



ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

Erasmus School of Economics

Bachelor Thesis International Bachelor Economics and Business Economics (IBEB)

Public - private sector differences: altruism, laziness, and job satisfaction

Name student: Silvia Cristiana Paunescu

Student ID number: 464973

Supervisor: Dana Sisak

Second assessor: Robert Dur

Date final version: 10 July 2020

The views stated in this thesis are those of the author and not necessarily those of the supervisor, second assessor, Erasmus School of Economics or Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Abstract

There is evidence in literature of public sector employees being more altruistic, by wanting to be helpful to others and useful for society, but also of those workers actually being lazier, because public organisations offer weaker incentives, attracting unmotivated workers who do not exert effort because of lower wages and advancement opportunities. This paper analyses those differences in employees' characteristics between sectors, and also differences in job satisfaction, as the concepts can be interconnected. Using data from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study, logistic regressions with public sector as the dependent variable are used to test for differences in characteristics, and a linear regression with the interaction between altruism and public sector, as well as different controls is used to test differences in job satisfaction. It is found that public sector employees are less altruistic, and not lazier than private sector employees. Additionally, public sector employees have higher job satisfaction, with an especially strong relationship if they are also altruistic.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Theoretical framework	5
3. Data	7
4. Methodology	8
5. Results	10
5.1 Altruism in the public sector	11
5.2 Laziness in the public sector	12
5.3 Job satisfaction differences	13
6. Discussion and Conclusion	14
7. Bibliography	16
8. Appendix	18

1. Introduction

Public sector motivation (PSM) is a characteristic of public sector employees to serve the common good of the society, rather than their self-interests (Houston, 2005). PSM has also been defined as 'an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations' (Perry, 1996, 6). This characteristic has implications for both motivation and effort exerted in job performance. Van de Walle et al (2015) found that people working in the public sector have higher PSM, as they consider important that their job is useful to society and for helping others. However, Buurman et al (2012) also expected public sector employees to be more altruistic than private sector employees, but in contrast with those expectation found that public sector employees are not more likely to donate to charity. This paper will test both altruism and laziness differences between sectors, as individual characteristics self-reported by a large sample of American respondents.

DeSantis and Durst (1996) focused on job satisfaction differences between sectors based on job characteristics, such as variety, monetary and nonmonetary rewards, personal characteristics, and work characteristics, such as work environment, attitude of co-workers and supervisors and work friendships. The findings are generally similar for both sectors, as all workers wanted to contribute to the society, have a good work environment and friendly co-workers, and therefore there were no major differences in terms of job satisfaction. However, Ghinetti (2007) found that public sector employees in Italy have a higher job satisfaction, in term of work environment, job security and consideration by colleagues. The strongest finding of this paper was that job satisfaction in terms of job security – moving from the private to the public sector increases job satisfaction in terms of job security by 21% to 26%. This higher job security could mean that public sector workers are less likely to exert effort in their job, and therefore have lower productivity levels. Therefore, this paper's aim is to contribute to the existent literature by comparing the sectors both in terms of individual characteristics such as altruism and laziness, but also in terms of job satisfaction, since the concepts may be interconnected.

The research question of this paper is therefore:

To what extent does employees' motivation differ between the public and the private sectors, more specifically how do individual characteristics such as altruism and laziness differ between sectors, and are there significant differences in job satisfaction?

Firstly, under the theoretical framework section existent literature will be discussed, and the hypotheses of this paper will be introduced. Under the data section the dataset and key variables will be presented, while under methodology the relevant statistical models for testing the hypotheses will be introduced. Moreover, the results of these previously mentioned models will be presented and explained, relating this analysis to the hypotheses. Finally, the results will be discussed, summarized, and the research question will be answered.

2. Theoretical framework

A firm will prefer to hire motivated workers, but cannot distinguish between motivated and unmotivated ones, since effort is not always observable. This paper will use similar terms as Delfgaauw and Dur (2008), where unmotivated workers would be the so called 'lazy' ones. It will be analysed whether public sector workers are more altruistic than those working in the private sector, or whether they are lazier, since both cases have prior empirical evidence. There are conflicting reasons for choosing to work in the public sector, since workers can display both public service motivation (PSM), or perhaps being lazier, because public sector workers receive weaker incentives than private sector ones and might slack because of it (Delfgaauw and Dur, 2008). Frank and Lewis (2004) found that public sector employees report having a 'stronger desire to help others and to be useful to society', compared to workers in the private sector.

