

Munyae M. Mulinge

Toward an Explanation of Cross-Sector Differences in Job Satisfaction and Organisational Attachment Among Agricultural Technicians in Kenya*

Abstract

Existing research carried out mainly in industrialised nations shows that there exist variations in job satisfaction and organisational commitment across employment sectors. Utilising data from agricultural technicians employed in the public, parastatal and private sectors in Kenya, this study tests for, and attempts an explanation of, such variations. Two competing explanations, the structural and the dispositional arguments, are assessed. While the former emphasises differences in the structural features of the workplace as being accountable for variations in job satisfaction and attachment across sectors, the latter captures possible cross-sector employee differences in dispositional affectivities and work motivation due to differential selection into the sectors. The results show that private sector technicians are higher in mean job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay relative to their counterparts in the public and parastatal sectors. Structural features of work that exist across economic sectors are found to be responsible for such differences. No support is found for the dispositional argument. It is concluded that work sector is important in determining employee levels of job satisfaction and organisational attachment but it is the cross-sector differences in the structural conditions of the workplace that produce the cross-sector variations in satisfaction, commitment and intent to stay.

Introduction

The concepts of job satisfaction and organisational attachment are some of the most studied in industrial and organisational psychology and in the sociology of work and occupations. Some of such research reveals the existence of considerable variations in employee job satisfaction (Rainey, 1991; Rainey, Backoff and Levine, 1978) and organisational commitment (Welsch and La Van, 1981) across economic/employment sectors. Public sector (and not for-profit) workers are usually shown to be lower in job satisfaction and organisational commitment relative to their counterparts in the private sector. Virtually all cross-sector comparative studies, however, have focused on work

settings in relatively industrialised nations such as the United States (Cherniss, 1989; Smith and Nock, 1980) and Australia (Cacioppe and Mock, 1984) and the developing nations remain understudied.

The primary objective of this study is to contribute to the body of cross-cultural knowledge by testing for variations in job satisfaction and organisational attachment across employment sectors in Kenya and for the factors that may account for such variations. The study seeks to answer the questions: Do employees in Kenya differ in job satisfaction and attachment by employment sector? If so, what causes these differences? Closely related to this question is the subject of whether the same factors produce satisfaction and attachment among employees in different work settings. To answer these questions the study, unlike those focusing on the industrialised nations of the West, goes beyond the traditional dichotomous private-public sector comparisons to incorporate a third comparative sector; the parastatal (quasi-public) sector. With specific reference to the first question, mean differences in the levels of job satisfaction and organisational attachment are examined for the three sectors. To address the second and third questions, on the other hand, two competing explanations of cross-sector variations in satisfaction and attachment are explored. While the first of these posits sectoral differences in the structural conditions of work as being responsible for sector differences in satisfaction and attachment, the second explanation views such differences in terms of sectoral differences in the dispositional characteristics of employees.

By examining the causes of cross-sector differences in satisfaction and attachment, the study may also contribute knowledge that could become useful to management in the formulation and implementation of future workplace policies. By so doing, it could pave the way for the identification of those aspects of the various sectors for which change might be expected to improve working conditions and worker satisfaction and attachment. This is important because job satisfaction and commitment have been shown to affect important employee behaviours such as workers' performance (Larson and Fukami, 1984), absenteeism and turnover (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Price and Mueller, 1986a; Brooke, 1986), transferring (Campion and Mitchell, 1986), intent to quit (Hom, Griffith, and Sellaro, 1984; Mowday, Koberg, and McArthur, 1984) and lateness (Adler and Golan, 1981; Farrell and Robb, 1980). They have also been thought to affect productivity (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Explaining Sectoral Differences in Satisfaction and Attachment

As utilised in this study, the concept of job satisfaction refers to the degree to which an employee likes his/her job (Price and Mueller, 1986a). Organisational attachment, on the other hand, represents the degree to which employees are bound to their employing organisation (Mueller, Boyer, Price, and Iverson, 1994). It is a more general concept that subsumes the more specific concepts of organisational commitment and intent to stay (Mueller, Wallace, and Price,

1992; Mueller, et. al., 1994). While the former is defined after Allen and Meyer (1990:1) as 'the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation', the latter is defined after Halaby (1986) and Halaby and Weakliem (1989) as the employee's expected likelihood of remaining employed by the same organisation rather than seeking employment elsewhere.

As indicated earlier, this study argues for two alternative explanations of sector differences in job satisfaction and organisational attachment namely, the structural and the dispositional/selection explanations. The first of these argues that differences in the structural characteristics of the work environment are the major source of cross-sector variations in employee satisfaction and attachment while the second posits that employees with different dispositions to be satisfied or attached are differentially distributed across sectors.

