

Sectoral Differences in Value Congruence and Job Attitudes: The Case of Nursing Home Employees

Ting Ren

Received: 20 April 2010 / Accepted: 3 February 2012 / Published online: 20 February 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Abstract Drawing on a survey of nursing staff of nursing homes in a Midwestern state in the United States, the study examines how the relationships between employee–organization value congruence and job attitudes vary between nonprofit and for-profit organizational types. Statistical comparison of the levels of employee value congruence and job attitudes does not suggest significant difference between the two types of employees. Although value congruence is found positively associated with nursing home employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and negatively associated with intent to quit, consistent with prior research, the difference in the magnitude of the relationships between the two types of employees is not found. These findings suggest inconsistency with conventional wisdom of profiling employee value according to organizational ownership type.

Keywords For-profit organizations · Job attitudes · Nonprofit organizations · Nursing homes · Sectoral difference · Value congruence

Organizations are complex systems consisting of individuals with different goals and interests. The alignment between employees’ interests and that of the organization, along with the consequences of this alignment on individual behavior and organizational performance, has been among the major foci in organizational studies. Particularly, the concept of person–organization value congruence has drawn substantial scholarly attention during the past several decades,

and research on the consequences of value congruence has exuberated. In general, person–organization value congruence has been found to exert profound effects on individuals’ attitudes, behaviors, and performance (O’Reilly and Chatman 1986; Schneider 1987; Kristof 1996; Verquer et al. 2003; Kristof-Brown et al. 2005).

People also belong to organizations of different ownership type. The value systems shared by organizational members may be similar within but distinct across sectoral boundary (Rothschild and Milofsky 2006). Therefore, how this kind of belonging impacts the value-attitude and value-behavior relationships is another question of interest. The ownership impact on employees’ attitudes and behaviors can be substantial given the fact that in the United States alone nonprofit organizations have already employed nearly 10% of the total workforce (Ben-Ner 2006). The ownership effect thus sheds light on the understanding of the relationship between employee value system and job attitudinal and behavioral outcomes.

The nursing homes provide a unique industry setting for the examination of the research question, because of the coexistence of for-profit, nonprofit, and public types of nursing home competing in the same market, advocating different organizational objectives, missions, and values. The present study examines how the relationships between person–organization value congruence and employee job attitudes vary between employees working for nonprofit and for-profit nursing homes, instrumented by a survey of nursing staff of nursing homes in a Midwestern state in the United States.

Value Congruence and Job Attitudes

Personal values are defined as the enduring beliefs desirable by the person and help the person to form a specific

T. Ren (✉)
HSBC Business School, Peking University,
University Town, Shenzhen 518055, China
e-mail: renting@szpku.edu.cn

mode of behavior and end-states of existence underlying the person's attitudinal and behavioral processes (Rokeach 1973; Connor and Becker 1974). People learn values through social connections, such as parents, teachers, peers, and significant others, and modify values on the basis of experience (Krau 1989; Wijting et al. 1978). The socially held values system is shared by members of the group, the organization, the community, the society, the cultural context, and is usually abided by the members voluntarily (Kluckhohn 1951; Rokeach 1973).

Within organizations, the interplay of organizational values and personal values is an important issue. Although organizational values are multifaceted including instrumental, cognitive, and affective dimensions (Elizur 1984; Sagie et al. 1996; Meglino and Ravlin 1998), the core of the values system is reflected in the broadly defined organizational goals and missions, which are not tied to specific or measurable outcomes but serve as the primary guidance for individual behavior at work (March and Simon 1958; Rokeach 1968; Chatman 1989; Vancouver and Schmitt 1991). Organizational goals and missions reflect the values and commitments of the founders and leaders of the organization (Schein 1985), and to some extent, the people who make up the organization (Schneider 1975). The present study focuses on the goal and mission elements of values.

Individual values and organizational values are connected through the concept of "person–organization value congruence" that affects individual behaviors and organizational activities. The person–organization value congruence is the situation where there is a match between individual members' values and organizational values (Chatman 1989, 1991). Schneider's (1987) attraction–selection–attrition (ASA) model describes the formation of person–organization value congruence: individual employees are attracted to (self-selection) and recruited by (selection) the organization with which they are sharing similar goals and values as their own. They are willing to stay with the organization, and those who do not share similar values system will leave the organization through attrition.

Prior research has demonstrated that value congruence between individual members and the organization has profound impacts on various aspects of individual job attitudes, behaviors, and performance (e.g., Kochan et al. 1976; O'Reilly and Chatman 1986; Schneider 1987; Kristof 1996; Verquer et al. 2003; Kristof-Brown et al. 2005; Hoffman and Woehr 2006). Evidence has shown that person–organization value congruence positively influences employees' job satisfaction (Chatman 1991; O'Reilly et al. 1991; Bretz and Judge 1994), satisfaction with leaders (Meglino et al. 1991), organizational commitment (Meglino et al. 1989; O'Reilly et al. 1991), extra-role behavior and contextual performance

(Goodman and Svyantek 1999), and career success (Bretz and Judge 1994), but associates negatively with employees' job stress (Posner et al. 1985), intend to quit (Vancouver and Schmitt 1991), and actual turnover (Chatman 1991; O'Reilly et al. 1991).