Van de Walle et al (2015), argued that preferences for choosing to work in the public sector depend both on PSM, shown by being helpful to others and useful for the society, but also on extrinsic motives, such as higher job security, opportunities for advancement and high income. The latter motives are more 'selfish' ones and can be similar to the 'laziness' characteristic of the public sector argued by Delfgaauw and Dur (2008).

This paper will therefore analyse on an individual level if workers in the public sector are more altruistic or lazier, or maybe even both.

Hypothesis 1: Workers in the public sector are more altruistic.

Hypothesis 2: Workers in the public sector are also lazier.

The second hypothesis is also based on the stereotype that public sector workers are lazier and put in less effort in their job than private sector employees, with little evidence in existent literature to support it. Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) argue that public sector organisations have weaker incentives than private ones, and therefore attract workers who do not exert effort. Although the public sector would have a mix between motivated workers and so-called lazy ones, those who do not exert effort can crowd out the motivated ones, especially if it cannot be distinguished between the two types. However, Frank and Lewis (2004) found that public servants reported doing the best they could in their jobs (i.e. putting in effort, which improves productivity), and they were working hard despite having lower wages and advancement opportunities than workers in the private sector, and therefore they could not be classified as unmotivated. Contrarily to previous beliefs, a study found that public sector employees have lower work satisfaction and no higher work motivation (Emmert & Taher, 1992). Therefore, both hypotheses are considered relevant and are supported by existent literature.

Since people spend a considerable amount of their time working, job satisfaction is an important part of overall life satisfaction. Job satisfaction is also an important factor for policy making because employees' satisfaction affects how they see their job, and therefore also their productivity and efficiency. If employees are happier with their job, they will be more committed to working efficiently. Schneider and Vaught (1993) found no significant difference between overall job satisfaction between the sectors, but found that females are more satisfied with their wage in the private sector than in the public one, and male in the private sector are more satisfied with their wage than females. This paper will also look at the possible differences in job satisfaction between sectors, but also between genders in the same sector to check whether there is any significant difference.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction between sectors.

Bright (2008) found that public sector employees have significantly higher levels of job satisfaction. People with high Public Sector Motivation – therefore altruistic – have the right characteristics for public organisations and are happier with their work. This is because it was found that people with high PSM levels are more attracted to public sector jobs, and more

suited for them. This conclusion follows from the Person-Organization Fit theory, meaning that individuals with certain characteristics are attracted to organizations with similar characteristics to theirs. A high level of PSM is therefore a characteristic which increases this compatibility between individuals and the public sector. However, Bright (2008) suggests that high PSM attracts people to the public sector, although the effect can be short-lived and mean a higher job satisfaction in the short-run, since PSM levels can drop over time if the working environment is not proper. If the working conditions are not good enough, and employees do not feel like they contribute to the society, their job satisfaction will be lower, meaning that high PSM cannot guarantee a higher job satisfaction. This paper will therefore test this theory and analyse whether there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between people with different levels of PSM working in the public sector.

Hypothesis 4: Altruism positively affects job satisfaction in the public sector.

3. Data

This study will be on an individual level, with a large sample data from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study, which is a long-term study of graduates from high schools in Wisconsin from 1957 until 2011. The data is gathered through repeated questionnaires, and it covers different demographic characteristics. This paper will therefore be able to control for gender, level of education, number of children and income. Age is not considered a good control variable since the data focuses solely on high school graduates from 1957, therefore everyone is around the same age.

The job sector variable will be a dummy, with 1 for working in the public sector, and 0 in the private sector. In the original dataset, people self-reported their sector of employment. Observations with answers like 'don't know', 'inappropriate', 'refused' and blanks were excluded.

