

Name: hila balalis

College degree: University Education doctoral student Tiraspol Moldova

Position: lecturer and teacher of Economics and Management

Place of work: ORT Israel

Phone: 972-522450588

Email: Hilab2013@gmail.com

Abstract: Alongside the importance of OCB and job satisfaction as key organizational behavior components, several demographic variables were found to moderate the relationships between these concepts.

Key words: OCB, organizational citizenship behavior, **job satisfaction**, General policy **makers**

Moderators for OCB and Job Satisfaction

Alongside the importance of OCB and job satisfaction as key organizational behavior components, several demographic variables were found to moderate the relationships between these concepts.

First, professional and workplace seniority was found to influence levels of both OCB and job satisfaction. Seniority affects wages and professional value; it represents experience, persistence, and the ability to adapt (e.g. [12]). Professional seniority usually lends itself to roles that involve more responsibility and have more hierarchical value, roles that involve a greater degree of organizational responsibility compared to those lower in hierarchy. In light of this, one would expect to find professional seniority as negatively correlated to withdrawal behavior (which is opposite to organizational citizenship behavior in several ways), i.e. significant seniority will be associated with decreased absences, for instance. This correlation may be reversed, however, in unionized workplaces where workers with seniority enjoy job security and professional union protection, and therefore suffer less consequence for absences than employees who are at the start of their careers.

Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a positive correlation, rather than a negative one, between seniority and withdrawal behavior.

Literature on the subject shows contradictory findings on the relationship between seniority in the workplace and withdrawal behavior. Some researchers did find a negative correlation between these factors [12] [13]. Becker's side-bet theory [14], however, claims that the more one has contributed to the organization the more difficult it will be for them to leave. A positive correlation was found between employee seniority and organizational commitment, such that the more seniority an employee has in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be [15] [16] [17]. Other studies did not find a significant correlation between employee seniority and job satisfaction [14] [18] [19].

A possible reason for the lack of consistency in previous findings is that some investigated role seniority, some workplace seniority, and some professional seniority. Seniority may affect employees differently depending on their profession, age, and the nature of their role.

In addition, age of employees was also found to correlate with job satisfaction, such that the older the worker the higher their level of satisfaction [17] [20]. There are several different opinions regarding the correlation between organizational commitment and employees' age. Some researchers [17] claim there is a positive correlation between these components, as the older the employee the less alternatives there are for employment. Other researchers found a negative correlation between these variables [21], such that the older the employee, the less organizational commitment they exhibit.

Moreover, Meyer and Allen [17] found a positive correlation between an employee's age, workplace seniority, and organizational commitment. Their claim is that the older the employee and the more seniority they have in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be.

Alongside the importance of OCB and job satisfaction as key organizational behavior components, several demographic variables were found to moderate the relationships between these concepts.

First, professional and workplace seniority was found to influence levels of both OCB and job satisfaction. Seniority affects wages and professional value; it represents experience, persistence, and the ability to adapt (e.g. [12]). Professional seniority usually lends itself to roles that involve more responsibility and have more hierarchical value, roles that involve a greater degree of organizational responsibility compared to those lower in hierarchy. In light of this, one would expect to find professional seniority as negatively correlated to withdrawal behavior (which is opposite to organizational citizenship behavior in several ways), i.e. significant seniority will be associated with decreased absences, for instance. This correlation may be reversed, however, in unionized workplaces where workers with seniority enjoy job security and professional union protection, and therefore suffer less consequence for absences than employees who are at the start of their careers. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a positive correlation, rather than a negative one, between seniority and withdrawal behavior.

Literature on the subject shows contradictory findings on the relationship between seniority in the workplace and withdrawal behavior. Some researchers did find a negative correlation between these factors [12] [13]. Becker's side-bet theory [14], however, claims that the more one has contributed to the organization the more difficult it will be for them to leave. A positive correlation was found between employee seniority and organizational commitment, such that the more seniority an employee has in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be [15] [16] [17]. Other studies did not find a significant correlation between employee seniority and job satisfaction [14] [16] [19].

A possible reason for the lack of consistency in previous findings is that some investigated role seniority, some workplace seniority, and some professional seniority. Seniority may affect employees differently depending on their profession, age, and the nature of their role.

In addition, age of employees was also found to correlate with job satisfaction, such that the older the worker the higher their level of satisfaction [19] [20]. There are several different opinions regarding the correlation between organizational commitment and employees' age. Some researchers [17] claim there is a positive correlation between these components, as the older the employee the fewer

alternatives there are for employment. Other researchers found a negative correlation between these variables [21], such that the older the employee, the less organizational commitment they exhibit.

Moreover, Meyer and Allen [17] found a positive correlation between an employee's age, workplace seniority, and organizational commitment. Their claim is that the older the employee and the more seniority they have in the organization, the greater their organizational commitment will be.

Differences between private and public sectors

In the literature review so far, I reviewed theories in regard to organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. The main goal of this study is to examine these variables among employees in the private and public sectors, and specifically differences between them. Therefore in the current chapter I will present empirical studies that examined these differences.