The Structural Argument

Although there exists no literature that we are aware of that directly compares the processes whereby the different satisfaction and attachment levels are produced, available evidence suggests that employees in public and private sector organisations do not operate under identical work environments and, therefore, evaluate their experiences differently. Public sector jobs are judged to be deficient in intrinsically fulfilling factors such as autonomy, participation in decision making, job variety/interesting work, role clarity, task significance, feedback, and quality social relations (Graham and Hays, 1993; Cherniss and Kane, 1987; Cacioppe and Mock, 1984; Mirvis and Hackett, 1983). Public and quasi-public organisations have been associated with external and internal controls that tend to undermine employee autonomy and flexibility in decision-making. In addition, despite being high in job security and having well-developed benefit programs, public sector jobs do not offer large financial gains compared to those in the private sector (Rainey, 1991).

Public sector jobs are also characterised by a deficiency in goal clarity (Graham and Hays, 1993; Rainey, Backoff and Levine, 1978) and poor quality social relations (quality of friendship, and helpfulness and concern among subordinates, co-workers and bureaucratic superiors) (Smith and Nock, 1980). Relative to those in private sector organisations, they have been associated with greater multiplicity, vagueness/ambiguity, and conflict of goals (roles) and performance criteria than do their counterparts in private sector organisations. Such characteristics may cause employee frustration (Gortner, 1977) and interfere with the individual's perception of his/her role. On the contrary, goals and policies in the private sector are usually internally determined and could be internally voided or altered if considered to be inappropriate. Public sector (white collar) workers have also been found to be less likely to consider their superiors as helpful, their co-workers as interested in them, and to see the

results of their work (Smith and Nock, 1980). These factors have been found to negatively affect satisfaction and attachment.

In the developing countries, the public and private sector work settings have also been demonstrated. Significant differences have been shown to exist in terms of compensation (pay and non-salary benefits), the working environment and career development schemes (Ozgediz, 1986; Central Bureau of Statistics, Kenya, 1986; Heller and Tait, 1982). According to Ozgediz, (1986), public service compensation systems may be adequate for lower level staff but not for qualified high level professionals and this has made the public sector the private sectors' training ground for young professionals in most developing countries. That is, young professionals join the public sector to gain the work experience that most private sector establishments require of most aspiring employees (Ozgediz, 1986). Differences such as those cited here provide support for this study's interest in comparing the job satisfaction and organisational commitment levels of employees in public, semi-public, and private organisations in a developing country, Kenya.

Based on the structural argument, it is differences (such as those reported above) in the structural features of the workplace and, therefore, in the conditions of work experienced by employees operating in different sectors that account for variations in job satisfaction and attachment across sectors. Employees in public (and parastatal) sector work environments are thus likely to experience less job satisfaction and organisational attachment relative to their private sector counterparts because of the inadequacy of intrinsically fulfilling factors (Mirvis and Hackett, 1983). Consistent with this position, the following hypotheses are derived for testing by this study:

- Hypothesis 1: Agricultural technicians working in the public and semi-public sectors are low in job satisfaction and organisational attachment relative to their counterparts in the private sector.
- Hypothesis 2: The differences across sectors in structural features of work – that is, differences in autonomy, job variety, job stress, upward communication, professional growth, formalisation, pay, and fringe benefits – result in employee differences in job satisfaction and organisation attachment.

In this study, the following job characteristics are considered to be structural factors that may account for differences in satisfaction and attachment across sectors. Participation in decision making, autonomy, upward communication, professional growth, routinisation (task variety), task significance, supervisory support, co-worker support, work group cohesion, workload, role ambiguity, resource adequacy, socialisation practices, distributive justice, pay, fringe benefits, promotional opportunity, job security, legitimacy, formalisation, and grievance procedures. The definitions of all of these variables are presented in Appendix I.

The Dispositional/Selection Argument

Although the bulk of the existing empirical literature about cross-sector variations in satisfaction and attachment supports the structural argument as the major explanation of such differences, a major competing explanation is the dispositional argument. Broadly speaking, the dispositional argument posits that employees bring particular dispositions to the workplace that directly affect the degree of their job satisfaction and organisational attachment. A disposition is a relatively stable orientation or tendency to think in a particular way and exists prior to entering/experiencing the employment environment. In this study three types of employee dispositional factors are of interest. These are the employee personality traits of positive affectivity and negative affectivity and work motivation.

Concerning the two affectivities, the dispositional argument posits two types of employees: those who are generally optimistic and cheerful and the chronic grouches, doomsayers and complainers. The former are said to be positively affective and the latter negatively affective. Positively affective employees are characterised by traits such as being interested, friendly, and joyful (Watson, Pennebaker, and Folger, 1987) and tend to be more satisfied. Negatively affective employees, on the other hand, are associated with such characteristics as being afraid, angry, and ashamed (Watson and Clark, 1984) and tend to be more dissatisfied. These two forms of relatively stable employee personality traits are well supported in the theoretical and empirical literature (Brief, Burke, Atieh, Robinson, and Webster, 1988; Staw, Bell, and Clausen, 1986).