However, very few studies have been conducted to examine the difference in the relationship between value congruence and attitudinal outcomes across types of employees working for different organizations divided by ownership status. The present study specifically examines the difference across organizational ownership types. There are various important individual attitudinal outcomes among which the present study focuses on job satisfaction as a general indicator of employees' overall psychological well-being, organizational commitment as an indicator of employees' devotion to the organization, and intent to quit as an indicator of ultimate outcome of individual behavior in the organization.

Sectoral Difference in the Relationships Between Value Congruence and Job Attitudes

Prior studies of value profile have focused on demographic characteristics including gender, age, race, education, seniority, social status (Cherrington et al. 1979; Elizur 1994), culture (Schwartz 1994; Schwartz and Sagie 2000), life domains (Sagie and Elizur 1996), and genetic versus environmental effects (Keller et al. 1992). Little literature has compared value profiles between employees working in different types of organization. Furthermore, although the effect of value congruence has been examined in an across-organization fashion, none of the studies I am aware of examines the difference in the degree of value congruence between organizational types, or the difference in the relationship between value congruence and the attitudinal outcomes between organizational types. As a result, its exploratory in nature to formulate a clear direction of prediction of the across-ownership-type comparison on the relationships between value congruence and attitudinal outcomes in question. This study is likely to be among the first to examine the issue.

The nature of an organization's mission, whether to make a profit for its own interest or to serve the uninformative consumers or for broader social purposes without a profit, reflects the organization's culture and identity. Organizational ownership status serves as a signal of mission, culture, and identity to attract particular segments of workforce and motivate them with particular rewards. Therefore, the ownership type does not just signal a tax status, but more importantly to the public a value component. To extend the understanding of the influence of people's values on individual behaviors in the workplace,

organizational ownership type may serve as a collective indicator of values system to provide a unique dimension for scholarly examination.

Prior research has adopted agency theory and intrinsic motivation perspective in the examination of the difference in practices and performance between nonprofit and for-profit organizations, suggesting competing explanations of the difference (Ben-Ner et al. 2011). A popular view suggests that nonprofit employees tend to be attracted by the ideals of selfless service and work fulfillment in pursuit of certain broader social purposes instead of generating financial revenues for their own interests (Moore 2000). Thus, nonprofit employees may share stronger work motivations than the for-profit counterparts (Light 2002), enjoy a higher level of satisfaction by working for the nonprofit missions (Benz 2005; Borzaga and Depedri 2005; Borzaga and Tortia 2006), and hold stronger loyalty to the organizations (Borzaga and Tortia 2006).

However, other studies present a mixed picture. One study found no difference in values and commitment to the organizational cause across ownership types: “no more altruistic and no less self-interested” (Lyons et al. 2006, p. 615, a comparison between public and private for-profit sector employees). An earlier study using a 1977 national sample of workers in schools, hospitals, philanthropic and other tax-exempt organizations found nonprofit jobs provide more challenge, variety, satisfaction, and intrinsic rewards than those in private enterprises (Mirvis and Hackett 1983). A follow-up study using a 1990 national sample of 1,190 working adults on their characteristics and attitudes reported that people employed in the private nonprofit sector gain more satisfaction from their jobs and has more trust in their management than the for-profit counterparts. Yet, people working in nonprofits are no more psychologically committed to their organizations than are people in the for-profit sector (Mirvis 1992; Goulet and Frank 2002).

Based on these competing observations and arguments, it appears that the comparison of the degree of value congruence and the impact of value congruence on individual attitudinal outcomes across organizational ownership types has not accumulated sufficient evidence to generate a convincing theory. Nonetheless, extant evidences from both academic research and business practices tend to suggest that nonprofit organizations’ effort in pursuit of social values and missions is at least *not-lower-than* that of the for-profit organizations. And the degree of value congruence among nonprofit employees tend to be *not-lower-than* that of the for-profit counterparts. Drawing on the argument of “diminishing marginal value of stimuli” made by social exchange theory (Homans 1974), those who have less of something generally place a higher value on each unit they possess and on each marginal unit obtained. Therefore, the effect of value congruence on the attitudinal

outcomes including satisfaction and organizational commitment among the for-profit employees are likely to be stronger than that of the nonprofit counterparts. That is, for-profit employees are likely to be more sensitive to their value congruence with the employing organization, and the impact on their attitudinal outcomes tend to be stronger, although the effect can be marginal due to the inconclusive theoretical debate mentioned before.

In terms of the outcome of intent to quit, since I don’t differentiate the employees in either type of organization by occupational status, it is impractical to assume employees of either type of organization will have better job opportunity in the external labor market. However, value incongruent employees in for-profit organizations may find nonprofit organizations to be a better fit therefore migrate toward the nonprofit ones. Yet it is less likely that the nonprofit workers find the for-profit organizations to be better fit with regard to values to transfer to. Therefore, the effect of value congruence on intent to quit is also likely to be stronger among for-profit employees than the nonprofit counterparts.

Hypothesis 1 Organizational ownership moderates the relationship between employee–organization value congruence and employees’ (a) job satisfaction, (b) organizational commitment, and (c) intent to quit in a way that the effect is stronger among for-profit employees in comparison to the nonprofit counterparts.

