IN THE EYES OF THE BEHOLDER:
EXPLORING WORK PERCEPTIONS OF STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
DARIMA BUTITOVA
Dr. Michael Diamond, Dissertation Supervisor

JULY 2017

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the
dissertation entitled

IN THE EYES OF THE BEHOLDER:
EXPLORING WORK PERCEPTIONS OF STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

presented by Darima Butitova,
a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,
and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Michael Diamond

Professor Barton Wechsler

Professor Mirae Kim

Professor Victoria Johnson

Professor Colleen Heflin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my academic advisor Dr. Michael Diamond who introduced me to the exciting world of organizational studies and helped me see organizations as dynamic and complex human creations. He always supported and encouraged my curiosity and helped me navigate through the woods of different epistemological and methodological frameworks. His theoretical and practical knowledge of public organizations helped me ground my theoretical aspirations to the world of practice. Dr. Diamond taught me to be always open to new ideas, to question my assumptions, and to be self-reflective. His personal integrity and wisdom guided me through PhD years, even after he moved to New York City.

I would like to thank Dr. Barton Wechsler - this dissertation would not be possible without his help with data collection. Despite of his busy schedule as a Dean of the Truman School, he was always available as a committee member to share his knowledge and expertise on public organizations.

Many thanks to Dr. Mirae Kim, who helped me develop the survey instrument which was used to collect the data for this dissertation. She was very supportive and always provided a valuable feedback. Dr. Kim helped me develop the analytical and technical skills important for a young researcher.

I am also very grateful to Dr. Victoria Johnson, who introduced me to the fascinating world of sociology and critical theory, which offers a variety of concepts that are very insightful and useful for understanding public administration, government, and social reality in general.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Colleen Heflin, who as a PhD coordinator always provided support and ensured that my PhD journey went smoothly.

Last but not least, I want to thank the Truman School of Public Affairs, its faculty, staff and students for creating a friendly and intellectually stimulating environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES/FIGURES	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Context and Statement of the Problem	1
Research Questions	3
Purpose and Significance	6
Outline of the Dissertation	8
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Context: Negative Perceptions of Government	9
Perceptions of Workplace Fairness and External Prestige	10
Workplace Perceptions and Years of Public Service	15
Workplace Perceptions and Turnover Intentions	16
The Role of Organizational Identification	22
3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES	25
Research Question 1	25
Research Question 2	27
4. METHODOLOGY	32
Data	32

Variables.....	34
Methods	41
5. STATE EMPLOYEES’ WORKPLACE PERCEPTIONS: THE EFFECT OF YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE.....	46
Association Between Distributive Fairness and Years of Public Service	48
Association Between Procedural, Interactional Fairness and Years of Public Service	51
Workplace Fairness, External Prestige and Years of Public Service	53
6. WORKPLACE PERCEPTIONS AS DETERMINANTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS	58
The Effect of Workplace Perceptions on Organizational Identification	58
Explaining Turnover Intentions Among State Employees.....	59
7. DISCUSSION	63
Perceptions Matter.....	63
Organizational Identification and Its Implications	67
Escaping Vicious Circle	70
8. CONCLUSION.....	73
Summary of the Results	73
Implications of the Study	74
Limitations and Future Research.....	75

APPENDIX

1. TRUST IN GOVERNMENT 1958-2017 BY GENERATION	78
2. SURVEY MATERIALS	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
VITA	107

LIST OF TABLES/FIGURES

Table/Figure	Page
Table 1. The Effects of Perceived Organizational Fairness/Unfairness.....	12
Table 2. The Effect of Perceived External Prestige (PEP) on Turnover Intentions.....	20
Table 3. Characteristics of Survey Respondents	33
Table 4. Distributive Fairness and Measures	34
Table 5. Procedural Fairness and Measures	35
Table 6. Interactional Fairness and Measures	35
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Variables	39
Table 8. Summary of Empirical Models for Research Question	42
Table 9. Correlations Between Variables.....	47
Table 10. Ordered Logistic Regression on Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Fairness.....	50
Table 11. Regression Results on Perceived Workplace Fairness and External Prestige	57
Table 12. Logistic Regression on Organizational Identification.....	59
Table 13. Mediation Effect of Organizational Identification on Turnover Intentions	60
Table 14. Bootstrap Replication Results	61
 Figure 1. Conceptual Framework	 30
Figure 2. Mediation Analysis.....	47