Employees entering a workplace could also be differentially motivated. Work motivation, or the degree to which work is considered a central part of one's life, entails the internalisation of work-related values. Employees who are characterised by work motivation view hard work to be intrinsically good and an end in itself (Kanungo, 1982). New employees are likely to enter an organisation with differing work related values such as a belief in the protestant ethic and the belief in work as a central life interest (Dubin, Champoux, and Porter, 1975; Dubin and Goldman; 1972). These values are moulded through the individual's upbringing and early socialisation. The holder of the Protestant work ethic is said to be committed to the values of hard work, to the work itself as an objective, and to the work organisation as the inevitable structure within which those internalised values can be satisfied (Weber, 1947). Being positive about work as a central part of life will translate into satisfaction with the tasks of the job and the profession, and attachment to the organisation which is the source of the job tasks.

As applied to cross-sector variations in satisfaction and attachment, the dispositional argument captures possible selection differences by sectors. Because it is possible that the employees of the three sectors studied here were differentially selected into these sectors, differences observed in employee job

satisfaction and organisational attachment reflect their differences in dispositional affectivities and work motivation rather than differences in the actual conditions of work. Since the pool of employees to be studied was not randomly distributed across sectors, it is possible that employees selected into a particular sector may be those characterised by a particular personality trait or other predispositional characteristics that are related to job satisfaction and attachment. This would lead to different sectors having employees who are differentially predisposed to be more or less satisfied or attached. For instance, it is possible that positively oriented and (work) motivated employees self-select, or are often hired into the private sector. The differences in the level of job satisfaction and attachment to the organisation for such employees could thus have resulted from such factors rather than from the structural differences in the work environment itself.

Based on the dispositional explanation of cross-sector variations in job satisfaction and organisational attachment the following hypothesis will be tested:

- Hypothesis 3: Cross-sector employee differences in dispositional factors (positive affectivity, negative affectivity, and work motivation) result in differences in job satisfaction and organisation attachment across the sectors.

Control Variables

The study will also control for a set of demographic variables including education, gender, and tenure. These are often referred to as 'correlates'. They may be correlated with satisfaction and attachment and the theoretical concepts specified in the structural and dispositional arguments that are posited to account for these variations. In addition, the study controls for specific training and previous employee movement across sectors. The latter will be represented by three dummies as follows, *MoveN*, *MoveU*, and *MoveD*. While the first dummy indicates no previous changes in employment sector, the second denotes movement from a lower level to a higher level organisation; that is, from the public to the parastatal and private sectors, or from the parastatal sector to the private sector. The third dummy, on the other hand, represents changes in employment sector from a higher level to a lower level organisation; that is, from the private sector to the parastatal and public sectors, or from the parastatal sector to the public sector. The definitions of all the control variables are also presented in Appendix I.

The Setting for the Study

The sample analysed by this study comprises of individuals who are formally trained in agriculture or in an agriculturally-related field such as plant breeding, horticulture, agronomy, plant pathology, entomology, and soil conservation. These, herein referred to as agricultural technicians were either engaged in edu-

cating farmers about better farming techniques, commonly referred to as extension services, or in agricultural research. They worked in one of three workplace settings: the public sector, the parastatal (semi-public) sector or the private sector.

Public sector organisations are defined as those that are totally owned and controlled by the government. They provide services to the public at no user charges. They mainly take the form of government ministries. Public sector organisations are monopolistic in nature (Gortner, 1977; Graham and Hays, 1993). That is, they provide services for which consumers have no alternative. In this study the public sector refers to the Ministry of Agriculture, the leading employer of agricultural technicians in Kenya. Agricultural technicians studied for the public sector served as extension personnel in the District Agricultural Extension Services branch of the national Division of Agricultural Education. Their duties included informing farmers about new innovations, demonstrating to them how to adopt and properly utilise the new innovations, and making follow-up visits to monitor the adoption rate and success in the utilisation of the technology.

Parastatal organisations, on the other hand, refer to semi-autonomous government monopolies (Graham and Hays, 1993) established through legislative authority with the primary goal to offer government controlled services such as power and lighting, telephone and postal services, and research (or technical knowledge and innovations) to the public. Their major sources of funding are rates and commissions. In Kenya these are mainly funded through government grants or private donor grants channelled through the government. The agricultural technicians analysed for the parastatal sector work setting was employed by the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) as researchers. KARI, the largest parastatal organisation in Kenya, was established in 1979 to conduct research in agriculture, as well as in numerous related areas. The organisation is made up of seven national centres, five regional centres and eleven sub-centres. Each KARI centre is headed by a director and is populated by technicians who are organised into research teams headed by a lead scientist/researcher. Each research team has responsibility for a designated area such as plant breeding or developing seed varieties.

Finally, the study defines private sector organisations as businesses, both small and corporations, that are primarily dependent on the economic market for financial support and for survival (Fottler, 1981). These operate in a relatively competitive market in which customers have a choice and may even refuse to accept the products and/or services of one organisation in favour of those from another organisation that more satisfactorily meets their needs (Gortner, 1977). Four private sector organisations – British American Tobacco (BAT) Kenya Limited, Brooke Bond Kenya Limited, Kenya Breweries Limited, and East African Industries Limited – were studied. These are subsidiaries of multinational corporations based in Europe and North America.