Research Methods

Industry and Data

The present study is conducted in the context of nursing home industry in Minnesota, which, as mentioned before, provides unique research opportunity with mixed ownership types. The present study is instrumented by the second-stage survey responded by nursing home employees, following the first-stage survey sent to all 409 nursing homes that registered in state regulatory body in late 2005. With two follow-up surveys in the spring of 2006, there are 121 nursing homes responded with a response rate of about 30%.

The nursing home employee survey used in the present study was administered after the home administrative survey. There are 23 nonprofit and 7 for-profit nursing homes participated in this stage of survey. The questionnaire to employees asks about the information such as individual characteristics, work attitudes, value congruence, and more. The study focuses on the core nursing employees working in a nursing home: registered nurses (RNs), licensed practical nurses (LPNs), and certified nursing assistants (CNAs). There are total 407 employees included in the empirical analysis. Detailed distribution of employees across occupation groups and types of

nursing home is described in the following section and presented in Table 1.

Variables

The key independent variable is the employee's perception of value congruence, measured by a question asking the employee to what extent he or she believes in the mission of the organization on a 5-point Likert scale (1-*strongly disagree* to 5-*strongly agree*). The sample mean (among the 407 nursing home employees that are included in the present analysis) is 4.01 and the standard deviation is 0.76. As the outcome of value congruence, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to quit are measured as the follows:

Job satisfaction is measured by one item: "I feel fairly satisfied with my present job," a revised version of Scarpello and Campbell (1983) ("all things considered, I am very satisfied with my current job"), employee rating ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Prior research has found the validity of this general measure of job satisfactions comparable to facet measures using multiple items (Scarpello and Campbell 1983). The sample mean of this measure is 3.84 and the standard deviation is 0.89.

Organizational commitment is measured by a 9-item scale that was obtained from Bozeman and Perrewé's (2001) organizational commitment questionnaire, originally developed by Porter et al. (1974). Since I focus on the attitudinal outcomes, the commitment aspect is only examined on the affective component among the three-component commitment model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), employees' intent to quit, referring to an employee's voluntary intention of leaving the present organization, is empirically distinguishable from organizational commitment. The sample items of the commitment measure are: "I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help this organization succeed," and "I feel very little loyalty to this organization (reversed scoring)." The possible responses range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) for each item. The final score is the average of the 9 items. The sample mean is 3.58 with a standard deviation of 0.65. The Cronbach's alpha of the 9 items is 0.84.

Intent to quit is measured by a single item "I will try to find a job with another organization in the next 12 months." Possible responses range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The sample mean is 2.43 and the standard deviation is 1.21.

Ownership status is measured by a dummy variable separating nonprofit from for-profit homes. The information is obtained from the Online Survey, Certification and Reporting data of nursing facilities (OSCAR) administered by federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Among the 407 employees included in the sample, 58 work for for-profit nursing homes and 349 work for nonprofit homes.

Control variables. At the individual level, I control for employees' gender, job titles, job tenure in years with the present organization and contract status (permanent vs. part-time and contract employment) obtained from the nursing home employee survey. These individual demographic characteristics have been controlled for in prior studies on employee behaviors and intentions (e.g., Morrison 1994; Vandenberghe and Peiro 1999; Podsakoff et al. 2000; Brower et al. 2009). Among the 407 nursing employees, 94% are female, 97% are taking a permanent position, and the average organizational tenure is 7.80 years (standard deviation is 9.44 years).

Several firm-level characteristics are also controlled for, including nursing home size measured by the total number of residents of a nursing home, a nursing home's chain status measured by a dichotomous variable indicating whether the nursing home is a member of a nursing home chain, a dichotomous variable that indicates whether the nursing home is affiliated with a hospital, case mix index that reflects the intensity of care and services provided to residents in each nursing home, and the county-level Herfindahl–Hirschman market concentration index that accounts for external environmental influences. These variables are obtained from public and state regulatory database (see Table 1 for the sources). Among the 30 nursing homes that included in the present study, the average number of residents is 75.67 (standard deviation 27.18), 40% are affiliated with a chain, and 6% are affiliated with a hospital (all nonprofit homes). The average case mix score is 0.99 (standard deviation 0.08) and the average score of Herfindahl–Hirschman index is 2203.67 (standard deviation 1362.90). Detailed description of all the variables is presented in Table 1.

Statistical Model

Since individual employees are nested within nursing homes, the data has the hierarchical characteristics. Therefore, it has the assumption that the data consists of a hierarchy of different populations whose differences relate to that hierarchy and the individual differences are random disturbances (Greene 2002). To account for this nature, I use a random effects model while controlling for individual and firm characteristics. When the moderating effect from ownership status is examined, I follow Baron and Kenny's (1986) standard three-step approach. In the moderating effect model, to account for the multicollinearity between the key independent variable (employees' value congruence) and the interaction terms (multiplied by the dichotomous variables indicating occupation and ownership status,

Table 1 Variables for value congruence, attitudinal outcomes, and ownership difference (total 407 employees: 58 FP versus 349 NP)

