. Moreover, there are no differences in empathy between the sectors. Likewise there is no difference across sectors in the belief that people can be trusted. However, nonprofit workers report spending more time with neighbors, relatives, and friends than government employees as do those employed in for-profits. In contrast, there is no difference between nonprofit and for-profit workers in the amount of time they spend with friends, relatives, and neighbors.

Considering religious beliefs, nonprofit and government workers are more likely to report that their religious affiliations are strong than are for-profit employees, while there is little difference in responses between those employed in nonprofits and those employed in the government. Likewise, nonprofit and government employees attend church more frequently than those employed in for profits and exhibit little difference between them. Yet, nonprofit workers are more likely to consider themselves very religious than are government or for-profit employees. Finally, nonprofit workers claim to be slightly more liberal leaning than do for-profit workers. However, they exhibit few differences from those employed in the public sector, who themselves differ little from for-profit workers. If we consider religious engagement and belief to be representative of collectivism, these bi-variate relationships suggest that nonprofit workers may be slightly more collectivist than for-profit or government workers. However, job related characteristics may be more influential in their work decisions.

Considering the working environment, nonprofit workplaces as reported by employees fit perceptions less closely. In contrast to expectations, for-profit workers are more likely to report that their work schedule is very flexible than are nonprofit or government workers, who exhibit few differences. Likewise, for profit employees are more likely to report that they have a good deal of freedom to do their tasks than are nonprofit or government employees. However, nonprofit workers are more likely than government employees to report that they have a good deal of freedom at work. However, both government and nonprofit workers are more likely to report that they worked from home about once a week than for-profit workers, but there is little difference between nonprofit and government workers. As expected, nonprofit

employees report being overworked at greater rates than do for-profit or government workers and government employees report higher rates of overwork more than for-profit employees. Thus while for-profit employees seem more likely to have more flexible workplaces, nonprofit employees feel strained.

Compensation between sectors present a story that supports research on compensation across sectors. There is no difference in the likelihood of being a fulltime worker or respondent's income based on sector. However, while nonprofit and government workers do not differ, they are both more likely than for-profit employees to report that they are paid too little. In the same way, while they themselves do not differ, nonprofit and government employees are more likely to consider the fringe benefits they receive from their jobs very good than are for-profit employees. And while both nonprofit and nonprofit employees consider it less likely that they will get a bonus or a pay increase than for-profit employees, nonprofit workers find this more likely than government workers. In this way, fringe benefits and bonuses seem to be important parts of nonprofit compensation.

Finally, skill use and advancement also differ across sectors. Although nonprofit and government workers do not differ, both sets of employees are more likely to strongly agree that their work uses their skills than for-profit employees. And while for-profit employees are more likely to feel that they will be promoted more so than public sector workers, nonprofit employees show no difference from government or for-profit employees in their perceived likeliness of being promoted. Yet, nonprofit workers are more likely to be praised by their supervisor than are for-profit or government employees, with public sector employees being less likely to be praised. In this way, skill use and

intrinsic rewards are prevalent in nonprofit sector workplaces. These bi-variate regressions indicate that nonprofit workers tend to be more collectivist than public or for-profit employees. It also indicates that intrinsic rewards and fringe benefits are more prevalent in the nonprofit sector. Yet these factors impact employee retention?

[Table Two About Here]

Looking at the general model of job satisfaction, we see that controlling for other factors, nonprofit and government employees are more likely than for profit employees to report that they are very satisfied with their current positions, with nonprofit employees being more likely than government workers to find a good deal of satisfaction in their job (table 9). Longer tenure in the position, also increases the likelihood of job satisfaction, as does the perception of income equity and placing a greater value on income.

Likewise, job security, an expected promotion, and good fringe benefits each increase the probability of job satisfaction across sectors. Similarly, intrinsic rewards such as the likelihood of receiving praise, a good deal of freedom to carry out one's tasks, and a better use of individual skills each contribute to a higher probability of job satisfaction.

Yet, when we model job satisfaction by sector and include measures of collectivism we see different patterns emerge within particular sectors. For-profit workers display trends similar to the base model (table 6). Job security, wage equity, and better fringe benefits each increase the likelihood of job satisfaction. Intrinsic motivations as well such as better use of skills, freedom in carrying out tasks, and praise from supervisors increased the probability of being very satisfied with for profit work. Surprisingly, greater trust in individuals also led to higher probabilities of job and satisfaction.

Wage equity and job security were also important to government employees as were intrinsic motivations of better skill use, praise on the job, and more freedom to carry out tasks (table 7). However, government employees who felt their schedules were very flexible were less likely to find their jobs very satisfying. Also surprising, measures of collectivism had no impact on job satisfaction. This could indicate that government workers do not vary in levels of collectivism or that this is not an important part of satisfaction in government work.

Nonprofit workers were more likely to find their jobs very satisfying if they received good fringe benefits, believed they could be promoted, and their skills were used well in their jobs (table 8). Like government employees, measure of collectivism had little impact. This suggests that personal efficacy is especially important in the nonprofit sector.