The Kenya government still plays a major role in regulating labour relations across employment sectors in the country. The arbitration process occurs in an industrial court that is highly controlled by the executive branch of government. Also the government wields considerable control over labour movements in the private sector. These facts, however, do not necessarily suggest the existence of uniform workplace conditions in the public, parastatal and private sectors. Certain differences that characterise the three sectors are likely to lead to differences not just in workplace conditions but also in employee job satisfaction and attachment. For instance, the three sectors are likely to pursue different styles of management. The private sector (and, to some extent the parastatal sector) are productivity driven and effectiveness is measured in terms of tangible results in the forms of profits or certain products. As such, closer supervision and a team approach are likely to be emphasised. The public sector, on the contrary, is service oriented and performance can only be measured in terms of satisfied clients and supervision is likely to be very relaxed and in some cases may only exist in principle. In addition, pay and fringe benefits are certainly highest in the private for profit sector. Other notable differences between the three sectors include job security and the levels of unionisation. The former is highest in the public sector and lowest in the private sector. Concerning the latter, public and parastatal sector employees in Kenya do not enjoy union representation but their counterparts in the private sector are allowed to join trade unions. Finally, the existence of low morale among (extension) workers in public agricultural sector employment relative to those in private sector agricultural employment has either been alluded to (Dodge, 1977; Nsereko, 1979; La-Anyane, 1985; Republic of Kenya, 1989:127), or demonstrated (Leonard, 1977) in some limited cases. This provides further testimony to the possible existence of variations in satisfaction and attachment across employment sectors in Kenya.

Data and Methods

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to 1,850 agricultural technicians spread across the three sectors studied as follows: Public sector, 1,102 respondents; parastatal sector, 503 respondents; and private sector, 245 respondents. The overall response rate for the study was 78.22% (1447 cases). Listwise deletion for missing data, however, reduced the sample analysed to 1211 cases. All variables (both dependent and independent) with the exception of pay and fringe benefits are measured using multiple item Likert type scale with five response points. Most of the scales have been widely used in previous studies (see e.g., Agho, 1989; Allen and Meyer, 1990; Mottaz, 1988) and have been judged to have acceptable validity and reliability. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the measures used in this study. From the table it is evident that the Cronbach's alpha for the variables ranged from .65 to .90 with an average of .81. Regression estimates of the zero-order correlation among the

latent constructs in the study, on the other hand, showed none of the correlations to approach the .80 multicollinearity criterion put forth by Asher (1983).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Scale	Number of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Alpha
Endogenous Orientations:					
Intention to stay	4	3.86	0.75	1-5	.75
Organisational Commitment	4	3.80	0.77	1-5	.78
Job Satisfaction	4	3.78	0.87	1-5	.86
Exogenous Variables:					
Decision Making	3	1.99	0.89	1-5	.76
Autonomy	3	3.12	1.05	1-5	.85
Upward Communication	3	3.36	1.02	1-5	.82
Supervisory Support	3	3.66	0.75	1-5	.74
Co-worker Support	3	3.72	0.80	1-5	.82
Work Group Cohesion	3	3.64	0.74	1-5	.77
Promotional Opportunity	4	2.71	1.00	1-5	.84
Professional Growth	3	3.38	1.09	1-5	.83
Job Security	3	3.86	0.83	1-5	.81
Legitimacy	4	2.96	1.07	1-5	.86
Formalisation	2	3.39	1.05	1-5	.82
Grievance Procedures	3	3.05	0.89	1-5	.65
Routinisation	3	2.73	1.06	1-5	.90
Task Significance	3	4.18	0.69	1-5	.72
Distributive Justice	4	2.74	1.02	1-5	.88
Pay	1	6168.05	4812.10	500-30000	—
Fringe Benefits	1	5.78	1.82	1-12	—
Work Load	3	2.75	1.07	1-5	.87
Role Ambiguity	3	1.68	0.69	1-5	.76
Role Conflict	3	2.50	0.84	1-5	.73
Resource Adequacy	3	2.95	1.04	1-5	.74
Socialisation Practices	3	3.37	1.06	1-5	.88
Positive Affectivity	3	3.31	0.94	1-5	.83
Negative Affectivity	3	2.51	0.93	1-5	.83
Work Motivation	3	4.07	0.73	1-5	.74
Education	1	13.87	2.10	7-22	—
Gender	1	0.27	0.44	0-1	—
Tenure	1	9.96	7.37	1-37	—
Firm Specific Training	4	2.72	1.06	1-5	.87
MoveN	1	.77	.42	0-1	—
MoveU	1	.21	.40	0-1	—
MoveD	1	.02	.15	0-1	—

To test for sector differences in job satisfaction and attachment, the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with Scheffe's test is utilised. To get adjusted means that are utilised to test for the effects of the structural variables and employee predispositions, however, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) is used.