Variable name	Variable definition	Sample mean (SD)	Sample range	NP mean (SD)	FP mean (SD)	Data source
<i>Organization type</i>						
Nonprofit	1-Nonprofit 0-Otherwise	0.86	0/1	–	–	OSCAR
For-profit	1-For-profit 0-Otherwise	0.14	0/1	–	–	OSCAR
<i>Employee level</i>						
Registered nurses (RNs)	1-RNs 0-Otherwise	0.17	0/1	0.17	0.16	MNEES
Licensed practical nurses (LPNs)	1-LPNs 0-Otherwise	0.23	0/1	0.23	0.17	MNEES
Certified nursing assistants (CNAs)	1-CNAs 0-Otherwise	0.60	0/1	0.59	0.67	MNEES
<i>Employee job attitudinal outcomes</i>						
Job satisfaction	I feel fairly satisfied with my present job (5-point Likert scale, 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree)	3.84 (0.89)	1–5	3.83 (0.88)	3.90 (0.95)	MNEES
Organizational commitment	Average of 9 items (5-point Likert scale, 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree): (1) I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help this organization succeed; (2) I feel very little loyalty to this organization (reversed score); (3) I find that my values and the organization's are very similar; (4) I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for; (5) I really care about the fate of this organization; (6) I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization; (7) This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance; (8) I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined; (9) Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees (reversed score)	3.58 (0.65)	1–5	3.57 (0.66)	3.61 (0.64)	MNEES
Intent to quit	I will try to find a job with another organization in the next 12 months (5-point Likert scale, 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree)	2.43 (1.21)	1–5	2.44 (1.22)	2.33 (1.11)	MNEES
Employee value congruence	I believe in the mission of our organization (5-point Likert scale, 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree)	4.01 (0.76)	1–5	4.01 (0.77)	4.05 (0.60)	MNEES
<i>Individual-level control variables</i>						
Female	1-Female 0-Otherwise	0.94	0/1	0.94	0.97	MNEES

Table 1 continued

Variable name	Variable definition	Sample mean (SD)	Sample range	NP mean (SD)	FP mean (SD)	Data source
Permanent employee	1-Permanent employee 0-Temporary/contract employee	0.97	0/1	0.96	0.98	MNEES
Organizational tenure	Years being worked at the nursing home	7.80 (9.44)	0.01–46.25	8.10* (9.61)	5.95 (8.20)	MNEES
<i>Firm-level control variables</i>						
Home size	Total number of residents currently reside in the nursing home	75.67 (27.18)	19–137	76.39 (25.36)	71.38 (36.22)	OSCAR
Chain status	1-If the nursing home belongs to a chain operation; 0-if independent	0.40	0/1	0.39	0.45	OSCAR
Case mix index	Intensity of care and services provided to residents in each nursing home	0.99 (0.08)	0.65–1.12	0.99 (0.07)	0.97 (0.14)	MDH and MDHS
Hospital affiliation	1-If the facility is affiliated with a hospital; 0-otherwise	0.06	0/1	0.07**	0	OSCAR
Herfindahl–Hirschman index	$HHI_i = \left(100 \times \frac{NH_i \# \text{residents}}{\text{county} \# \text{NH residents}}\right)^2$	2203.67 (1363.90)	276.50–5343.99	2130.50** (1306.09)	2643.94 (1614.05)	OSCAR and ZIP code

Data sources: *MNEES* Minnesota Nursing Home Employee Survey, *OSCAR* Online Survey, Certification and Reporting data of nursing facilities (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services), *MDH* Minnesota State Department of Health, *MDHS* Minnesota State Department of Human Services, *ZIP code* ZIP code used by the U.S. postal service

*, **, and *** Significance of two-tailed statistical tests at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 levels, respectively, for the comparisons between NP and FP nursing staff

For the continuous variables the comparison uses t-test, and for dichotomous variables the comparison uses nonparametric Mann–Whitney test

respectively), the value congruence variable is centered on the grand mean before being interacted with the moderators (Aiken and West 1991; Cohen and Cohen 1983). The resulting multicollinearity diagnostics show that all VIF scores are below 10 that resolves the problem (Neter et al. 1985; Ryan 1997).

The results of regression analysis examining the ownership effect on the relationships between employee value congruence and the job attitudinal outcomes are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 presents first the results using all nursing homes, and then separately within nonprofit and for-profit nursing homes. The results are presented side by side for comparison. Table 3 presents a formal test of the moderating effect from the ownership status (that is, the difference between nonprofit and for-profit nursing homes).

Results

The descriptive statistics and simple comparison of the key variables included in the present study are shown in Table 1. The statistical comparison is conducted to show the difference in the included variables between nonprofit and for-profit nursing homes. A *t* test is used when the

variables are continuous, and a nonparametric Mann–Whitney test is used when the variables are dichotomous. The asterisks attached to nonprofit homes indicate the level of statistical significance of these differences in comparison to for-profit homes.

In general, 86% sample nursing staff work for nonprofit nursing homes, and 14% work for for-profit ones. In terms of the distribution of the three groups of nursing staff among either type of nursing homes, there is essentially no difference: among the employees working for nonprofit nursing homes, about 17% are RNs, 23% are LPNs, and 59% are CNAs, in comparison to the distribution among for-profit employees, which is about 16% RNs, 17% LPNs, and 67% CNAs. The difference in distribution is statistically insignificant by Mann–Whitney test.