Reviews of the relevant literature reveal that work motivation among public sector employees and managers is very different from that of their private sector counterparts [24,25]. However, most research on the subject devotes limited attention to the relative importance of the causes of these differences [26]. For example, compared to factors such as age or gender, how important is the sector that an employee works in? In particular, the hierarchical level at which an employee works cannot be neglected. In comparing public sector and private sector employee motivation, strong interaction effects have been found between work motivation and management level [24]. In addition, most of the research fails to control for relevant explanatory variables, often because of very small sample sizes [26]. Sometimes, when samples of private sector and public sector employees contain too many differences in gender, age, education, job content, or hierarchical level, differences in work motivation can be explained simply by these demographic or organizational factors.

Employees in the public sector often make a choice to deliver a worthwhile service to society. They are motivated by a strong desire to serve the public interest [26,27], by a sense of service to the community that is not found among their private sector counterparts [28] and by an urge to promote the public interest [29]. Public

sector employees show a stronger service ethic than private sector employees [27]. Public service motivation comprises elements such as the opportunity to have an impact on public affairs, commitment to serving the public interest, and an interest in achieving social justice [25, 30].

This choice of the “good cause” is certainly not the only choice that public sector employees make. Most workers constantly make choices between work and family. Some opt for a more balanced life with less work–family conflict, whereas others show high degrees of work commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, putting in extra time and effort. Can some of the observed differences between public sector and private sector employees be explained by such a positive choice, adding to a further understanding of the differences in work motivation between public sector and private sector employees?

The research has consistently found that private sector employees and managers value economic rewards more highly than do public sector employees and managers [28, 31]. Direct economic benefits are less important for public sector employees than for those in the private sector [32]. Pay is a much greater motivator for private sector employees, supervisors [33], and managers [34] than it is for their public sector counterparts. Unlike private sector managers, public sector managers are not strongly motivated by pay expectancy [35]. Based on an analysis of 34 empirical studies, Boyne [26] found support for only 3 out of 13 hypotheses about the differences between public sector and private sector management. This study was not a real meta-analysis; however, because it gave equal weight to all studies included and may have overlooked other significant differences. Although we acknowledge that this might lead to a slightly skewed picture, the fact that one of three positive results indicated less materialism in public managers largely corroborates previous assumptions. For example, based on an analysis of 14 national surveys, Crewson [37] concludes that economic rewards are most important to private sector employees.

There is a broad consensus that public sector employees are more intrinsically motivated. Leete [38] found that nonprofit organizations rely disproportionately on intrinsically motivated employees. This also seems to be the case in the public sector. Most studies have concluded that public sector workers are less extrinsically and hence more intrinsically motivated [37]. Public sector employees are more motivated

by job content, self-development, recognition, autonomy, interesting work, and the chance to learn new things [39].

When it comes to the motivational impact of a supportive working environment, the literature on differences between the public and private sectors is silent. Although there is a large body of studies dealing with the link between motivation and job security, the findings often are conflicting [36, 38, 39, 40]/ the general picture is that, all else being equal, public sector employees are strongly motivated by security and stability [33]. Job security refers to workers' ability to retain a desirable job; job stability refers to the duration of the match between a worker and a job. Most studies, however, deal with job security, not job stability. Job stability is a concept that is closer to job content or working style than job security, which has more to do with external economic conditions. Being motivated by a supportive working environment reflects feelings of safety in one's role [41], which is a broader concept than stability. It also encompasses the need to work in a friendly, harmonious, respectful atmosphere. There is some evidence that federal government executives consider their coworkers, colleagues, and bosses significantly more important than do business executives [42], and public employees seem to respond more favorably to a people-oriented leadership style than do private employees [43].

The research on work and organizational commitment offers mixed results. Early research by Buchanan [44] reinforced the belief that public sector managers have a lower level of organizational commitment than business executives. Similar findings have been reported by Rainey [45]. In a comparison of 474 Australian public sector employees and 944 private sector employees, Zeffane [43] found higher commitment among the latter. Moon [46] found that public sector managers have a lower level of organizational commitment than do private sector managers, especially in terms of their willingness to expend extra effort. Goulet and Frank [47] report the lowest organizational commitment among public sector employees and managers in a sample consisting of for-profit, nonprofit, and public sector employees and managers.

Some other studies, however, have reported a higher level of commitment among public sector managers or no difference. Farid (1997), for example, compared

the organizational commitment of 54 and 43 middle managers from public sector and private sector organizations, respectively, and found no significant differences. Most studies report inconclusive or inconsistent findings [49].

In a critical review of the empirical literature—and in an effort to “debunk negative stereotypes”—Baldwin concludes that private sector and public sector employees are equally motivated. However, Baldwin’s summary table makes clear that most of the cited studies deal with public sector managers, not street-level public sector employees. Baldwin’s conclusion of equal motivation, then, may be relevant only for managers and not for other employees.