Results

Table 2 presents the mean differences in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay for the three sectors. From the table it is evident that mean job satisfaction is highest in the private and is lowest in the public sector. Mean commitment and intention to stay are also highest in the private sector, but lowest in the semi-public sector. Tests of significance for group means using One-way ANOVA with the Scheffe test showed the private sector to be significantly different from both the semi-public and public sectors in mean satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay. No significant differences were found between employees in the public and semi-public sectors. Specifically, agricultural technicians in the private sector are more satisfied, more committed, and have higher intention of staying with their employer relative to their counterparts in the parastatal and public sectors. This finding is consistent with the study's first hypothesis.

Table 2: Mean Satisfaction, Commitment, and Intention to Stay by Sector

Variable	Employment Sector		
	Private	Semi-public	Public
Intention to stay	16.20	15.13	14.81
Organisational Commitment	16.20	14.77	15.00
Job Satisfaction	16.02	15.11	15.47

To test the argument that the differences in satisfaction and attachment are mainly due to the differences in the structural features of the work environment, we performed multiple regression analysis with dummy variables for the sector and structural variables as controls. This allows for obtaining adjusted means by sector and is consistent with the argument in the literature that employees in different sectors operate under distinctive work environments in terms of the structural factors/dimensions of the workplace. The results from the analysis are presented in Table 3. From the table, it is evident that controlling for the structural factors of the work environment removed the public sector effect on satisfaction. The adjusted mean satisfaction for public sector technicians was 3.75 and was not significantly different from that of the private sector technicians of 3.73. The adjusted mean satisfaction for the parastatal sec-

tor, however, emerged to be significantly higher relative to the private sector. Its value was 3.87 and was significant at $p < .10$. The table also shows that controlling for structural variables removed the sector effect on both commitment and intention to stay. No significant differences in adjusted means in the above employee orientations was observed for both the public and the parastatal sectors relative to the private sector.

Table 3: Adjusted Means in Satisfaction, Commitment and Intent to Stay By Sector^{*1}

Category of Variables Parastatal	Satisfaction		Commitment			Intent to Stay		
	Private	Public	Para- statal	Private	Public	Para- statal	Pri- vate	Pub- lic
Structural Variables	3.727	3.752	3.872*	3.652	3.572	3.612		
Dispositional Variables	4.022	3.724***	3.761***	4.117	3.768***	3.666***		
Structural + Dispositional Variables	3.525	3.520	3.627	3.882	3.768	3.795		
Control Variables	4.066	3.646***	3.876**	4.149	3.685***	3.796***		
All Variables Combined	3.786	3.750	3.845	3.910	3.751**	3.809		

The second step in the analysis involved testing the dispositional explanation of sector differences in satisfaction and attachment. This involved controlling for the three employee predispositions identified earlier. Results from this procedure showed that controlling for employee dispositions separately failed to eliminate the sector effect on satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay. As evident from Table 3 both the public and parastatal sectors remained significantly lower in mean satisfaction, commitment, and intent to stay relative to the private sector (see Table for adjusted mean values).

The third step in the analysis involved combining both the structural and dispositional variables in a single equation. As shown in Table 3, controlling for structural and dispositional variables simultaneously eliminated the sector effects on satisfaction, commitment and intention to stay. No significant differences in adjusted mean values (see Table 3) in all the above employee orientations were realized for both the public and parastatal sectors relative to the private sector. This procedure, in fact, suggested that employee dispositions are related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay but the relationship had been suppressed when they were controlled for separately.

Because of the possibility that certain employee demographic characteristics may be correlated with the theoretical concepts specified in the structural and dispositional arguments that are posited to account for the variations in satisfaction and attachment across the sectors, it was considered desirable to control for them. This was carried out in two stages. First, we estimated a regression equation that combined a list of control variables with the sector dummies. The outcome was similar to that realised with dispositional factors.

The analysis failed to remove the sector effects on satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay. The adjusted mean values in satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay for both the public and parastatal sectors remained significantly lower relative to the private sector.

The second stage of the analysis utilising control variables involved estimating a regression equation in which structural, dispositional and control variables were entered together. Based on the analysis, the sector effects on job satisfaction and intention to stay were wiped out. No significant differences in adjusted mean values in these employee orientations were realised between both the public and parastatal sectors and the private sector. For organisational commitment, however, public sector technicians remained significantly lower than those in the private sector in the same. Those in the parastatal sector, on the other hand, were not significantly different in commitment from their private sector counterparts.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study was carried out with two major goals. First we wanted to establish whether (agricultural) technicians differ in terms of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay by sector of employment. Second, we sought to explain the causes of such variations by pitting the structural argument against the dispositional argument. The major findings of the study are discussed below in light of these goals.