*“If men define situations
as real, they are real in their consequences.”
Thomas Theorem*

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Context and Statement of the Problem

We often think about government in negative terms, as a powerful institution which imposes excessive regulation and restrains civic liberties. At the same time, privatization, deregulation, and reduction in government spending are generally regarded as a favorable course of actions. Some researchers argue that these views are associated with a neoliberal ideology, which promotes marketization of social relations (Harvey, 2007; Campbell & Pedersen, 2001).

Hence, the government is constantly critiqued by media, academia, and citizens. Quite recently, this critique led to an interesting outcome for the US presidential elections, resulting in appointments of businessmen for the highest executive offices in the country. However, the government critique has an impact not only on elections and appointments of senior leadership positions in the government but also, and probably more importantly, on rank and file government employees who devoted their lives to public service.

This dissertation argues that the overwhelming government critique does little to improve government performance and efficiency, and is more destructive rather than constructive. In fact, public distrust and cynicism toward the government may negatively affect government employees - citizens whose job is to represent the government and act on behalf of the government. While citizens hold negative attitudes toward the government by externalizing and othering, government employees tend to internalize the negative

image of the government. This may impact government employees' perceptions, attitudes and behavior.

Exploring government employees' perceptions of the workplace is important for the field of public administration. In fact, when we critique the government as an institution, we tend to forget that government is represented by individuals who chose a career of serving the public, and negative societal attitudes toward the government can undermine organizational identification of government employees. At the same time, unwillingness to identify with the government may lead to poor work performance and problems with retention of the most qualified workforce. This may decrease overall government performance and further contribute to the negative image of the government, leading to a vicious circle of a failing government. Thus, the present study focuses on how government employees perceive their workplace under the current neoliberal shift which delegitimizes the government by emphasizing its failures rather successes.

The dissertation is based on theoretical frameworks developed in the field of organizational psychology, which helps link societal, organizational and individual levels of analysis. Interestingly, organizational psychology offers a theoretical lens to studying the government as an organization and its employees. This perspective provides a more personified and humanized way of looking at government as people who daily perform government functions. Furthermore, this approach highlights the role of subjectivity and perceptions at a workplace. Since perceptions influence attitudes and behavior, a connection between individual work performance and organizational performance becomes more evident.

Research Questions

Assuming the predominance of the neoliberal ideology as a contextual background, the study focuses on answering two research questions:

- What is the effect of years of public service on workplace perceptions?
- How workplace perceptions influence organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees?

For the purposes of this study work perceptions are conceptualized as 1) perceptions of workplace fairness – whether employees perceive that their organization treats them with fairness, and 2) perceptions of external prestige –employees’ perceptions of how outsiders view their organization. Thus, while perceived workplace fairness provides employees’ perspectives regarding their own organization, perceived external prestige offers their views on how government as their workplace is perceived by citizens.

The first research question is concerned with what happens with employees’ workplace perceptions as they work for the government for many years. The effect of time spent working for the government on perceptions of fairness and external prestige, helps us understand whether long-term public servants, who gained important work experience which needs to be passed to younger colleagues, have a more rewarding work experience compared to employees who recently started their government careers.

Since fairness is one of the essential values for public organizations, it is especially important to examine whether government employees perceive their workplace as fair. Being representatives of larger communities (cities, states, nations), government employees are expected to put public interest above their private interest to ensure the general welfare. In fact, taxpayers fund public organizations, including government, to deliver public services based on values of equity and fairness (Frederickson, 1990, 2010;

Stone, 2002; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, 2015; Denhardt & Catlaw, 2015). It may be difficult to do so if government employees perceive their workplace as unfair.

Furthermore, perceptions of external prestige among government employees are important to examine especially today when anti-government rhetoric is supported by many citizens, leading to neoliberal policies which reduce the role of government in economic and social affairs especially on the federal level. Currently, government employees' perceptions of whether citizens value their work may have a more significant effect on their work attitudes and behavior, leading to higher rates of turnover especially among employees who are highly competitive on the job market.