Different organizational [51] or national cultures (52) can explain many differences. Nevertheless, the fact that public sector managers have weaker organizational commitment than their private sector counterparts is one of the three hypotheses supported by Boyne’s overview of 34 empirical studies [26]. Balfour and Wechsler [49] found different correlations between public sector employment and several dimensions of commitment. The only consistent finding is a negative correlation between public sector employment and the willingness to expend extra effort. This dimension, “willingness to exert considerable effort,” is one of the three factors associated with commitment.

The contrasting view, espoused by proponents of public-service motivation [53] is that individuals are drawn to careers in public service primarily by a unique set of altruistic motives such as wanting to serve the public interest, effect social change, and shape the policies that affect society. This perspective views public service as a distinct profession or calling to which certain types of people are morally compelled. This implies that job seekers do not necessarily view private sector and public sector jobs as competing options; an individual who is drawn to a career in public service would choose a public sector job even if the economic rewards were not competitive with comparable jobs in the private sector.

Research questions

The theoretical goal of this study is to examine the relationship between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" (as factors significant to organizational success [4]). We also seek to determine whether there is a difference in these organizational positions between the private sector and the public sector.

Specifically, current study will examine the following questions:

1. Is there a correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior"?
2. Is there a difference in the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in the public sector versus the private sector?
3. Is there a correlation between "job satisfaction", "organizational citizenship behavior" and "seniority"?

The study's practical objective is to illuminate the significance of "job satisfaction" and the cultivation of an organizational atmosphere that encourages "organizational citizenship behavior" in both the private and public sectors. The purpose of the study is to serve as a catalyst for organizations to adopt aware management practices that increase these factors within organizations.

Research Hypotheses

In light of current theoretical and research literature the research hypotheses are as follows:

(H1) There is a correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior".

(H2) A difference will be indicated in the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" between the public and private sectors.

(H3) The correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" will be stronger among employees with significant seniority than those with limited seniority.

Research Methodology

Research approach: This research subject is best examined by a qualitative research and quantitative approaches.

The study field

The study investigates the relationship between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior", and compares the terms of this relationship in the private sector and the public sector, using data collected from 109 participants.

The sample is a convenience sample. The participants, both men and women, administrative and non-administrative employees, which were considered appropriate respondents, were randomly selected from all departments, branches, and divisions of the selected organizations (as aforementioned, in the public sector questionnaires were given to administrative staff only), i.e., the organizations' various departments / branches are represented in the study.

Participants were sampled out of two main populations - public sector and private sector. In regard to private sector, participants were sampled out of private school in Israel while in regard to public sector, participants were sampled out of H.I.T - Holon Institute of Technology.

Research tools

A questionnaire was created for the purposes of this study. It is comprised of multiple-choice questions (Likert scale), and divided into three parts (some questions were taken from relevant research in Hebrew or English): The first part includes questions regarding "job satisfaction" (MSQ), in which participants were asked to rate their satisfaction on a scale of 1 – 6 with 1 being 'not satisfied' and 6 being 'highly satisfied'.

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate their level of satisfaction with different aspects of their work, on a scale of 1 – 6, 1 being 'not satisfied' and 6 –

highly satisfied. Previous studies have yielded reasonable internal consistency coefficients – Cronbach 's alpha (internal adapter) – for the overall satisfaction index, such as $\alpha = 0.86$ [111]. Items 1-20 examine the variable "satisfaction", and Cronbach's internal consistency coefficient α in this part of the questionnaire is $\alpha = 0.915$.

The second section regarding "organizational citizenship behavior" was defined in the questionnaire by a list of statements related to the phenomenon under investigation. Participants were asked to assess their level of agreement with each statement on a scale of 1-5 with a score of 5 indicating that the employee "strongly agrees" with the statement, while a score of 1 indicates that the employee "strongly disagrees" with the statement. As the statements regard employees' personal attitudes and positions, there was no "not relevant" option.

Data analysis:

The data analysis included two aspects:

- a. Analysis and replication in the circular model of qualitative observation.
- b. Statically analysis of data using t tests, ANOVA and pearson correlations.

Findings

Study 1 - Quantitative Correltaional study

7.4.1 Difference between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior


The variables in the questionnaire were measured with the use scales for several items / questions with the range of possible scores in the first questionnaire portion on "job satisfaction" ranging from 1 - 6, and from 1 - 5 in the second questionnaire portion on "organizational citizenship behavior". For the purposes of analysis, relevant answers were combined for each item to create one measurement - the average of responses in each scale. The average of the "job satisfaction" scale was $M = 4.787$ and the standard deviation; $Sd = 0.644$; The average of the "organizational citizenship behavior" scale was $M = 4.085$ and the standard deviation $Sd = 0.521$.

In light of current research literature, before the research hypotheses was tested, a trial was conducted to uncover whether there is a difference in the overall "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" averages between the private

and public sectors. In order to test whether there is a significant difference a t-test for independent samples was conducted.