Based on the findings of this study, private sector technicians are higher in mean job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay relative to their counterparts in both the public and the parastatal sectors. This finding supports the study's first hypothesis that agricultural technicians working in the public and semi-public sectors are low in job satisfaction and organisational attachment relative to their counterparts in the private sector. Generally speaking, it is also consistent with the existing literature. Attempts to explain the differences in satisfaction and attachment showed a combination of structural variables to be mainly responsible for them. Consistent with hypothesis 2 of the study, it was found that it is the differences in the structural features of work that obtain across economic sectors that account for variations in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay among agricultural technicians. In addition, it was shown that employee differences in dispositional characteristics did not account for the differences in satisfaction and attachment observed across employment sectors. Hence, no support was found for the study's third hypothesis that employee differences in dispositional factors result in differences in job satisfaction and organisational attachment. Combining both the structural and the dispositional factors, however, removed the sector effects on satisfaction, commitment, and intent to stay and this tended to suggest that the relationship between employee dispositions

and the above employee orientations had been suppressed when these were controlled for separately.

The analysis was also expanded to encompass a set of demographic and other control variables. Like the dispositional variables, these control variables were not supported as independently causing the observed differences in satisfaction and attachment among agricultural technicians working in the public, parastatal, and private sectors. When these were analysed alone, the private sector technicians still emerged to be higher in satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay than their counterparts in both the public and the parastatal sectors.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the study's findings. First, that the sector one works for is important in determining the levels of job satisfaction and organisational attachment one is likely to attain. For the agricultural technician, being in the private sector is more likely to lead to higher job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to stay than being in either the public or the parastatal sectors. Second, that it is mainly the cross-sector differences in the structural conditions of the workplace that produce the cross-sector variations in satisfaction and attachment. This is consistent with the view advanced in the literature that employees in different sectors do not operate under identical work environments. Rather, they are confronted with considerable variations in the structural conditions of work.

Notes:

1. Private sector is the omitted category.

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .00$

References

- Adler, S. and J. Golan. 1981. 'Lateness as a Withdrawal Behavior', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66: pp. 544-554.
- Agho, A. O. 1989. 'The Determinants of Employee Job Satisfaction: *An Empirical Test of a Causal Model*', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa City, University of Iowa.
- Allen, N. J. and J. D. Meyer. 1990. 'The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63: pp. 1-18.
- Asher, H. B. 1983. *Causal Model*, Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Application in the Social Sciences, No. 07-033, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Becker, G. S. 1962. 'Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis', *The Journal of Political Economy*, 70 (5): pp. 9-49.
- Brief, A. P., M. J. Burke, J. M. Atieh, B. S. Robinson, and J. Webster. (1986). 'Should Negative Affectivity Remain an Unmeasured Variable in the Study of Job Stress?', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73 (2): pp. 193-198.

- Brooke, P. P., Jr. 1986. 'A Causal Model of Employee Absenteeism', unpublished doctoral dissertation, the university of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Cacioppe, R. and P. Mock. 1984. 'A Comparison of Quality of Work Experience in Government and Private Organisations', *Human Relations*, 37: pp. 923-940.
- Campion, M.A. and M. M. Mitchell. 1986. 'Management Turnover: Experiential Differences Between Fairness and Current Managers', *Personnel Psychology*, 39: pp. 57-69.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, Kenya. 1986. *Economic Survey*, Government Printers, Nairobi.
- Cherniss, C. 1989. 'Career Stability in Public Service Professionals: A Longitudinal Investigation Based on Biographic Interviews', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17: pp. 399-422.
- Cherniss, C. and J. S. Kane. 1987. 'Public Sector Professionals: Job Characteristics, Satisfaction and Aspirations for Intrinsic Fulfillment Through Work', *Human Relations*, 40: pp. 125-137.
- Dodge, D. J. 1977. *Agricultural Policy and Performance in Zambia: History, Prospects, and Proposals for Change*, Research Series #32, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.
- Dubin, R. and D. R. Goldman. 1972. 'Central Life Interests of American Middle Managers and Specialists', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 2: pp. 133-141.
- Dubin, R., J. E. Champoux, and L. W. Porter. W. 1975. 'Central Life Interests and Organisational Commitment of Blue-Collar Clerical Workers', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20: pp. 411-421.
- Farrell, D. and D. L. Robb. 1980. 'Lateness to Work: A Study of Withdrawal from Work,' paper presented at the annual meeting of the academy of management, Detroit.
- Freeman, R. B. and J. L. Medoff. 1984. *What Do Unions Do?* Basic Books, New York.
- Fottler, M. D. 1981. 'Is Management Really Generic?', *Academy of Management Review*, 6 (1): pp. 1-12.
- Gortner, H. F. 1977. *Administration in the Public Sector*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Graham, C. B. Jr. and S. W. Hays. 1993. *Managing the Public Organisation* (2nd. edition). CQ Press: Washington D.C.
- Hackman, J.R. and G. R. Oldham. 1975. 'Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: pp. 151-170.
- _____. 1980. *Work Redesign*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Halaby, C. N. 1986. 'Worker attachment and workplace authority', *American Sociological Review*, 51: pp. 634-49.
- Halaby, C. N. and D. Weakliem. 1989. 'Worker Control and Attachment to the Firm', *American Journal of Sociology*, 95: pp. 549-591.