Job satisfaction will be measured by the respondents' answers to a question directly asking how satisfied they are with their job, with responses varying from very satisfied, fairly satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied. These responses will then be given a numerical equivalent, in order to be able to objectively measure the satisfaction, with

equivalent numbers range from 0 (very dissatisfied) to 3 (very satisfied). As Table 1 suggests, 55.4% of the public sector employees are very satisfied with their job, compared to 51.6% of private sector employees. Moreover, 10.1% of private sector employees are dissatisfied with their job, while only 7.1% of the public sector employees are dissatisfied with their job. Therefore, the variance in job satisfaction between sectors can already be seen.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of job satisfaction between sectors

Job satisfaction	Public sector employees		Private sector employees	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0	19	1.3%	115	2.0%
1	84	5.8%	461	8.1%
2	544	37.5%	2191	38.3%
3	805	55.4%	2955	51.6%
Total	1452	100%	5722	100%

Laziness will be measured by considering the answers to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that you see yourself as someone who is lazy at times?’, while altruism will be based on the question ‘To what extent do you agree that people would describe you as a giving person, willing to share your time with others?’. This latter question is closely related to the definition of public service motivation. Both these questions have answers ranging from strongly, moderately, and slightly agree and disagree, and will therefore be converted to categorical variables from 0 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree.

The summary statistics Table 3 can be found in the appendix.

4. Methodology

In order to test the first two hypotheses, two linear regressions will be used, with public sector as the dependent variable, since it is the endogenous variable, and altruism, respectively laziness as dependent variable, since they are both exogenous variable, together with demographic control variables, such as age, gender, education level and wage:

(1) Public sector = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ altruism + β_2 gender + β_3 education level+ β_4 number of children + β_5 income + ϵ

(2) Public sector = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ laziness + β_2 gender + β_3 education level+ β_4 number of children + β_5 income + ϵ

The above-mentioned regressions will evaluate whether public sector employees are more altruistic and lazier, compared to the private sector ones, and control for individual characteristics, therefore try to reduce omitted variable bias, in order to analyse if there are any significant differences between the sectors, but also between genders and different education levels.

Altruism, and respectively laziness, are the independent variables since they are both fixed characteristics. The models are controlling for demographic characteristics, since working in the public sector can be influenced by them. The first control variable, gender, is a dummy variable with females taking the value 0 and men 1. Gender is considered a good control because gender may influence the choice of working in the public sector. According to Frank and Lewis (2004), public sector employees are, on average, more likely to be female and have higher levels of education. Contrarily, van de Walle et al (2015), found that individuals with lower education level and lower income are more likely to choose to work in the public sector, because public sector is seen as a safer career option and there is a lower probability of having high income in the public sector compared to the private one. Therefore, this paper will also control for education level, which will be in the form of a categorical variable, with levels ranging from 1 to 6, 1 being high school graduate or less, or less than 1 year of college, level 2 being college graduate, level 3 being Bachelor's diploma, 4 Master's, 5 PhD, MD and other doctorates, and 6 being post doctorate education. Since the public sector variable in the regression model is related to the current or last job of the individual, this paper will also control for income, because some individuals may have previously worked in the private sector. As previously mentioned, a lower income individual may be more likely to choose to work in the public sector (van de Walle et al, 2015), and therefore omitting income in the regression can affect the results. Moreover, Perry (1997) found that higher income is negatively affecting PSM and explained in terms of wealthy individuals having a reduced sense of civic involvement. Lastly, number of children will also be controlled for because, as stated

earlier, public sector is considered a safer career choice, and therefore people having (more) children may be more inclined to care about job stability.

In order to test for a significant difference in job satisfaction between sectors, a mean analysis of job satisfaction with sectors will be made, while also checking for gender differences.

$$(3) \text{ Job satisfaction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ altruism} + \beta_2 \text{ public sector} + \beta_3 \text{ public sector} * \text{altruism} + \beta_4 \text{ number of children} + \beta_5 \text{ gender} + \beta_6 \text{ education level} + \beta_7 \text{ income} + \varepsilon$$

The third regression takes into account PSM, here measured by altruism, and the public sector dummy variable, together with the interaction between altruism and public sector, and the same demographic controls as the previous regressions. This regression is aiming to test whether altruism leads to a higher job satisfaction in the public sector, and if so, how strong, and significant this relationship is.