The results indicated a significant difference at 95 % certainty. The differences in job satisfaction averages in the different sectors presented as $t(107) = 3.799$, $p < 0.05$ (two - sided), while differences in organizational citizenship behavior averages are $t(107) = 6.472$, $p < 0.05$ (two - sided). Therefore, both the overall satisfaction averages and the organizational citizenship behavior averages showed a significant difference between the private and public sectors. Moreover, with the use of a t-test (one-sided), it became evident that the overall average of "job satisfaction" and the overall average of "organizational citizenship behavior " was higher in the public sector than the private sector.

Figure 2: Difference between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior among total sample



Afterwards, differences between averages of both variables were examined between Public Sector vs. the Private Sector by independent t-test. This examination revealed that employees at Public Sector reported higher job satisfaction ($M=3.56$, $SD=1.23$) in compare with employees at Private Sector ($M=2.21$, $SD=0.62$) ($t(52)=3.21$, $p<.01$).

Moreover, employees at Public Sector reported higher organizational citizenship behavior (M=4.02, SD=1.14) in compare with employees at Private Sector (M=3.14, SD=1.22) ($t(52)=4.82, p<.01$).

Figure 3: Difference between public and private sectors at job satisfaction





Figure 4: Difference between public and private sectors at organizational citizenship behavior



7.4.2 Correlation between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior

Hypothesis (H1) argues that there is a relationship between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior", such that the higher the degree of job satisfaction, the more organizational citizenship behavior employees will exhibit.

Due to the discovery that the internal consistency of all questions related to the "job satisfaction" variable is high, and the internal consistency of questions related to the "organizational citizenship behavior" variable is high, a total average variable could be determined separately for each variable. As these are two continuous variables, Pearson's correlation coefficient (two-sided) was used to determine whether there is a distinct correlation between the two.

The results uncovered a positive, strong, and significant correlation between employees' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior, with 99% certainty, ($r(109) = 0.698, p < 0.01$). In order to examine job satisfaction factors that significantly contribute to organizational citizenship behavior, a multivariate regression analysis was conducted, with job satisfaction items (questions) as independent variables and the total average of organizational citizenship behavior as the dependent variable.

A one-way analysis by a variance (ANOVA) test uncovered a significant contribution at 95 % certainty, with 73% explained variance. Variables that significantly contribute to organizational citizenship are (noted according to their level of significance to variance): a. "The way in which my place of employment enforces its policy"; b. "The opportunity to be constantly busy"; c. "The relationships among my colleagues"; d. "The opportunity to do things for others".

Therefore, H1 was supported.


7.4.3 Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior - the Public Sector vs. the Private Sector

Hypothesis (H2) predicted a distinction in the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in the public sector versus the private sector. Therefore, when the intervening variable "sector" is maintained, the

difference in the quality of the correlation between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in each sector will be uncovered.

Pearson's correlation coefficient (two - sided) was calculated separately in order to examine the distinction in the correlation between the two variables in each sector. Results showed a significant distinction in the correlation between the variables in the private and public sector. Furthermore, it was found that the strength of the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in the public sector ($r(55) = 0.720, p < 0.01$) was slightly more significant than the strength of the correlation between the same variables in the private sector ($r(54) = 0.589, p < 0.01$). Therefore, there is a significant and moderate distinction in the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in the public sector versus the private sector.

Figure 5: Difference between public sector versus the private sector at correlations of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior



7.4.4 The Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, According to Seniority


Hypothesis (H3) argued that the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" will be stronger among veteran employees when

compared to those with limited seniority. For observation and hypothesis substantiation purposes, the intervening variable "seniority" was maintained, and employees with limited seniority were defined as those with up to 5 years of experience, while employees with 5 years of experience or more were considered veteran employees. Pearson's correlation coefficient (two - sided) was separately calculated for each group in order to test the strength of the correlation between the variables among veteran employees and employees with limited seniority.

Examination of the correlation between the overall "job satisfaction" average and the overall "organizational citizenship behavior" average with seniority as the consistent variable, uncovered that the correlation between the two variables (job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior) was significant, positive, and strong among veteran employees (over 5 years of experience) ($r(77) = 0.707, p < 0.01$), with no significant difference in the strength of the correlation among limited senior employees (up to 5 years of experience) ($r(26) = 0.650, p < 0.01$).

Thus, the hypothesis was not supported. No significant correlation was found between the relationship of job satisfaction to organizational citizenship behavior and employee seniority.

Figure 6: Difference between veteran and senior employees at correlations of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior




7.4.5 The Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, According to Age Group

In order to test the difference in the relationship between the variables in each age group, the intervening variable "age group" was consistent and Pearson's correlation coefficient (two - sided) was separately calculated for each age group. Results revealed a clear, positive, moderate to strong correlation in all age groups. However, there is an indication that the strength of the correlation among the adult age group (46-66) ($r(43) = 0.594, p < 0.01$), is slightly lower compared to the younger age group (36-45) ($r(35) = 0.784, p < 0.01$), with the latter being lower compared to the next-younger group (20-35) ($r(27) = 0.801, p < 0.01$).

Therefore, a negative correlation trend was found between the age group variable and the strength of the correlation between the two variables (job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior) - the older the age group, the more the strength of the correlation between the variables declines.