- Heller, P. and A. Tait. 1982. 'Government Employment and Pay'. *Some International Comparisons*, International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.
- Hom, P. W., R. W. Griffeth, and C. L. Sellaro. 1984. 'The Validity of Mobley's (1977) Model of Employment Turnover', *Organisational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34: pp. 141-174.
- Homans, G. D. 1961. *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Form*, Harcourt: Brace and World, New York.
- Ivancevich, J. M., A. D. Szlagyi Jr., and M. Wallace. Jr. 1977. *Organisational Behavior and Performance*, Goodyear Publishing Company Inc, Sante Monica, California.
- Kahn, R. L., D. Wolfe, and J. Schoek. 1964. *Organisational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*, Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Kanungo, R. N. 1982. *Work Alienation*, Praeger, New York.
- Katz, D. and R. L. Kahn. 1978. *Social Psychology of Organisations*, Wiley, New York.
- La-Anyane, S. 1985. *Economics of Agricultural Development in Tropical Africa*, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Chichester.
- Larson, E.W. and C. V. Fukami. 1985. 'Employee Absenteeism: The Role of Ease of Movement', *Academy of Management Journal*, 28: pp. 464-471.
- Leonard, D. K. 1977. *Reaching the Peasant Farmer: Organisational Theory and Practice in Kenya*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Mangelsdorff, A.D. 1989. 'A Cross-Validation Study of Factors Affecting Military Psychologists' Decision to Remain in Service: The 1984 Military Psychologists' Survey', *Military Psychology*, 1: pp. 241-251.
- Mathieu, J. E. and D. M. Zajac. 1990. 'A Review of Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organisational Commitment', *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (2): pp. 171-194.
- Mirvis, P. H. and E. J. Hackett. 1983. 'Work and Workforce Characteristics in the Non-profit Sector', *Monthly Labour Review*, 106: pp. 3-12.
- Mottaz, C. 1988. 'Work satisfaction among hospital nurses', *Hospital and Health Services Administration*, 33: pp. 57-74.
- _____. 1985. 'The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3): pp. 365-385.
- Mowday, R.T., C. S. Koberg, and A. W. McArthur. 1984. 'The Psychology of the Withdrawal Process: A Cross-Validation Test of Mobley's Intermediate Linkages Model of Turnover in Two Samples', *Academy of Management Journal*, 27: pp. 79-94.
- Mowday, R. T., L. Porter, and R. Steers, R. 1982. *Employee-Organisation Linkages*, Academic Press, New York.
- Mueller, C. W., E. Boyer, J. L. Price, and R. Iverson. 1994. 'Employee Attachment and Noncoercive Conditions of Work: The Case of Dental Hygienists', *Work and Occupation*, 21: pp. 179-212.

- Mueller, C.W., J. Wallace, and J. L. Price. 1992. 'Employee Commitment: Resolving Some Issues', *Work and Occupations*, 19: pp. 211-236.
- Mulinge, M. M. 1994. *Job Satisfaction and Organisational Attachment Among Agricultural Professionals in Kenya*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Nsereko, J. 1979. *Selected Causes of Agricultural Problems in a Peasant Society with Examples from Uganda*, Kenya Literature Bureau, Nairobi.
- Ozgediz, S. 1986. 'Managing the Public Service in Developing Countries: *Issues and Prospects*', World Bank staff working papers number 583, management and development series number 10, the World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Price, J. L. and C. W. Mueller. 1986a. *Absenteeism and Turnover Among Hospital Employees*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
- _____. 1986b. *Handbook of Organisational Measurement*, Pittman Publishing, Marshfield, MA.
- Rainey, H. G. 1991. *Understanding and Managing Public Organisations*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Rainey, H., R. W. Backoff, and C. H. Levine. 1978. 'Comparing Public and Private Organisations', *Public Administration Review*, 36: pp. 223-244.
- Republic of Kenya. 1989. *National Development Plan 1989-93*, Government Printers, Nairobi.
- Robinson, J. P., R. Athanasiou, and K. B. Head. 1969. *Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupation Characteristics*. Survey Research Center, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann-Arbor.
- Smith, M. D and S. L. Nock. 1980. 'Social Class and the Quality of Work Life in Public and Private Organisations', *Journal of Social Issues*, 36(4): pp. 59-75.
- Staw, B. M., N. E. Bell and J. A. Clausen. 1986. 'The Dispositional Approach to Job Attitudes: A Lifetime Longitudinal Test', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: pp. 56-77.
- Watson, D. and L. A. Clark. 1984. 'Negative Affectivity: The Disposition to Experience Aversive Emotional States', *Psychological Bulletin*, 96: pp. 465-490.
- Watson, D., J. W. Pennebaker and R. Folger. 1987. 'Beyond Negative Affectivity: Measuring Stress and Satisfaction in the Workplace', *Journal of Organisational Behavior Management*, 8(2) : pp. 141-157.
- Weber, M. 1947. *Theory of Social and Economic Organisations* [Translated by A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons], Free Press, New York.
- Welsch, H. D. and H. La Van. 1981. 'Inter-Relations Between Organisational Commitment and Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Professional Behavior, and Organisational Climate', *Human Relations*, 34 (12): pp. 1079-1089.