Statistical Comparison of Value Congruence, Job Attitudes, and Control Variables

The first comparison is on the employees' value congruence variable. Nonprofit employees reported an average score of 4.01 in comparison to for-profit employees' 4.05. The difference is statistically insignificant, yet it contradicts conventional wisdom that nonprofit employees have stronger value congruence among them and with that of the

Table 2 Ownership difference in the relationships between employee value congruence and attitudinal outcomes: NP and FP, GLS estimation

	Job satisfaction			Organizational commitment			Intent to quit		
	All	NP	FP	All	NP	FP	All	NP	FP
Value congruence	0.284*** (0.072)	0.269*** (0.073)	0.431 [^] (0.296)	0.393*** (0.036)	0.393*** (0.038)	0.397*** (0.091)	-0.388*** (0.083)	-0.381*** (0.092)	-0.452*** (0.092)
<i>Individual-level control variables</i>									
Female	-0.049 (0.188)	-0.051 (0.217)	0.093 (0.182)	-0.106 (0.087)	-0.136 [^] (0.092)	0.291* (0.153)	-0.076 (0.136)	0.040 (0.113)	-1.209*** (0.229)
Permanent employee	-0.310 (0.243)	-0.257 (0.256)	-0.983*** (0.351)	0.065 (0.198)	0.052 (0.211)	0.114 (0.170)	-0.542 (0.462)	-0.484 (0.499)	-0.700*** (0.202)
Organizational tenure	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.007 [^] (0.005)	0.007 (0.019)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.004 [^] (0.003)	-0.000 (0.022)	-0.027*** (0.005)	-0.027*** (0.005)	-0.027 (0.036)
Registered nurses	0.100 (0.166)	0.081 (0.184)	0.353 (0.278)	0.134 (0.107)	0.149 [^] (0.112)	0.037 (0.360)	-0.242 [^] (0.176)	-0.257 (0.203)	-0.204 (0.251)
Licensed practical nurses	-0.029 (0.140)	-0.005 (0.148)	-0.005 (0.614)	-0.019 (0.072)	-0.018 (0.068)	0.030 (0.436)	0.003 (0.124)	-0.015 (0.127)	-0.102 (0.535)
<i>Organizational-level control variables</i>									
Total no. of residents	-0.000 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)	-0.008* (0.004)	-0.000 (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)	-0.002 (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.003)	0.002 (0.004)
Chain status	-0.023 (0.123)	-0.136 (0.132)	0.093 (0.210)	-0.077 (0.087)	-0.142 [^] (0.107)	0.039 (0.189)	0.181 (0.147)	0.240 [^] (0.167)	0.181 (0.259)
Case mix index	-0.774 (0.775)	-2.103** (0.835)	2.631** (1.338)	0.173 (0.386)	-0.358 (0.542)	1.148 [^] (0.852)	-0.774 (0.833)	-0.402 (1.153)	-2.750 [^] (1.763)
Hospital affiliation	0.330*** (0.078)	0.404*** (0.107)	-	0.350*** (0.069)	0.395*** (0.117)	-	-0.439*** (0.106)	-0.489*** (0.140)	-
Herfindahl-Hirschman index (10 k)	-0.562 [^] (0.338)	-0.615 [^] (0.377)	-2.129*** (0.360)	-0.314 (0.266)	-0.357 (0.366)	-0.895*** (0.166)	0.140 (0.377)	0.143 (0.423)	1.402*** (0.510)
No. of observations	407	349	58	407	349	58	407	349	58
Wald χ^2	67.24	59.70	53.85	363.88	578.30	58.90	110.33	103.86	48.18
Prob > χ^2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Overall R^2	0.09	0.10	0.20	0.24	0.27	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.24

Among the 407 nursing home employees included in the analysis, 58 work for for-profit homes and 349 work for nonprofit homes

*, **, and *** Significance at the two-tailed 0.10, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively

[^] Significance at the one-tailed 0.10 level. All estimations are clustering by nursing home. Robust standard errors are in parentheses

Table 3 Ownership effect on the relationships between employee value congruence and attitudinal outcomes: NP versus FP, GLS estimation