Interestingly, most research on workplace perceptions conceptualizes them as important determinants of a variety of work attitudes and behavior. For example, workplace perceptions are associated with organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, 1991), organizational identification and commitment (Tyler & DeGoey, 1995 Carmeli, 2005; Kang et al., 2011), meaningfulness of work (Wu, 2011) and increased trust (Aryee et al., 2002). At the same time, there is a lack of studies on how work perceptions vary among government employees, depending on length of their public service. Meanwhile, it is especially important to study long-term employees, who are often regarded as formal and informal leaders responsible for effective delivery of public services, as well as a transition of essential institutional knowledge to younger and less experienced public servants.

The second research question focuses on the role of workplace perceptions in explaining organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees. First, the study aims to examine the effect of workplace perceptions on organizational

identification of government employees. Second, it will focus on government employees' perceptions of external prestige as an important understudied factor contributing to influencing turnover intentions among government employees. More specifically, a mediating role of organizational identification in the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions will be explored. If employees work many years for the government and feel underappreciated and undervalued by the citizens whom they serve, they may be more likely to have lower organizational identification and, therefore, turnover intentions. Furthermore, assuming that government employees have higher levels of public service motivation (Perry & Wise, 1990) and take pride in serving the public (Brewer, 2003), perceptions of citizens' positive or negative opinion about government employees' service to the public may have a more significant effect on their turnover intentions compared to private sector employees.

Interestingly, perceived external prestige as a factor which influences turnover intentions of government employees is a relatively new topic in public administration research. Most studies on turnover in the public sector focus on organizational and individual factors explaining turnover intentions (Kim, 2005; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Moynihan & Pandey, 2008, Hassan, 2012; Choi, 2011). There is a limited research on how environmental factors impact turnover. For example, scholars tend to take into account economic factors (unemployment rate) and geographical factors (location of the employer), and generally disregard such socio-cultural factors as organizational prestige (Selden & Moynihan, 2000; Selden et al., 2013; Hassan, 2012). At the same time, empirical research in the field of organizational psychology shows that perceived external prestige, i.e. how employees think outsiders view their organization, is an important factor which influences

employees' turnover intentions across cultural and organizational contexts (Mignonac et al., 2006; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Ciftcioglu, 2011). To our knowledge, this question hasn't been answered in the context of US government organizations, which are known for low levels of public trust (Pew Research Center, 2017), and a long tradition of bureaucracy bashing (Garrett et al., 2006). Hence, the second research question examines the relationship between perceived external prestige of government and turnover intentions of government employees.

Overall, the two research questions explore workplace perceptions of current government employees: first, as a dependent variable, focusing on the effect of years of public service, and second, as an independent variable, examining workplace perceptions as a factor impacting organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees.

To answer the research questions, the present study delves into an organizational reality of one state government agency located in the Midwest. Using an online survey conducted in the Spring of 2016, the study explores workplace perceptions of 522 state government employees.

Purpose and Significance

This research illustrates the utility of using organizational psychology approach for studying the government as a human organization. More specifically, the study focuses on employees' perceptions of government as workplace and their influence on work attitudes and behavior. Even though the previous public administration studies examined the role of fairness in organizations (e.g. Hassan, 2012; Choi, 2011; Rubin, 2009), perceptions of external prestige is a relatively unexplored topic. While many studies examined the

relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions (e.g. Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Ciftcioglu, 2011), most of these studies focused on private and nonprofit organizations and international context. At the same time, studies concerned with how US government employees perceive their workplace in terms of external prestige as well as, studies which consider both workplace fairness and external prestige as factors contributing to organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees were difficult to locate.

Meanwhile, widely spread anti-government sentiments in American society influence work attitudes and behavior of government employees as citizens hired by the government to perform its functions (Milward & Rainey, 1983; Berman, 1997; Thomas, 1998; Garrett et al., 2006; Marvel, 2016). Thus, the present study takes organizational psychology perspective and explores workplace perceptions of government employees, focusing on how these perceptions change depending on time spent working for the government as well as how they influence organizational identification and turnover intentions. The research questions considered in this dissertation expand on previous studies and seek to find answers to previously understudied topics which can advance public administration research and may have important practical implications for improving performance in public organizations.