5. Results

Table 2: Means for altruism, laziness, and job satisfaction between sectors

Variable	Mean	Number of observations
Altruism in the public sector	4.0344	1248
Altruism in the private sector	4.0089	4495
Laziness in the public sector	1.9709	1236
Laziness in the private sector	1.9442	4441
Job satisfaction in the public sector	2.4704	1452
Job satisfaction in the private sector	2.3957	5722

The mean for altruism is very similar between the sectors. In the public sector the mean for altruism is 4.0344, and in the private sector it is 4.0089. A value of 4 means that the individual moderately agrees to being described you as a giving person, willing to share their time with others, and this value is rather high, since the scale is from 0 to 5. The difference in laziness between sectors is also small at a first glance, the mean laziness for the public sector being 1.9709, and for the private one 1.9442. At first, the public sector employees seem both slightly more altruistic and slightly lazier than the private sector ones. As the third hypothesis is

testing for differences in job satisfaction between sectors, the means were also firstly compared. By just looking at the data, it seems that job satisfaction is slightly higher in the public sector, but all relationships will be better analysed with regression models, in order to test the significance of the results.

5.1 Altruism in the public sector

For the first two regressions, with public sector being the binary dependent variable, logistic regressions were used. Firstly, only the effect of altruism on the public sector will be tested, in order to check if public sector employees are, on average, more altruistic. Afterwards, a more complex model (regression 1 in the methodology section) was used, with different demographics controls for more clear results. The results are reported in Tables 4 and 5 in the appendix. The first regression model is related to the first hypothesis, and it is testing for differences in altruism between sectors, model 1 being without control variables, and model 2 with. For the first model it can be seen that almost all levels of altruism have an odds ratio smaller than 1, but they cannot be interpreted since they are not statistically significant. However, for the second and more complex model, all altruism levels except one (slightly disagree) are statistically significant and have negative odds ratios. Altruism level 5, corresponding to people who strongly agree to being altruistic has a statistically significant effect on being in the public sector at 10% significance, while all the other levels are significant at 5%. Because all odds ratios are smaller than 1, this means that people of all altruism levels are less likely to be in the public sector than people in the reference category, which is altruism level 0 – people who strongly disagree to being altruistic. Therefore, employees in the public sector are not more altruistic than those in the private sector, contrarily to the expectations of the first hypothesis. The R^2 of the regression is quite low, but a goodness of fit test is performed, as a better way of assessing a logistic model. Hosmer and Lemeshow's goodness of fit test has a large p-value, 0.5787, indicating that in fact the model chosen fits the data well. Therefore, the first hypothesis stating that public sector employees are more altruistic is rejected. Regarding the control variables, no significant difference is found between genders or regarding the number of children. However, interesting results are found regarding the education level; people who graduated from collage are 38.21% more likely to be in the public sector, compared to high school graduates, at 1% significance level. Bachelor graduates are almost 3 times more likely to be working in the public sector compared to high

school graduates (odds ratio of 2.9244), while master's graduates are almost 8 times more likely (odds ratio of 7.9262), and PhD graduates 6 times more likely (odds ratio of 6.6210), at 1% significance level. Hence, highly educated individuals are more likely to work in the public sector, compared to those with lower levels of education. These results are therefore in line with the findings of Frank and Lewis (2004). However, although the highest level of education, post doctorate education, has the highest odds ratio of 12.3208, this result is insignificant, most likely because the sample of this paper has very little observations of the highest education level.