We further note that the t-test for independent variables uncovered a significant difference in the correlation between "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in relationship to age – the older the age group, the more "job satisfaction" (independent variable).

Figure 7: Difference between age groups at correlations of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior




7.4.6 The Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, According to Staff Meeting Participation

In order to examine the correlation between the variables "job satisfaction" and "organizational citizenship behavior" in relationship to staff meeting participation, items a-d in the relevant question were combined (Part C, Question 4 in the questionnaire) as "Participate in staff meetings" as opposed to item e, which was defined as "do not participate in staff meetings". The intervening variable "participation in staff meetings" was the consistent variable and Pearson's correlation coefficient (two - sided) was calculated separately for each group.

Results showed a distinct, positive, strong correlation with "job satisfaction" among the group of respondents who participate in staff meetings ($r(85) = 0.746, p < 0.01$) compared to those who do not participate in staff meetings ($r(22) = 0.545, p < 0.01$). Thus, the strength of the correlation increases with participation in staff meetings and taking an active part in collective thinking and decision-making.

A t-test of independent variables revealed a significant difference in "job satisfaction" between employees who participate in staff meetings and those who do not, such that employees who participate showed greater overall job satisfaction (independent variable) when compared to employees who do not participate in meetings.

Figure 8: Difference between participation at staff meetings at correlations of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior



Study 2 - Qualitative study

The study involved 70 respondents: 50 teachers, 10 principals, and 10 supervisors. The use of several sources was driven by the need to investigate different perspectives on the phenomenon under study, and to ensure that its conceptualization is not strictly based on the employees or supervisors' perspective. This kind of narrow scope is a prevailing weakness of studies on organizational citizenship behavior that depreciates the credibility of research findings [16].

Findings of this study showed that most of the respondents included in this study assigned a great deal of responsibility to the principal in motivating organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. The principal's crucial influence was also identified in previous studies on organizational citizenship behavior [5] [6]. A school principal that gives teachers positive feedback for volunteering, who builds emotional connections with their teachers and is concerned about their experience, who allows teachers professional autonomy and includes them in decision-making processes, is considered to be one that encourages organizational citizenship behavior. Feedback and personal connection cultivate a sense of belonging among teachers, as well as a feeling of commitment toward the principal ("how can I say no to him/her"). They also develop professional autonomy, which allows teachers the opportunity to take initiative and exhibit behaviors that go beyond their official job requirements.

However, the absence of such leadership qualities in a principal was not necessarily perceived to reduce instances of organizational citizenship behavior among teachers.

Study 3 - Quantitative Experimental study

Following study 1 which was a correlational study, I also conducted an intervention experiment in order to test whether teachers from private sector differ in their job satisfaction and OCB in compare with teachers from public sector.

The multi-dimensional pedagogical system in the public sector (which includes, the school administration, teachers, school staff, local authority education department etc.) is significantly different from pedagogical system in the private sector (which usually has more autonomy for teachers and supervisors and sometimes have also more budgets). Therefore these factors could influence the ways teachers perceive their role and their level of impact. In order to assess whether teachers from private sector differ from teachers from public sector in the way motivational program will influence on their job satisfaction and OCB.

As stated above, motivational program to enhance job satisfaction and OCB among teachers was built by literature review and also personal interviews that were conducted both with from public sector and private sector. Interventions were conducted separately in private school and public school in Israel. Intervention program included 10 lessons, while each lesson lasted for 2.5 hours. Following are the main results:

4.3.1 Difference between groups at job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior between groups

The variables in the questionnaire were measured with the use scales for several items / questions with the range of possible scores in the first questionnaire portion on "job satisfaction" ranging from 1 - 6, and from 1 - 5 in the second questionnaire portion on "organizational citizenship behavior". For the purposes of analysis, relevant answers were combined for each item to create one measurement -

the average of responses in each scale. Following table shows differences between groups in the final stage of the study.

To examine significant differences between groups, Two way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The two-way ANOVA not only aims at assessing the main effect of each independent variable but also if there is any interaction between them.

Table 9: Means and standard deviations of job satisfaction according to study groups

| | Private sector | Public sector |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Intervention | 4.22 (1.12) | 3.78 (0.81) |
| Control | 3.78 (0.78) | 3.26 (1.22) |

Two way ANOVA showed a significant effect for the intervention ($F(1, 196)=6.12, p<.01$), meaning teachers who undergo motivational intervention program reported higher job satisfaction ($M=4.00, SD=1.21$) in compare with teachers in control group ($M=2.73, SD=0.81$).

In addition a significant effect for the sector ($F(1, 194)=7.31, p<.01$), meaning teachers who belong to public sector reported higher job satisfaction ($M=3.52, SD=0.92$) in compare with teachers who belong to private sector ($M=3.21, SD=0.76$).

Finally, an interaction effect was found between sector and group ($F(1, 194)=3.22, p<.01$). As seen in the following figure, while among teachers in both sectors were benefited from motivational program and reported higher job satisfaction in compare to control group, greater increase was indicated in private sector in compare to public sector.