If workplace perceptions of government employees become less favorable with more years of public service, contributing to lower organizational identification along with turnover intentions, it means that long-term public service is not as rewarding as it is often assumed. Therefore, human resource policies should pay more attention to long-term public servants who may need a positive feedback on their work both from the government

agency and the public whom they serve. Since government employees provide services to the public and meaningfulness of their work is associated with social rather than economic value, they need to feel that their work is appreciated and regarded as prestigious by citizens. Therefore, improving citizen-government relations at large maybe essential for more productive public organizations.

Outline of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized in the following manner. Chapter 2 provides a literature review of previous research on topics relevant for this dissertation. Based on the overview of the literature, Chapter 3 discusses the conceptual framework for the dissertation, research questions and hypotheses. Data, specific variables and methods used to answer the research questions are described in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 examines the relationship between workplace perceptions and years of public service, thus answering the first research question. The effect of workplace perceptions on organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees is considered in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 discusses the findings and their implications, and Chapter 8 concludes the dissertation with a brief summary of results, discusses limitations of the study and offers avenues for future research.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of the relevant literature and theoretical foundations of the dissertation. It begins with a brief review of the studies on perceptions of government. The chapter then continues with an overview of works on workplace perceptions, focusing on fairness and external prestige, followed by a literature review on organizational identification and turnover intentions.

Context: Negative Perceptions of Government

The results of the poll conducted by the Pew Research Center show that between 1958 and 2017 citizens' trust in government decreased (Appendix A). Moreover, it seems that the level of trust in government is at its historical low, with a cross-generational consensus: today about 20% of respondents report that they trust government always or most of the time, compared to about 80% in 1958 (Pew Research Center, 2017).

Anti-government sentiments in the American society draw attention of many researchers. Interestingly, most research on perceptions of government focuses on citizens' view of the government. For example, Berman (1997) is concerned with increased public cynicism toward the government, while Thomas (1998) discusses declined public trust in government. Research on bureaucracy bashing argues that it undermines government's public image, recruitment, and retention (Garrett et al., 2006), while Milward & Rainey (1983) argue that adverse public stereotypes, oversimplifications, myths and facile assumptions against government bureaucracy tend to distort decisions about a proper role of government and bureaucracy in particular. Moreover, some researchers even claim that

there is an implicit anti-public sector bias among Americans which distorts more balanced perceptions of the government (Marvel, 2016).

These mostly negative views of the government held by many citizens influence government employees' social identity, resulting in a variety of defensive reactions. For example, Melkers & Thomas (1998) found that public managers' perceptions about citizens' evaluation of government work are negatively biased, in fact, they are lower than actual citizens' evaluations. Furthermore, not only public trust in government is low, but also public administrators' trust in citizens is low as well. This leads to persistence of ineffective public participation initiatives, and even a self-fulfilling prophecy of government inefficiency (Yang, 2005). Meanwhile, research which positively highlights government is relatively scarce. Goodsell (2003, 2014) is one of few authors who defends the US government bureaucracy, arguing that it works well compared to other countries. At the same time, Mettler (2012) argues that one of the possible reasons of why citizens have misconceptions about the government is lack of knowledge about government programs, even when they benefit from them.

Thus, most research focuses on citizen-government relations studying citizens' perceptions of government and vice versa - government employees' perceptions of citizens. However, there is not much research about government employees' perceptions of government in terms of workplace fairness and especially in terms of external prestige.

Perceptions of Workplace Fairness and External Prestige

An application of the concept of workplace perceptions to studying government requires an adoption of an organizational-psychology perspective. This perspective helps us understand the importance of perceptions and subjectivity in workplaces by looking at

the government not as an institution, but rather as an organization – government agency – which consists of people who perform government functions.

As it was previously mentioned, for the purposes of this study workplace perceptions are conceptualized as perceptions of workplace fairness and external prestige. Perceived workplace fairness offers employees' perspectives regarding workplace fairness, whereas perceived external prestige provides employees' perspectives of how outsiders view their organization in terms of prestige.