Appendix 1

Definitions of Endogenous and Exogenous Variables

Variable	Definition
Exogenous Variables:	
Intent to Stay	is the degree to which the employee plans/wants to stay with the organisation (Halaby, 1986).
Organisational Commitment	is the degree of the employee's identification with, and involvement in, a particular organisation (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982).
Job Satisfaction	is the degree to which an employee likes his/her job (Price and Mueller, 1986a).
Exogenous Variables:	
1. Structural Factors:	
Participation in Decision Making	is the extent of the employee involvement in the adoption of major policy decisions that affect the organisation and its workers (Mulinge, 1994).
Autonomy	is the degree to which employees are afforded substantial freedom, independence, and discretion by their job in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying out the job (Hackman and Oldham, 1975).
Upward Communication	is the degree to which an employee is able to transmit information up the organisation's hierarchy (Mulinge, 1994).
Supervisory Support	is the degree to which supervisors are, friendly, helpful, and supportive in job related matters (Mottaz, 1985).
Co-worker Support	is the degree to which co-workers are friendly, helpful, and supportive in job related matters (Mottaz, 1985).
Work Group Cohesion	is the degree to which employees of an organisation form close informal relations in their immediate work units (Price and Mueller, 1986b)
Promotional Opportunity	is the chance for vertical occupational mobility within the organisational hierarchy (Price and Mueller, 1986a).
Professional Growth	is the extent to which an organisation provides the employee with the opportunity to increase work-related skills and knowledge (Mangelsdorff, 1989).

Job Security	is the degree to which an employee is guaranteed his/her job (Leonard, 1977).
Legitimacy	is the degree to which the governance practices in the organisation are socially approved by the employees (Halaby, 1986).
Formalisation	is the degree to which the norms of an organisation are explicitly formulated (Price and Mueller, 1986b).
Grievance Procedures	is the extent to which appeal procedures are available to employees to air their grievances (Freeman and Medoff, 1984).
Routinisation	is the degree to which an employee's job performance is repetitive (Hackman and Oldham, 1975).
Task significance	is the degree to which an individual's role contributes significantly to the overall organisational work process (Hackman and Oldham, 1980).
Distributive Justice	is the degree to which rewards and punishments are related to performance inputs (Homans, 1961).
Pay	is the (monthly) wages and salaries which employees receive for their services to the organisation (Mulinge, 1994).
Fringe Benefits	are the discretionary nonmonetary and monetary payments other than direct wages or salaries that workers get from their jobs (Ivancevich, Szlagyi, and Wallace, 1977).
Workload	is the degree to which activities are distributed among employees.
Role Ambiguity	is the degree to which there is a discrepancy between the amount of information a person receives and the amount necessary to perform the role adequately (Kahn, Wolfe, and Schoek, 1964).
Role Conflict	is the degree to which incompatible demands are made upon an individual by two or more persons whose jobs are functionally interdependent with that of the individual (Kahn, et. al., 1964).
Resource Inadequacy	is the degree of insufficiency in the resources that are necessary for the employee to execute duties with the minimum of discomfort (La-Anyane, 1985).
Socialisation Practices	is the degree to which employing organisations display institutionalised procedures for

familiarising/acquainting (new) employees with the workings of the organisation (Mulinge, 1994).

2. Employee Dispositions:

- Positive Affectivity is the degree to which one feels enthusiastic across time and situation (Watson, Pennebaker, and Folger, 1987).
 Negative Affectivity is the degree to which one feels dissatisfaction across time and situation (Watson and Clark, 1984).
 Work Motivation is the degree to which employees are in general willing to work (Robinson, Athanasiou and Head, 1969).

3. Control Variables:

- Education refers to the highest level of formal schooling or training an individual has had.
 Gender refers to the sex role of the individual.
 Tenure refers to the individual's length of service in the organisation.
 Firm Specific Training is the degree to which the occupational socialisation of an employee equips him/her with the ability to only increase the productivity of the firm providing it (Becker, 1962).
 Sector Movement refers to employee previous changes in employment sector.

Dr. Munyae M. Mulinge
Department of Sociology
University of Botswana
Private Bag 0022
Gaborone, Botswana
Phone: 267-3552766 [W]
267-307775 [H]
E-mail: mulingem@mopipi.ub.bw

* This research was supported by a Rockefeller Foundation African Dissertation Internship Award.