Figure 8: Interaction between group and sector in job satisfaction




Table 10: Means and standard deviations of OCB according to study groups

| | Private sector | Public sector |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Intervention | 4.5 (0.78) | 4.01 (1.21) |
| Control | 2.97 (0.78) | 3.21 (0.87) |


Two way ANOVA showed a significant effect for the intervention ($F(1, 196)=5.57, p<.05$), meaning teachers who undergo motivational intervention program reported higher OCB ($M=4.25, SD=1.21$) in compare with teachers in control group ($M=3.09, SD=0.81$).

No significant effect for the sector ($F(1, 194)=1.02, p=.31$), meaning teachers who belong to public sector had similar OCB ($M=3.52, SD=0.92$) in compare with teachers who belong to private sector ($M=3.73, SD=0.56$).

Finally, an interaction effect was found between sector and group ($F(1, 194)=4.22, p<.01$). As seen in the following figure, while among teachers in both sectors were benefited from motivational program and reported higher OCB in

compare to control group, greater increase was indicated in private sector in compare to public sector.

Figure 9: Interaction between group and sector in OCB



4.3.2 Difference between groups at correlations between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior

To examine outcomes of motivational program on job satisfaction and OCB correlations between teachers from public sector and teachers from private sector, pearson correlations were computed.

Results showed a significant distinction in the correlation between groups in these variables, and specifically between employees that participated in the intervention and employees that didn't participate (control). Among employees that participated in the intervention, strong and significant correlation was found ($r=0.762$, $p<.01$). On the other hand, among employees that didn't participate in the intervention, weaker correlation was found ($r=0.462$, $p<.05$).

Following table shows correlations between four groups.


Table 11: Correlations between job satisfaction and OCB according to study groups

| | Private sector | Public sector |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Intervention | 0.682** | 0.821** |
| Control | 0.392* | 0.521** |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As seen in table 7, stronger correlation was found between job satisfaction and OCB specifically among employees from public sector, and to less extent between these variables from private sector. In addition, intervention of enhancing motivation showed that it creates stronger relationships between job satisfaction and OCB, in compare with control group.

Figure 10: Correlations between job satisfaction and OCB among intervention and control groups between private and public sectors



To conclude, the experiment described in this chapter shows that the main hypothesis of this research has been supported. Meaning, motivational program for teachers succeeded to enhance both job satisfaction and organization citizenship behavior in compare to control group. In addition, the intervention strengthen

associations between job satisfaction and OCB especially among intervention group. Finally, motivational program had stronger effect among teachers in private sector.

Discussion

This study aims to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in general, and the variations in this relationship in the private sector versus the public sector in particular. This is based on the assumptions that organizational culture shapes the way employees operate, manage, and execute tasks in their organization [2], and that organizational citizenship behavior, as a component of this culture, has direct implications on organizational 'success' [1]. Main findings show that:

- A. Helping students and colleagues: This component includes voluntarily helping students (tutoring and assistance with personal problems outside of school hours, listening and attending to students, showing compassion and empathy for struggling students), and new teachers or peers with various matters. This component is referred to as an aspect of organizational citizenship behavior in previous studies as well [9].
- B. Development and implementation of educational and organizational changes and innovations: Initiating changes in teaching methods, introducing curriculum innovations, and organizing school projects, are part of teachers' citizenship behavior, as they are not directly rewarded for these initiatives even though they require time and effort. The lack of compensation is particularly evident in changes enforced by the Ministry of Education. Later works on organizational citizenship behavior include this component in their definition of the phenomenon [3] [18] [31] [51].
- C. Organizational orientation: This component, referred to as "civic integrity" in related literature, regards the teacher's commitment to the school as an organization and not strictly to their own class. Participation in school activities, such as ad-hoc committees, or voluntarily taking part in organizational aspects of the school – which is unique to teachers – are included in this component.

- D. Professional commitment: This component refers to teachers' commitment to do everything in their power for the success of their students. Using a variety of teaching methods, adjusting teaching methods to suit the students, and providing comprehensive and in-depth assessments, are perceived as behaviors for which teachers are not directly compensated, which are aimed at cultivating success among students. They depend on the teacher's personal discretion and their willingness to invest many hours of their free time.

General conclusions and recommendations

The following recommendations are made in light of this study and its results. Recommendations will be separately discussed in regard to general policy makers and specific policy makers in educational system.

General policy makers

1. Administration in both types of organizations (public sector and private sector), should deepen the debate regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in their organization, in recognition of their organizational business objectives. This approach answers to the current study's intention, which aims to promote dialogue and awareness surrounding this issue.
2. It is recommended that a policy of collaboration with employees is adopted, as this will encourage their identification with the organization's policies and better adjust organizational values to employees, strengthening their sense of belonging, trust, and commitment. This can be done in several stages: the first stage is a meeting between executives and unit heads / team leaders; the second stage is a meeting between team leaders and employees during which a discussion and dialogue is held regarding employees' crucial role in promoting organizational policies and values – with the goal of adjusting policies and values to changing conditions, implementing them, and giving “life” to the written word.
3. It is recommended to periodically conduct job analysis for various positions with the employees, in order to refresh consideration of role content, think

about improvement, and consider promotion prospects and / or mobilization if necessary, in order to raise the level of job satisfaction and enhance the quality of teamwork and organizational efficiency.