Considering turnover likelihood, nonprofit employees are no more likely to consider leaving their jobs than for-profit employees (table 5). Yet government workers are much less likely to consider leaving. Those employed longer in their current positions, regular, permanent employees, and those that considered their fringe benefits very good were significantly less likely to consider leaving this year, despite their perceptions of their income or other job-related factors. Not surprisingly, those who felt they were paid too little were more likely to consider leaving in the coming year. Yet those who strongly agreed that they had a good deal of freedom in carrying out their jobs, those with higher perceptions of job security, and workers who felt they would be promoted were also more likely to consider leaving. It could be that these workers feel their skills are more marketable and have less organizational loyalty.

When the sectors are considered separately, we find patterns similar to those observed in predicting job satisfaction. For-profit employees are less likely to consider leaving those who had longer tenure with the company were less likely to consider leaving as were regular employees (table 6). Surprisingly, better job security and those who believed they may receive a promotion were more likely to consider looking for work. This could be in reference to the possible failure of the promotion as well as a reflection of greater employee marketability.

Government employees (table 7) were also less likely to consider leaving when they had been employed longer, but those that believed their fringe benefits were especially good were also less likely to consider a job transition. Collectivism levels had no impact on this decision.

In the same way, nonprofit employees with longer tenure at the company and better fringe benefits were less likely to consider leaving (table 8). Yet, like for profit workers, those with higher perceptions of job security were more likely to consider leaving. In addition, those whose skills were used more effectively in their work were also more likely to consider a change. Yet, measure of collectivism had no impact, indicating that there is little variability among nonprofit workers or that public benefit is not a factor in deciding job transition. This suggests that like the for-profit sector, employee marketability may play an important role in nonprofit job decisions. Yet again, personal efficacy seems to be more important in the nonprofit sector than the other sectors.

Discussion

Collectivism seems to be weak predictor of nonprofit job turnover and satisfaction. Instead, fringe benefits, skill use, and length of tenure are the most predictive factors of the likelihood of considering a job transition and satisfaction among nonprofit employees. This calls into question the idea that a public focus or empathetic mindset is the most motivating factor for nonprofit sector workers. Instead, these findings suggest that nonprofit employees may fall between public sector and for-profit sector workers in their mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and their focus on marketability and personal efficacy.

For-profit employees seem to place some emphasis on extrinsic factors, but seem to factors such use promotability and job security to calculate their value in between sectors. Nonprofit employees also seem to engage in such calculus. Marketability may be a more important part of job transition in the private sector because there are more firms and greater competition for employees within the for-profit and nonprofit sectors. Like government employees, the fringe benefits are also an important part of work decisions and satisfaction, suggesting that there is more than the job itself that contributes to nonprofit employees to staying at their places of employment. Ancillary benefits are also important.

However, personal efficacy also stands out in the nonprofit sector as an important part of job satisfaction and tenure above characteristics of the nonprofit workplace like flexibility. Thus, the focus is on personal dynamics of work rather than the workplace or working environment in particular. In this way, nonprofit workers seem to mix

characteristics important to for-profit and government sectors, adding a dimension of personal efficacy.

These findings also have implications for understanding turnover in the nonprofit sector and for organizations seeking to retain their employees. Benefits are important to nonprofit workers, perhaps more than the flexibility or workplace dynamics. As a result, organizations should prioritize benefit plans, perhaps above pay increases. In addition, because personal efficacy is a major factor in work transition decisions, organizations should identify and strategically use employee's skills as well as implement review processes that allow workers to connect view their unique contribution to the organizations work. Yet greater freedom in carrying out tasks is not necessarily linked to greater efficacy.

Conclusion

Nonprofit workers are considered to exchange monetary income for intrinsic rewards such as progress towards the organizations mission and general public benefit. However, these findings suggest that nonprofit workers use a mixture of intrinsic and extrinsic benefits and to understand their work. As a result, nonprofit work decisions appear to be a mix of those found in for-profit and government workers, focusing on marketability, ancillary benefits of the job, and adding personal efficacy to the mix.

TABLE 1: VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS AND BI-VARIATE REGRESSIONS

		SIGNIFICANCE				SIGNIFICANCE	
		NPO	GOVT			NPO	GOVT
EMPATHY (1-36)	Government Forprofit	-	~	INCOME	Government Forprofit		
SELFLESS (1-8)	Government Forprofit	+*	"+***	TOO LITTLE PAY (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+**	+***
INFORMAL HELPING (1-8)	Government Forprofit		+ ~	REGULAR EMPLOYEMNT (0-1)	Government Forprofit	~**	+***
VOLUNTEERING (1-5)	Government Forprofit	+*	+*	HOURS WORKED	Government Forprofit		
POLITICAL VIEWS (1-9=conserv)	Government Forprofit	-*	-***	BONUS LIKELY (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+*	-***
VERY RELIGIOUS (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+*	+***	GOOD FRINGE BENEFITS (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+*	+***
STRONG AFILIATION (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+***	+***	MONEY EVERYTHING (0-1_	Government Forprofit	~	-*
TRUST (0-1)	Government Forprofit			PROMOTION LIKELY (0-1)	Government Forprofit	~**	~**
TIME W OTHERS (1-18)	Government Forprofit	+**	~**	PAY FOR PERFORMANCE (0-1)	Government Forprofit	*+	~***
OVERWORK (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+~		LOOK FOR NEW JOB (0-1_	Government Forprofit	+*	~***
OVERWORKED (1-4)	Government Forprofit	+**	+**	VERY SATISFIED (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+~	~
WORKHOME WEEKLY (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+*	+*	PRAISED (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+**	+*
FREE WORK (0-1)	Government Forprofit	+**	~***	SKILL USE (1-4)	Government Forprofit	+***	+**
FLEXIBLE WORK (0-1)	Government Forprofit						