5.2 Laziness in the public sector

The second regression model (Table 5 in the appendix), similarly to the previous one also had two models, first one only checking for the effect of laziness on being employed in the public sector, and the second one also including demographics. From the first model, it can be seen that lazier workers have a higher probability of being employed in the public sector, as laziness levels from 1 to 5 have an odds ratio greater than 1, and therefore they are more likely to be working in the public sector compared to people who do not consider themselves lazy (laziness level 0, equivalent to highly disagree to being lazy in the questionnaire). However, the laziest workers, who highly agree (level 5), is the only category with an odds ratio smaller than 1 (0.8173), and therefore are less likely to work in the public sector compared to workers who are not lazy. However, those results are only significant for laziness level 1 at 1% significance level at laziness level 3 at 5% significance level. The results therefore only show that people who moderately disagree to being lazy (level 1) and those who slightly agree to being lazy (level 3) are more likely to work in the public sector than individuals who strongly disagree to being lazy. The second model which controls for demographics, shows no significant differences in laziness between the sectors, with no significant results for any level of laziness. Therefore, the second hypothesis stating that workers in the public sector are lazier than those in the private one can be rejected. However, although the same demographic controls were used as in the first regression, the model for laziness does not seem to be a good fit for the data, with Hosmer and Lemeshow's goodness of fit test having a rather small p-value, 0.0007, proving again that this model is not statistically significant.

5.3 Job satisfaction differences

In the third regression model (Table 6 in the appendix), the public sector variable has a significant (p -value = 0.003) and positive effect on job satisfaction, as for this paper's sample working in the public sector increases job satisfaction by 0.5536, which is quite a relevant increase since job satisfaction takes values ranging between 0 and 3. Therefore, the third hypothesis stating that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between sectors cannot be rejected. Furthermore, the interaction term between current job being in the public sector and altruism is statistically significant at all levels of altruism at 5% significance level. This suggests that job satisfaction changes for altruistic individuals working in the public sector, as compared to those in the private sector. This interaction is negative, meaning that the combined effect of both public sector and altruism on job satisfaction is less than the sum of their individual effects. Altruism has a positive effect on job satisfaction, but this effect is only statistically significant for high levels of altruism, so only for individuals who moderately agree (at 10% significance) and strongly agree (at 5% significance). This therefore suggests that altruistic individuals are more satisfied with their job. By considering both of these effects, the fourth hypothesis cannot be rejected, because public sector employees who also have high levels of altruism have, on average, a higher job satisfaction.

Although DeSantis and Durst (1996) found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and education, the effect of education in this paper is inconclusive. DeSantis and Durst (1996) argue that people with higher education are more unsatisfied with receiving simple tasks, making them more unsatisfied with their job compared with individuals with lower education. However, this paper finds that education level equivalent to Bachelor graduate has the lowest job satisfaction, followed by the highest level of education, post doctorate education, while PhD graduates are the most satisfied with their jobs. Furthermore, gender was also found to have a significant effect on job satisfaction at 10% significance. Males have, on average, slightly higher job satisfaction than their female counterparts, with an increase in job satisfaction of 0.0353. Previous literature did not find any significant differences between genders on job satisfaction, and this paper's sample only shows a small difference, so those results should not be generalized (Ghinetti, 2007; Schneider & Vaught, 1993).

Discussion and conclusion

This paper's aim was to answer the research question of whether there are differences in individual characteristics such as altruism and laziness between sectors, and whether there are also differences related to job satisfaction.

The findings suggest that public sector employees are not more altruistic, contrarily to initial expectations. It was found that almost all levels of altruism have a negative effect on the dependent variable – public sector. Therefore, public sector employees were found to be, on average, less altruistic than their private sector counterparts. However, it should be noted that this study only used data from high-school graduates from 1957, and the time of the interview was 1992. Therefore, all respondents were around the same age, most probably in their 50s. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) found that the longer individuals work in a public organization, the lower their public sector motivation is. Another explanation in the same paper is that as individuals grow older, their 'life-cycle considerations as work or retirement' lower, not necessarily related to the organization they work in. Therefore, the results may only apply to a certain age group, and different results in terms of PSM may be obtained if different age groups were tested.

Although Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) found that lazy workers can crowd out the motivated ones in the public sector, since effort is not completely verifiable, this does not seem to be the case for this paper's data. There were found no significant differences in laziness between the sectors, as public sector employees did not seem lazier, compared to those working in the private sector. However, individuals might also choose to work in the public sector because they are risk averse, not necessarily lazy. Buurman et al (2012) find public sector employees much more risk averse, as they are significantly less likely than private sector employees to choose the lottery ticket, when faced the choice of choosing between receiving a gift certificate, donating the money to charity or receiving a lottery ticket. Therefore, future studies should also control for risk aversity.