	Job satisfaction			Organizational commitment			Intent to quit		
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(I)	(II)	(III)	(I)	(II)	(III)
Value congruence		0.284*** (0.072)	0.497* (0.280)		0.393*** (0.036)	0.399*** (0.102)		-0.388*** (0.083)	-0.437*** (0.102)
Nonprofit			-0.088 (0.150)			-0.062 (0.089)			0.224* (0.117)
Value congruence × nonprofit			-0.233 (0.287)			-0.007 (0.110)			0.057 (0.142)
<i>Individual-level control variables</i>									
Female	-0.018 (0.180)	-0.049 (0.188)	-0.046 (0.190)	-0.055 (0.103)	-0.106 (0.087)	-0.106 (0.088)	-0.105 (0.137)	-0.076 (0.136)	-0.066 (0.143)
Permanent employee	-0.362 [^] (0.230)	-0.310 (0.243)	-0.306 [^] (0.237)	-0.006 (0.178)	0.065 (0.198)	0.061 (0.197)	-0.436 (0.391)	-0.542 (0.462)	-0.523 (0.460)
Organizational tenure	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.028*** (0.006)	-0.027*** (0.005)	-0.027*** (0.005)
Registered nurses	0.168 (0.162)	0.100 (0.166)	0.107 (0.165)	0.231** (0.108)	0.134 (0.107)	0.135 (0.108)	-0.333* (0.184)	-0.242 [^] (0.176)	-0.247 [^] (0.176)
Licensed practical nurses	-0.022 (0.144)	-0.029 (0.140)	-0.020 (0.140)	-0.009 (0.080)	-0.019 (0.072)	-0.019 (0.072)	-0.002 (0.135)	0.003 (0.124)	-0.001 (0.123)
<i>Organizational-level control variables</i>									
Total no. of residents	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)
Chain status	-0.009 (0.121)	-0.023 (0.123)	-0.034 (0.119)	-0.061 (0.099)	-0.077 (0.087)	-0.085 (0.085)	0.187 (0.154)	0.181 (0.147)	0.214 [^] (0.136)
Case mix index	-0.813 (0.741)	-0.774 (0.775)	-0.669 (0.801)	0.161 (0.471)	0.173 (0.386)	0.251 (0.425)	-0.867 (0.922)	-0.774 (0.833)	-1.016 (0.866)
Hospital affiliation	0.320*** (0.077)	0.330*** (0.078)	0.358*** (0.083)	0.336*** (0.078)	0.350*** (0.069)	0.371*** (0.086)	-0.429*** (0.110)	-0.439*** (0.106)	-0.511*** (0.118)
Herfindahl–Hirschman index (10 k)	-0.455 [^] (0.329)	-0.562 [^] (0.338)	-0.594* (0.350)	-0.152 (0.289)	-0.314 (0.266)	-0.343 (0.282)	-0.056 (0.413)	0.140 (0.377)	0.263 (0.397)
No. of observations	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407	407
Wald χ^2	64.56	67.24	65.44	43.16	363.88	403.27	81.79	110.33	116.37
Prob > χ^2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Overall R^2	0.03	0.09	0.09	0.03	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.14	0.15

Among the 407 nursing home employees included in the analysis, 58 work for for-profit homes and 349 work for nonprofit homes

*, **, and *** Significance at the two-tailed 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 levels, respectively

[^] Significance at the one-tailed 0.10 level. All estimations are clustering by nursing home. Robust standard errors are in parentheses

organization. The present study does not confirm the inexistence of the difference in favor of either type of organization. Rather it stimulates an interesting observation of the issue using an idiosyncratic dataset from a specific industry setting.

Turning to the difference in employee job attitude measures, on average nonprofit employees reported slightly lower scores of job satisfaction (3.83 vs. 3.90), organizational commitment (3.57 vs. 3.61), and higher score of intent to quit (2.44 vs. 2.33). The differences are trivial in magnitude and statistically insignificant. However, it draws some interesting observations when compared to prior studies. The pattern of difference manifested in the present study contradicts conventional belief and some of the previous research findings, such as Boxx et al. (1991), Goulet and Frank (2002), and Lyons et al. (2006) who reported stronger commitment and higher level of satisfaction among nonprofit employees in comparison to the for-profit counterparts. Yet, using national survey instruments, Mirvis and associates reported earlier stronger satisfaction and commitment among nonprofit employees (Mirvis and Hackett 1983), but later found the difference essentially disappeared (Mirvis 1992). The inconsistency in the findings suggests that employees' job attitudes may be shaped by individual and contextual factors that transcend the ownership difference.

In terms of the control variables, there is no difference detected in the distribution of employees' gender and permanent position between the two types of organization, but nonprofit employees tend to have a longer tenure than the for-profit counterparts ($p < 0.10$, two-tailed t test). On the surface this seems to contradict nonprofit employees' lower self-report rating on satisfaction and commitment, and higher score on intent to quit. However, what people think can actually differ from what people eventually do, and the subtleness of the difference is beyond the scope of the current research. In terms of the firm-level control variables, no difference is detected in home size, chain status and case mix between the two types of nursing home, but for-profit homes tend to operate in a more competitive market—more likely to be in urban area, and nonprofit homes can be affiliated with hospitals but none of the for-profit homes is. This is due to the fact that in Minnesota all hospitals are nonprofit.

Results of Regression Analysis

I first present the results for the baseline hypothesis. As shown in the first, fourth, and seventh columns of Table 2 on all the sample nursing staff, employees' value congruence has a positive relationship with employees' self-rating on job satisfaction ($p < 0.01$, two-tailed test), organizational commitment ($p < 0.01$, two-tailed test), and a negative

relationship with intent to quit ($p < 0.01$, two-tailed test). These results are consistent with prior studies as mentioned in the literature review.

Now I turn to the results of ownership difference in the relationships between value congruence and job attitudes. This is a new area without previous research that I can calibrate my results on. The fundamental premise is that people belonging to different types of organization may share unique identity that incorporates many social and individual characteristics. Therefore, an organization's ownership type can serve as a collective indicator of a unique values system and differentiates employees between types. However, due to the deficiency of research on the difference in employee value profile between types of organization, and the difference in the impact of value congruence on other attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, the present study is rather exploratory in nature.

Table 2 presents the results of regression analysis using the whole sample (407 employees) and the nonprofit (349 employees) and for-profit (58 employees) sub-samples separately. For each dependent variable, the three sets of regression results are presented side by side to compare and contrast. Table 3 reports a formal test of the moderating effect, following Baron and Kenny's (1986) three-step approach, using the whole employee sample.