***= P<=.001 **=P<=.01 *=P<=.05 ~=P<=.10

References

- Almond, Stephen and Jeremy Kendall. 2000. "Taking the Employee's Perspective Seriously: An Initial United Kingdom Cross-Sectoral Comparison." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 29(2) 205-231.
- Andreoni, James, William Gale, and John K Sholz. 1995. "Charitable Contributions of Time and Money." Unpublished manuscript.
- Benz, Mathias. 2005. "Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction? – Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms." *KYKLOS*. 58(2) 155-176.
- Borzaga, Carlo and Ermanno Tortia. 2006 "Worker Motivations, Job Satisfaction, and Loyalty in Public and Nonprofit Social Services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 35 (2) 225-248.
- Brandl, Julia and Wolfgang Guttel. 2007. "Organizational Antecedents of Pay for Performance Systems in Nonprofit Organizations." *International Society for Third Sector Research*. 176-199.
- Brinckley, James and Lawrence Van Horn. 2000. "Incentives in nonprofit Organizations: Evidence from Hospitals." *Bradley Policy research Center Working Paper No. FR 00-02*.
- Buelens, Marc and Herman Van den Broeck. 2007. "An Analysis in Work Motivation between Public and Private Organizations." *Public Administration Review*. Jan/Feb. 65-74.
- Decktop and Circa. 2000. "The Risk and Reward of a Double-Edged Sword: Effects of a Merit Pay Program on Intrinsic Motivation." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 29(3) 400-418.
- Frank, Robert. 1996. "What Price the High Moral Ground?" *Southern Economic Journal* 63:1-17.
- Goulet, Laurel and Margaret Frank. 2002. "Organizational Commitment Across Three Sectors: Public, Non-profit, and For-profit." *Public Personnel Management* 31(2) 201-210.
- Greeley, Andrew. 1997. "Religion and Social Capital." *The American Prospect*. 8(32).
- Hansman, Henry. 1980. "The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise." *Yale Law Journal*. 89(5)835-901.
- Hohl, Karen. 1996. "The Effects of Flexible Work Arrangements" *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 7:69-86.
- Houston, David and Katherine Cartwright. 2007. "Spirituality and Public Service." *Public Administration Review Jan/Feb*. 88-102.
- Kalleberg, Arne, Peter Marsden Jeremy Reynolds, and David Knoke. 2006. "Beyond Profit? Sectoral Differences in High-Performance Work Practices." *Work and Occupations* 33 : 271-302.
- Lafranchi, Joseph, Makram Laruem, and Mathieu Narcy. 2006. "Would you accept this job? An evaluation of the decision utility of workers in the for-profit and nonprofit sectors." Conference paper presented at EALE.
- Leete, Laura. 2007. "Work in the Nonprofit Sector" *The Nonprofit Sector: A research Handbook* Powell and Steinberg (eds). New Haven: Yale University Press. 159-179.
- Leete, Laura. 2000. "Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Nonprofit and For-Profit Organizations." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 43: 423-446.
- Mirvis, Phillip and Edward Hackett. 1983. "Work and Workforce Characteristics of the Nonprofit Workforce." *Monthly Labor Review*. 116(4)3-12.
- Moynihan, Donald and Sanjay Pandey. 2007. "The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration Review*. Jan/Feb 40-53.
- Onyx, Jenny and Madi MacClean. 1996. "Careers in the Third Sector" *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 6:331-345.
- Preston, Anne. 1989. "The Nonprofit Worker in the For-Profit World." *Journal of Labor Economics*. 7(4) 438-63.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rabin, Mathew. 1998. "Psychology and Economics" *Journal of Economic Literature*. 36:11-46.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 1996. "Altruism, Nonprofits, and Economic Theory." *Journal of Economic Theory*" 34(2) 701-728.
- Ruhm, C. and C. Borkowski. 2003 "Compensation in the Nonprofit Sector." *Journal of Human Resources*. 38(4) 992-1021
- Salamon, Lester. 2005. *The State of the Nonprofit Sector*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Speckbacher, Gerhard. 2003. "The Economics of Performance Management in Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 13(3) 267-281.

- Theuvsen, Ludwig. 2004. "Doing Better While Doing Good: Motivational Aspects of Pay-for-Performance Effectiveness in Nonprofit Organizations." *Voluntas* 15(2) 117-136.
- Weisbrod, Burton. 1988. *The Nonprofit Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wright, Bradley. 2007. "Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter?" *Public Administration Review*. Jan/Feb. 54-64.