The third hypothesis of this paper was not rejected, and it was found that working in the public sector has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. Furthermore, it was found that altruism has a positive effect on job satisfaction in the public sector, but only for individuals who consider themselves very altruistic, and therefore have high levels of PSM.

This conclusion is in line with previous literature, which found high levels of PSM to lead to significantly higher levels of job satisfaction, but also performance (Bright, 2008; Perry, 1996).

Therefore, to answer the research question, there were no significant differences in individual characteristics between sectors, but it was found that public sector employees have higher job satisfaction, with an especially stronger relationship if they are highly altruistic.

This study also had its limitations. Firstly, the dataset used was an American one, from Wisconsin, and although extensive, the results cannot necessarily be generalized to other countries, since other factors such as the working conditions of country's GDP may differ. Moreover, key variables such as altruism and laziness are self-reported, so they might not always be truthful. For further research, more recent data should be used, with different age groups, since the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study database had high-school graduates from the same year, and there should be a cross-country comparison done to be able to generalize the results. Kooij et al (2011) demonstrate that there are age-related differences in preferred jobs, working conditions, and motivation, and age can therefore potentially also play a role in choosing to work in the public sector, which was not accounted for in this paper, since all individuals were in the same age group. Furthermore, additional factors other than PSM which drive people to choose to work in the public sector, such as for example job security and risk aversity, should also be included and controlled for in the model to avoid the possible bias.

Bibliography

Bright, L. (2008). Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on the Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 38(2), 149–166. doi: 10.1177/0275074008317248

Buurman, M., Delfgaauw, J., Dur, R., & Van den Bossche, S. (2012). Public sector employees: Risk averse and altruistic?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(3), 279-291.

Delfgaauw, J, & Dur, A.J. (2008). Incentives and workers' motivation in the public sector. *The Economic Journal*, 118(525), 171–191. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0297.2007.02108.x

Desantis, V. S., & Durst, S. L. (1996). Comparing Job Satisfaction among Public- and Private-Sector Employees. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 26(3), 327–343. doi: 10.1177/027507409602600305

Emmert, M. A., & Taher, W. A. (1992). Public Sector Professionals: The Effects of Public Sector Jobs on Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Work Involvement. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 22(1), 37–48. doi: 10.1177/027507409202200103

Frank, S. & Lewis, G. (2004). Government employees working hard or hardly working?. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 34(1), 36-51.

Ghinetti, P. (2007). The public- private job satisfaction differential in Italy. *Labour*, 21(2), 361–388. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9914.2007.00375.x

Houston, D. J. (2005). “Walking the Walk” of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood, and Money. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1), 67–86. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mui028

Kooij, D. T., Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G., Kanfer, R., & Dikkers, J. S. (2011). Age and work-related motives: Results of a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(2), 197-225. doi:10.1002/job.665

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3492429

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5–22. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303

Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(2), 181-197. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024345

Schneider, D. S., & Vaught, B. C. (1993). A comparison of job satisfaction between public and private sector managers. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 68-83.

Van de Walle, S., Steijn, B., & Jilke, S. (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.

Appendix

Table 3: Summary statistics

Variable	Observations	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Altruism	6047	4.0246	1.0236	0	5
Laziness	5973	1.9628	1.4598	0	5
Job satisfaction	7261	2.4118	0.7126	0	3
Current/ last job	7202	0.2017	0.4013	0	1
Education level	7599	1.8417	1.1765	1	6
Gender	7600	0.4407	0.4965	0	1
Income	6860	31645.5900	36409.8100	0	300000
Number of children	7593	2.9505	1.6912	0	14
Public sector	1453	-	-	-	-
Private sector	5749	-	-	-	-

Table 4: Logistic regression on differences in altruism between sectors, with public sector as dependent variable

Variable	(1)		(2)	
	Coefficient	Odds ratio	Coefficient	Odds ratio
Altruism				
1	-0.2384 (0.3888)	0.7879 (0.3063)	-0.8761** (0.4174)	0.4164** (0.1738)
2	0.0700 (0.3477)	1.0725 (0.3729)	-0.4706 (0.3627)	0.6247 (0.2269)