As shown in Table 2, employees' value congruence has a positive relationship with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and a negative relationship with intent to quit, using the whole sample with 407 employees, and the sub-samples using 349 nonprofit employees and 58 for-profit employees, respectively. As expected, the effect tends to be stronger in terms of the magnitude of the coefficient of the value congruence variable among for-profit employees in comparison to the nonprofit counterparts. First looking at the effect on job satisfaction, the relationship between value congruence and job satisfaction is positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level for the whole sample and the nonprofit sub-sample. In contrast, the effect is weaker among the for-profit employees ($p < 0.10$, one-tailed test), but the magnitude of coefficient is bigger. Secondly, the effect of value congruence on organizational commitment is statistically significant at the 0.01 level across all the regressions using different samples. This time the magnitude of coefficient is essentially identical. Thirdly, the relationship between value congruence and intent to quit is consistently negative across all the regressions using different samples ($p < 0.01$), and the magnitude of the coefficient appears to be larger among the for-profit sub-sample in comparison to that using the nonprofit sub-sample. Therefore, Table 2 suggests that, in general, value congruence improves the three aspects of job attitudes across different ownership types of organization, and among two out of the three cases the effect appears to

be stronger in for-profit organizations. This set of finding is consistent with Hypothesis 1.

Table 3 presents the results testing the moderating effect of ownership status using the whole sample of 407 employees. The first step is to show the effect from all the control variables on the dependent variable without the key independent variable, value congruence, and the moderator, the dichotomous variable indicating ownership status. The result is shown in Model I. The second step is to show the effect of the key independent variable, value congruence, and the result is shown in Model II, where value congruence has a positive effect on job satisfaction ($p < 0.01$) and organizational commitment ($p < 0.01$), but a negative effect on intent to quit ($p < 0.01$). Model III shows the moderating effect by including the ownership type variable (nonprofit is the included group) and the interaction term between value congruence and ownership type. However, none of the coefficients of the interaction terms is statistically significant. Therefore, I didn't gain formal statistical support for Hypothesis 1.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study extends the current understanding of the relationships between value congruence and employees' job attitudinal outcomes by investigating the relationships in question between nonprofit and for-profit types of organization. In the present case value congruence serves as a motivational mechanism that requires less organizational external intervention with employees' effort. Therefore, organizations are able to benefit from the spontaneous effort exerted by better motivated employees. The advantage can be obtained through forming a value congruent workforce. Yet the positive effect from value congruence may differ across different types of employee, since employees belonging to different types of organization may exhibit different kinds of response to the motivational intervention. Therefore, for organizations to better motivate employees, it is necessary to understand these differences and adopt better approaches to maximize the benefit from employees' intrinsic motivation. In the case of value congruence, it is important for organizations to realize the difference in effects of value congruence on employees' attitudinal and behavioral outcomes across different types of employee, and avoid the use of "one size fits all" kind of approach in aligning the effects with organizational interests.

The comparison between nonprofit and for-profit organizations extends the examination of the effect of value congruence on individual attitudinal outcomes to the inter-organizational level. The findings from the present examination certainly benefit the understanding of the difference in organizational behavior and performance between the two

types of organization. In the theoretical viewpoint, organizational ownership status signals unique mission, culture, and identity of the organization to attract a particular type of employees. However, whether employees who join a particular type of organization will share uniformly the set of values is subject to debate. Treating employees within certain type of organization as a prototype in terms of their value profile may disguise some substantive differences that will drive employees' attitudes and behaviors very differently. This may be a fundamental reason why in the prior literature the comparative results of values and attitudes between employees of different types of organization are mixed (e.g., Mirvis and Hackett 1983; Mirvis 1992; Goulet and Frank 2002; Lyons et al. 2006). Apparently it is hard to gain a unanimous agreement among the kind of empirical studies. Therefore, a prediction on the across-ownership-type comparison on the relationships between value congruence and attitudinal outcomes is rather exploratory.

Yet, it is not to say the present study adds just one more layer of muddiness to the already blurry picture. First of all, the importance of the research question merits academic endeavor like the present one. Secondly, the blurry picture is partly caused by the dearth of research. More relevant studies like the present one will help to clarify the big picture. And last but not the least important, the mixed results per se simply reflect the complexity of the issue. Perhaps the mixed results are *the* results that exactly display the actual picture of the issue. To further discover the pattern of value congruence and the impact of value congruence on individual attitudinal outcomes across organizational ownership types, we need urgently more empirical evidence.

Lastly, I would like to point out two empirical limitations in the present study due to the constraints in data collection. First, the common method bias issue may concern some of the readers, as the employee attitudinal variables are responded by the same employee based on personal perception. Although employees are the ones who know their perceptions better than any other sources (Schneider et al. 1980), future research may use multi-source responses for the key measures to minimize the potential self-report bias. And second, in the current study I use some single-item measures. I believe the measures largely capture the focal content of the subject-matters. The respondents thus should understand well what they were asked, which grants me strong face validity. The adoption of single-item measures were also found in prior studies (e.g., Scarpello and Campbell 1983; Posner 1992; Gould-Williams 2003). However, the measurement concern associated with single-item measures remains, and multiple items are encouraged to use in the future studies to establish internal consistency for the measures. In light of the theoretical importance of the issues investigated in the

present study, I believe future research effort is worthwhile to further address the methodological limitations and provide richer empirical evidence.