4. To pay attention to relationships in the organization and conduct activities, embedded into the annual work plan, that strengthen the connection between management and employees and among employees themselves, on a team and / or branch level as well as the organization as a whole. Thus, channels of open dialogue and cooperation will be developed, which can create a positive work environment and an organizational culture that encourages organizational citizenship behavior and mutual responsibility among employees.

5. We recommend the following for organizations in the business sector:
 - *Promoting "active listening" among employees and strengthening their organizational 'spirit'. For instance: conduct round table meetings in order to allow employees to express their opinions; perform job satisfaction surveys (examine parameters that are related to the role itself, the social climate, and the interpersonal relationships among staff and managers); utilize regular management reviews in order to bring up topics beyond keeping up with objectives, by raising open-ended questions regarding the employee's job satisfaction. It is important to analyze findings and categorize them by content in order to establish a plan of action.
 - * It is recommended to motivate and reward employees for their contribution to the organizational atmosphere and environment, and not strictly for performance and quantitative objectives, which may cultivate a competitive organizational climate.

6. We recommend the following for organizations in the public sector:
 - *Continue to deepen awareness and care for employee job satisfaction. Considering the issue of limited financial compensation, and the dynamic and changing nature of job satisfaction, a periodic investigation of factors affecting satisfaction in different organizational sectors should be conducted (e.g. according to position and age), in recognition of the fact that employees face changing conditions on an almost daily basis.

7. We recommend creating an opportunity for the employee to give to others, each according to their own personal choice and discretion, both within the organization and outside it, as part of “corporate social responsibility”; this will help employees develop a sense of fulfillment and self – efficacy, specifically within the framework of a supportive workplace.

Policy makers in educational system

Despite the limitations of qualitative research in terms of overarching conclusions, the perception of the teacher's role as one that includes tasks such as the transference of knowledge, assessment of student achievements, supervision during recess and so on, impacts educational policy and reforms such as the Dovrat Committee. When most respondents do not perceive initiating and implementing change, diversifying teaching methods, helping students and colleagues, and so on, to be part of their mandatory role requirements, it becomes clear that any educational reform must begin by implementing a new definition of the teacher’s role that introduces these tasks as obligatory aspects of the teaching profession. For instance, reforms t

Bibliography

- 1 Samuel J. Organizations, Properties, Structures and Processes. Haifa: University Press of Haifa - Zamora house, 1990.
- 2 Crossman J. Environmental and Spiritual Leadership: Tracing the Synergies from an Organizational Perspective. In: Journal of Business Ethics. 2011, 103. 4, p. 553-565.
- 3 Organ D. W. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome (1st ed.). Lexington, Massachusetts and Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1988.
- 4 Sharma J. P., Bajpai N., Holani U. Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Public and Private Sector and its Impact on Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study in Indian Perspective. In: International Journal of Business and Management, 2011, 6, 1, p. 67-75.

- 5 Schnake, M. Organizational Citizenship: A Review, Proposed Model, and Research Agenda. *Human Relations*, 1991, 44, 7, 735-759.
- 6 Dipola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools and its Relationship to School Climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 2001, 11, 424-445.
- 7 Chhokar, J.S., Zhuplev, A., Fok, L.Y., & Hatman, S.J. The Impact of Culture on Equity Sensitivity Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Five-Country Study. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 2001, 14, 1, 79-98.
- 8 Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1995, 16, 2, 127-142.
- 9 Allen, T.D., Barnard, S., Rush, M.C., & Russell, J.E.A. Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Does the Source Make a Difference? *Human Resource Management Review*, 2000, 10, 1, 97-114.
- 10 Oplatka, I. Imposed School Change and Women Teachers' Self-Renewal: A new Insight on Successful Implementation of Changes in Schools. *School Leadership and Management*, 2005, 25, 2, 171-190.
- 11 Price J. L. Handbook of Organizational Measurement. In: *International Journal of Manpower*, 1997, 18, (4/5/6), p. 305-558.
- 12 Porter L.W., Steers, R. M. Organizational, Work, and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism. In: *Psychological Bulletin*, 1973, 80, p. 17-151.
- 13 Becker H. S. Notes on the Concept of Commitment. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 1960, 66, p. 32-40.
- 14 Granot-Shlonsky L. Effect of Personal Variables, Functional and Organizational Promotion of Women to Management Positions in High Schools in

Israel. Unpublished MA thesis. In Haifa University, Department of Political Science, 1999.

15 Cole J. Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Health: The Relationship between Professional and OCB. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. In Haifa University, 2000.

16 Meyer J. P., Allen N. J. Commitment in the Work Place. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1997.

17 Vigoda E. Organizational Politics: Characteristics, Causes, and Consequences of Interpersonal Influence Processes on the Performance of Employees, the Public Administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. In Haifa University, 1997.