3	-0.3539 (0.3315)	0.7019 (0.1227)	-0.7955** (0.3439)	0.4514** (0.1552)
4	-0.2312 (0.3244)	0.7936 (0.2574)	-0.6738** (0.3358)	0.5098** (0.1712)
5	-0.1023 (0.3244)	0.9028 (0.2929)	-0.5637* (0.3361)	0.5691* (0.1913)
Education level				
2			0.3236*** (0.1034)	1.3821*** (0.1430)
3			1.0731*** (0.0997)	2.9244*** (0.2915)
4			2.0702*** (0.1053)	7.9262*** (0.8345)
5			1.8903*** (0.1622)	6.6210*** (1.0738)
6			2.5113 (1.6218)	12.3208 (19.9823)
Gender				
			0.0476 (0.0698)	1.0487 (0.0732)
No. of children				
			-0.0221 (0.0219)	0.9782 (0.0215)
Income				
			-7.38e-06**** (8.72e-07)	1.0000*** (8.72e-07)
Constant	-1.0986*** (0.3203)	0.3333*** (0.1068)	-0.9382*** (0.3411)	0.3913*** (0.1335)
Pseudo R ²	0.0019	0.0019	0.0909	0.0909

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01

Table 5: Logistic regression on differences in laziness between sectors, with public sector as dependent variable

Variable	(1)		(2)	
	Coefficient	Odds ratio	Coefficient	Odds ratio
Laziness				
1	0.2662*** (0.0979)	1.3050*** (0.1277)	0.1418 (0.1069)	1.1524 (0.1232)
2	0.1276 (0.1188)	1.1361 (0.1350)	-0.0039 (0.1300)	0.9962 (0.1295)
3	0.2157** (0.0902)	1.2407** (0.1119)	0.1631* (0.0977)	1.1772* (0.1150)
4	0.1003 (0.1175)	1.1055 (0.1299)	0.0232 (0.1264)	1.0235 (0.1294)
5	-0.2018 (0.2386)	0.8173 (0.1950)	-0.2594 (0.2380)	0.7715 (0.1836)
Education level				
2			0.3101*** (0.1046)	1.3636*** (0.1426)
3			1.0684*** (0.1000)	2.9106*** (0.2909)
4			2.0594*** (0.1059)	7.8409*** (0.8302)
5			1.8912*** (0.1642)	6.6270*** (1.0880)
6			2.4375 (1.6305)	11.4448 (18.6602)
Gender			0.0458 (0.0701)	1.0470 (0.0734)
No of children			-0.0200 (0.0220)	0.9802 (0.0215)

Income			-7.72e-06***	1.0000***
			(8.82e-07)	(0.2154)
Constant	-1.4249***	0.2405***	-1.6420***	0.1936***
	(0.0699)	(0.0168)	(0.1172)	(0.0227)
Pseudo R ²	0.0020	0.0020	0.0906	0.0906

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01

Table 6: Regression 3 – Effect of altruism, public sector, interaction between them and control variables on job satisfaction

Variable	Coefficient
Altruism	
1	0.0679 (0.1488)
2	0.0856 (0.1355)
3	0.1703 (0.1289)
4	0.2413* (0.1275)
5	0.3430*** (0.1277)
Public sector	0.5536*** (0.1874)
Public sector # Altruism	
1 1	-0.7039** (0.2729)
1 2	-0.4726** (0.2729)
1 3	-0.5378*** (0.1950)
1 4	-0.5205*** (0.1909)
1 5	-0.4192** (0.1905)
Gender	0.0353* (0.0191)
Income	2.38e-06*** (2.36e-07)

Education level	
2	-0.0389 (0.0274)
3	-0.0966*** (0.0302)
4	-0.0639* (0.0338)
5	0.0671 (0.0469)
6	-0.0808 (0.2807)
Number of children	0.0162*** (0.0055)
Constant	2.0244*** (0.1286)
R ²	0.0360

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses; *p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01