Acknowledgment This study was supported by the Aspen Institute Grant NSRF 2005-1, "A Comparative Study of Organizational Structure, Behavior and Performance."

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Ben-Ner, A. (2006). For-profit, state and non-profit: How to cut the pie among the three sectors. In J. Touffut (Ed.), *Advancing public goods* (pp. 40–67). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Ben-Ner, A., Ren, T., & Paulson, D. F. (2011). A sectoral comparison of wage levels and wage inequality in human services industries. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 608–633.
- Benz, M. (2005). Not for the profit, but for the satisfaction? Evidence on worker well-being in non-profit firms. *Kyklos*, 58, 155–176.
- Borzaga, C., & Depedri, S. (2005). Interpersonal relations and job satisfaction: Some empirical results in social and community care services. In B. Gui & R. Sugden (Eds.), *Economics and social interaction: Accounting for interpersonal relations* (pp. 132–153). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borzaga, C., & Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35, 225–248.
- Boxx, W. R., Odom, R. Y., & Dunn, M. G. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion. *Public Personnel Management*, 20, 195–205.
- Bozeman, D. P., & Perrewe, P. L. (2001). The effect of item content overlap on organizational commitment questionnaire-turnover cognitions relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 161–173.
- Bretz, R. D., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32–54.
- Brower, H. H., Lester, S. W., Kowsgaard, M. A., & Dineen, B. R. (2009). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 35, 327–347.
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 333–349.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459–484.
- Cherrington, D. J., Conde, S. J., & England, J. L. (1979). Age and work values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 617–623.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (1974). Values and the organization: Suggestions for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 550–561.
- Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379–389.
- Elizur, D. (1994). Gender and work values: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 201–212.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 254–275.
- Gould-Williams, J. (2003). The importance of HR practices and workplace trust in achieving superior performance: A study of public-sector organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, 28–54.
- Goulet, L. R., & Frank, M. L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: Public, non-profit, and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management*, 31, 201–210.
- Greene, W. H. (2002). *Econometric analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hoffman, B. J., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 389–399.
- Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms (revised edition)*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Keller, L. M., Bouchard, T. J., Jr., Arvey, R. D., Segal, N. L., & Dawis, R. V. (1992). Work values: Genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 79–88.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388–433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kochan, T. A., Cummings, L. L., & Huber, G. P. (1976). Operationalizing the concepts of goals and goal incompatibilities in organizational behavior research. *Human Relations*, 29, 527–544.
- Krau, E. (1989). The transition in life domain salience and the modification of work values between high school and adult employment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34, 100–116.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1–49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281–342.
- Light, P. C. (2002). The content of their character: The state of the nonprofit workforce. *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, 9(3), 6–16.
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (2006). A comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 605–618.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24, 351–389.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, S. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424–432.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, S. L. (1991). Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction. *Human Relations*, 44, 481–495.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mirvis, P. H. (1992). The quality of employment in the nonprofit sector: an update on employee attitudes in nonprofits versus business and government. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 3, 23–41.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hackett, E. J. (1983). *Work and work force characteristics in the nonprofit sector* (pp. 3–12). April: Monthly Labor Review.

- Moore, M. H. (2000). Managing for value: Organizational strategy in for-profit, nonprofit, and governmental organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29, 183–204.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543–1567.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1985). *Applied linear statistical models*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Chatman, J. A. (1986). Organization commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492–499.
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person–organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487–516.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513–563.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603–609.
- Posner, B. Z. (1992). Person–organization value congruence: No support for individual differences as a moderating influence. *Human Relations*, 45, 351–361.
- Posner, B. Z., Kouzes, J. M., & Schmidt, W. H. (1985). Shared values make a difference: An empirical test of corporate culture. *Human Resource Management*, 24, 293–309.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rothschild, J., & Milofsky, C. (2006). The centrality of values, passions, and ethics in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 17, 137–143.
- Ryan, T. P. (1997). *Modern regression methods*. New York: Wiley.
- Sagie, A., & Elizur, D. (1996). The structure of personal values: A conical representation of multiple life areas. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 573–586.
- Sagie, A., Elizur, D., & Koslowsky, M. (1996). Work values: A theoretical overview and a model of their effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 503–514.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 577–600.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climate: Individual preferences and organizational realities revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 459–465.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437–453.
- Schneider, B., Parkington, J. J., & Buxton, V. M. (1980). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 252–267.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19–45.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagie, G. (2000). Value consensus and importance: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 465–497.
- Vancouver, J. B., & Schmitt, N. W. (1991). An exploratory examination of person–organization fit: Organizational goal congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 333–352.
- Vandenberghe, C., & Peiro, J. M. (1999). Organizational and individual values: Their main and combined effects on work attitudes and perceptions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 569–581.
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473–489.
- Wijting, J. P., Arnold, C. R., & Conrad, K. A. (1978). Generational differences in work values between parents and children and between boys and girls across grade levels. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 12, 245–260.