Defining Workplace Fairness

Organizational psychology researchers are still debating over a definition and measurement of workplace fairness/organizational fairness (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001; Colquitt & Rodell, 2015). Looking at a historical development of the concept, we find that one of the first conceptualizations of fairness in an organizational setting is Adams' equity theory. Defining distributive fairness as the equitability of outcomes received from a social exchange or interaction, Adams investigated the equitability of the ratio of input (work) to outcome (pay) across similar workers (Adams, 1963, 1965). Adams believed that if the ratio differed between two workers doing a similar job, workers would decrease or increase their input accordingly. Even though this theory explained much, it did not explain cases when workers' work-to-pay ratio differed, and yet they still perceived it as fair. The limitations of Adams' equity theory motivated researchers to develop a theory of procedural fairness, which was concerned with the perceived fairness of processes used to make decisions regarding outcomes (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Thibaut et al., 1974, Thibaut & Walker, 1978). In addition, scholars conceptualized interactional fairness in a way that differentiated between the effects of formal processes and informal interactions that

influence outcomes (Bies, 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990)¹. Thus, perceived organizational fairness can be defined as employees' perceptions of the fairness of compensation, formal procedures, and informal social interactions at work.

Effects of organizational fairness/unfairness

Over the last several decades, researchers conducted hundreds of observational and experimental studies of different organizations across private and public sectors (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001, 2013). Researchers in the fields of social psychology, organization studies, and occupational health have accumulated evidence that organizational unfairness is associated with individual and organizational effects that do not contribute to a productive work environment, while organizational fairness is a significant determinant of the effective workplace. For example, organizational fairness is positively associated with job satisfaction, innovative behavior, engagement and empowerment, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational identification and commitment, increased trust, etc. On the other hand, organizational unfairness is associated with physical and mental health issues, turnover intentions, counterproductive work behavior, including theft, sabotage, workplace aggression and violence. Table 1 summarizes the effects of perceived organizational fairness and unfairness for individuals and organizations.

Table 1. The effects of perceived organizational fairness/unfairness

	Organizational unfairness	Organizational fairness
Individual effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mental health issues (Ndjaboue et al., 2012; Spell & Arnold, 2007), including depression (Grynderup et al., 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job satisfaction (Davis & Ward, 1995; DeConinck & Stilwell,

¹ Byrne & Cropanzano (2001) offer an interesting overview of the historical development of a concept of organizational fairness.

	<p>2013; Ybema & van den Bos, 2010), psychological strain (Francis & Barling, 2005), insomnia (Elovainio et al., 2009; Greenberg, 2006);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical health issues, including cardio-vascular diseases (Elovainio et al, 2006), increased sickness absence (Duijts et al, 2007; Elovainio et al., 2013; Hjarsbech et al., 2014), • overall decrease in employee wellbeing (Lawson et al, 2009), including heavy drinking (Kouvonen et al., 2008), lower self-esteem (Ferris et al., 2012). 	<p>2004; Irving et al., 2005; Choi & Rainey, 2014; Narisada & Schieman, 2016),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • innovative behavior (Janssen, 2004), engagement and empowerment (van Dijke et al., 2012), motivation (Minkler, 2004; Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009).
Organizational/ group effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more active unions (Aryee & Chay, 2001; Blader, 2007b; Johnson & Jarley, 2004; Rubin, 2011), • trust issues and withholding information (Bidarian & Jafari, 2012; Lin & Huang, 2009; Saunders & Thornhill, 2003), • turnover intentions (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Parker & Kohlmeyer, 2005; Choi, 2011; Hassan, 2012), • sabotage (Ambrose et al., 2002), theft (Greenberg & Scott, 1996), misconduct (De Schrijver et al., 2010; Ferris et al., 2012; Kickul, 2001), • workplace aggression and violence (Aquino et al., 2004; Diamond, 1997; LeBlanc & Barling, 2004), work alienation (Ceylan & Sulu, 2011). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, 1991; Lavelle et al., 2007; van Dijke et al., 2012), organizational identification and commitment (Blader, 2007a; Brockner et al., 1992; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Tyler & Degoey, 1995), • increased trust (Aryee et al., 2002; Choi, 2011), loyalty to senior leadership, and cooperation (Cho & Sai, 2012), whistleblowing (Seifert et al., 2010; Lavena, 2016),

The findings reported in Table 1 are especially important in the context of public organizations. It is crucial to ensure that government employees perceive their workplace as fair to avoid potential misconduct in public organizations, where employees spend taxpayers' money on public policies that aim for equitable and fair societal outcomes.