18 Itzhaky H. Effects of Organizational and Role Components on Job Satisfaction: A Study of Nonprofessional Women Workers. In: Administration in Social Work, 1995, 19, 3, p. 1-17.

19 Silberberg A., & Ptolemy D. Job Satisfaction: Organizations in General and the Police and Prison Service in Particular. Ramat Gan, Ziv Institute for Organizational Development, 1999.

20 Goulet L. R., Frank M. L. Organizational Commitment across Three Sectors: Public, Non-Profit, and For-Profit. In: Public Personnel Management, 2002, 31, 2, p. 201-210.

21 Weiss D. J. et al. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1967.

22 Marschke E., Preziosi R., Harrington W. J. How Sales Personnel View the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Spirituality in the Workplace. In: Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 2011, 15, 2, p. 71-84.

23 Rainey, Hal G., and Barry Bozeman. 2000. Comparing Public and Private Organizations: Empirical Research and the Power of the A Priori. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 10(2): 447-69.

- 24 Wright, Bradley E. 2001. Public-Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(4): 559–86.
- 25 Boyne, George A. 2002. Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies* 39(1): 97–122.
- 26 Perry, James L. 2000. Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2): 471–88.
- 27 Houston, David J. 2000. Public Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4):713–27.
- 28 Box, Richard C. 1999. Running Government Like a Business: Implications for Public Administration Theory and Practice. *American Review of Public Administration* 29(1): 19–43
- 29 Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367–73.
- 30 Wittmer, Dennis. 1991. Serving the People or Serving for Pay: Reward Preferences among Government, Hybrid Sector, and Business Managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 14(4): 369–83.
- 31 Newstrom, John W., William E. Reif, and Robert M. Monczka. 1976. Motivating the Public Employee: Fact vs. Fiction. *Public Personnel Management* 5(1): 67–72.
- 32 Jurkiewicz, Carole L., Tom K. Massey, Jr., and Roger G. Brown. 1998. Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 21(3): 230–50.
- 33 Khojasteh, Mak. 1993. Motivating the Private vs. Public Sector Managers. *Public Personnel Management* 22(3): 391–401.
- 34 Moon, M. Jae. 2000. Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, and Managerial Level. *Public Performance and Management Review* 24(2): 177–94.

- 35 Crewson, Philip E. 1997. Public Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499–518.
- 36 Crewson, Philip E. 1997. Public Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499–518.
- 37 Leete, Laura. 2000. Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Nonprofit and For-Profit Organizations. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 43(4): 423–46.
- 38 Houston, David J. 2000. Public Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 713–27.
- 39 Lewis, Gregory B., and Sue A. Frank. 2002. Who Wants to Work for the Government? *Public Administration Review* 62(4): 395–404.
- 40 Kihlgren, Annica L., Ingegerd Fagerberg, Kirsti Skovdahl, and Mona Kihlgren. 2003. Referrals from Home Care to Emergency Hospital Care: Basis for Decisions. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 12(1): 28–36.
- 41 Posner, Barry Z., and Warren H. Schmidt. 1996. The Values of Business and Federal Government Executives: More Different Than Alike. *Public Personnel Management* 25(3): 277–89.
- 42 Zeffane, Rachid. 1994. Patterns of Organizational Commitment and Perceived Management Style: A Comparison of Public and Private Sector Employees. *Human Relations* 47(8): 977–1010.
- 43 Buchman, Bruce. 1974a. Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 19(4): 509–32.
- 44 Rainey, Hal G. 1982. Reward Preferences among Public and Private Managers: In Search of the Service Ethic. *American Review of Public Administration* 16(4): 288–302.

- 45 Moon, M. Jae. 2000. Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, and Managerial Level. *Public Performance and Management Review* 24(2): 177–94.
- 46 Goulet, Laurel R., and Margaret L. Frank. 2002. Organizational Commitment across Three Sectors: Public, Non-Profit, and For-Profit. *Public Personnel Management* 31(2): 201–10.
- 47 Farid, Mamadouh I. 1997. Job Characteristics, Leadership, and Organizational Commitment as Perceived by Managers in the Egyptian Public and Private Sectors. *Academy of Strategic and Organizational Leadership Journal* 1(1): 20–31.
- 48 Balfour, Danny L., and Barton Wechsler. 1991. Commitment, Performance, and Productivity in Public Organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 14(4): 355–67.
- 49 Baldwin, Norman J. 1991. Public versus Private Employees: Debunking Stereotypes. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 11(1–2): 1–27.
- 50 Kline, Cathy J., and Lawrence H. Peters. 1991. Behavioral Commitment and Tenure of New Employees: A Replication and Extension. *Academy of Management Journal* 34(1): 194–204.
- 51 Cho, Kyung-Ho, and Seok-Hwan Lee. 2001. Another Look at Public–Private Distinction and Organizational Commitment: A Cultural Explanation. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* 9(1): 84–102.
- 52 Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50 (3): 367 – 73 .