Perceptions of External Prestige

Perceived external prestige describes the way employees think outsiders view their organization (Smidts et al., 2001; Herrbach et al., 2004). It is sometimes referred as construed external image (Dutton et al., 1994), and depends on a variety of information sources which influence employees' interpretations of how their organization is viewed by outsiders. It is important to note that this construct is conceptually different from organizational image - an image transmitted or projected by organizational members outside (Alvesson, 1990), organizational identity - employees assessment of their own organization (Dutton et al., 1994), and organizational reputation - outsiders' view of an organization (Carmeli, 2005). Thus, in the case of government, perceived external prestige represents how government employees think citizens view their government agency.

Even though perceived external prestige is a concept which is widely used in organizational psychology research featuring a variety of organizations and international context, it is an understudied topic in terms of the public administration literature. Thus, most research on perceived external prestige focuses on private and nonprofit organizations, with a few exceptions which studied law enforcement agencies in Netherlands and China (Bartels et al., 2007; Wu, 2011) (see Appendix A).

Similar to perceived workplace fairness, external prestige is often regarded as a determinant of a variety of organizational outcomes, including turnover intentions (Ciftcioglu, 2011; Mignonac et al., 2006; Herrbach et al., 2004; Rathi & Lee, 2015; Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015; Carmeli & Freund, 2009), emotional exhaustion (Mishra, 2013), organizational identification (Bartels et al., 2007; Smidts et al., 2001), commitment

(Carmeli, 2005; Kang et al, 2011; Fuller et al., 2006), meaningfulness of work (Wu, 2011); emotional labor (Mishra et al., 2012), etc.

Thus, compared to perceived workplace fairness, perceived external prestige is a concept that is not widely used in studies of public organizations, especially in the USA.

Workplace Perceptions and Years of Public Service

While workplace perceptions and their effects on organizational outcomes are extensively studied in the field of organizational psychology, public administration researchers have devoted little attention to exploring factors that impact how government employees perceive their workplace in terms of fairness and external prestige. For example, a few scholars have explored perceived workplace fairness in government, focusing on the federal level (Cho & Sai, 2012; Choi, 2011; Rubin, 2011; Choi & Rainey, 2014; Lavena, 2016), state level (Hassan, 2012; Noblet & Rodwell, 2009), and international context (Francis & Barling, 2005; Kouvonen et al., 2008; Marmot & Bell, 2012; De Schrijver et al., 2010). However, many studies conceptualize perceived workplace fairness as a determinant of different organizational outcomes, including turnover intentions and job involvement (Choi, 2011; Hassan, 2012), expectancy of career development and job satisfaction (Cho & Sai, 2012), organizational misbehavior (De Schrijver et al., 2010), and whistleblowing (Lavena, 2016). Other scholars have focused on perceived fairness of performance evaluations among government employees (deLeon & Ewen, 1997; Kim & Rubianty, 2011; Harrington & Lee, 2015). Overall, their findings do not differ much from the previous research and are generally consistent with the effects of organizational fairness research reported in Table 1. At the same time, studies that explore determinants of perceived workplace fairness among government employees are relatively scarce.

It is important to note that although most previous studies include basic demographic characteristics of government employees, such as age, education, and organizational tenure, researchers often treat these as control variables, which consequently have not received full attention. Nonetheless, taking a closer look at the studies' results reveals a negative correlation between years of public service and (1) perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals (Harrington & Lee, 2015, N=442,500), (2) loyalty to senior leadership and expectancy for career development (Cho & Sai, 2012, N=52,214), (3) job satisfaction (Choi & Rainey, 2014, N=221,479), and (4) public service motivation (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007, N=237). Whereas most studies pay attention to the federal government, there is a lack of literature that discusses how years of public service relates to workplace perceptions of state employees.

Workplace Perceptions and Turnover Intentions

Public administration literature suggests that as employees get older and serve the public for many years, they are less likely to quit their jobs (Moynihan & Pandey, 2008; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008). However, there seems to be an interesting contradiction: as time goes by, government employees tend to have lower levels of job satisfaction (Choi & Rainey, 2014), yet they are less likely to quit their jobs.

The present study aims to provide an insight into this interesting puzzle by first focusing on how workplace perceptions vary among government employees who worked for the state government for 1 to 40 years, and then, by examining in more depth the effect of these perceptions on organizational identification and turnover intentions among government employees.

Explaining Turnover Intentions in Government

Researchers studying turnover in the US public sector, usually conceptualize it as a negative process, associated with a loss of institutional knowledge and expenses related to hiring and training of new employees (Meier & Hicklin, 2008; Kim, 2005; Moynihan & Pandey, 2008; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008).

At the same time it is important to note that turnover is commonly measured as turnover intentions. Some researchers argue that there are conceptual grounds to believe that turnover intentions are a proxy for actual turnover (e.g. Lee & Whitford, 2008; Whitford & Lee, 2015). While others admit that using turnover intentions instead of data on actual turnover is related to challenges with collecting the data from employees who already left their organizations (Mor Barak et al., 2001). Following researchers who argue that turnover and turnover intentions are two distinct concepts which may have similar antecedents but have different effects on organizations (e.g. Tett & Meyer, 1993; Allen et al., 1995; Cohen et al., 2016), this study focuses on turnover intentions.

The effect of turnover intentions on work environment is potentially wider in its scope compared to actual turnover. In fact, studies have found that turnover intentions rate is higher than actual turnover (Cho & Lewis, 2011). In other words, more people report their intention to leave their job than actually do so. At the same time, employees who report turnover intentions also report low job satisfaction, decreased organizational commitment and burnout (Choi & Rainey, 2014; Kim, 2015). Moreover, many employees who admit that they are willing to quit may continue their employment for a long period of time, therefore decreasing overall organizational performance. Thus, high rates of

turnover intentions may be detrimental to organizational performance, which is especially important in terms of government organizations funded by taxpayers.

Explaining turnover intentions rather than actual turnover brings attention to the role of workplace perceptions, including perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige. While researchers studied the role of workplace fairness in explaining turnover and turnover intentions in public and private organizations (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Parker & Kohlmeyer, 2005; Hassan, 2012), there is a lack of research on the effect of external prestige on turnover intentions among government employees in the USA. Two empirical studies which featured perceived external prestige in the US context focused on affective commitment and withdrawal cognition among university faculty, staff and administrators (Fuller et al., 2006) and service innovation implementation among customer service workers (Schaarschmidt, 2016).

Consequently, research on turnover intentions in US government organizations does not consider the role of perceived external prestige. Most studies focus on individual, organizational and environmental factors (Kim, 2005, 2012; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Moynihan & Pandey, 2008; Selden & Moynihan, 2000; Selden et al., 2013). For example, while explaining turnover intentions in the state government, Moynihan and Landuyt (2008) take into account individual characteristics (primary earner, household size, age, years of residency in a specific state, tenure, education, gender, race) and organizational characteristics (job satisfaction, workload, being a supervisor, a variety of human resources practices as well as work environment), while ignoring environmental factors. Other studies, which also focus on explaining turnover intentions in the government, along with individual and organizational characteristics take into consideration such environmental

factors as unemployment rate (Selden et al., 2013), and location of the employer (Selden & Moynihan, 2000).

Thus, there is a lack of studies which explore perceptions of workplace fairness and external prestige among government employees as significant factors influencing their turnover intentions. Additionally, even though there is a limited research on relationship between workplace fairness and turnover intentions, there are no studies on perceptions of external prestige among US government employees. However, given the current anti-government sentiments in the society and the importance of retention of most qualified public servants, it is essential to explore whether perceived external prestige of government influences turnover intentions among government employees.

Linking Workplace Perceptions and Turnover Intentions

Across a variety of cultural and organizational contexts, perceived external prestige and turnover intentions are found to be negatively associated (Herrbach et al., 2004; Mignonac et al., 2006; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Ciftcioglu, 2011; Mishra, 2013; Rathi & Lee, 2015; Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015). For example, employees in Turkey, France, India, Israel, Netherlands, South Korea, and China consistently reported that they are more likely to think about leaving their organization if they believe that it is not regarded as prestigious (see Table 2). However, most of the empirical studies were conducted in private and nonprofit organizations. Only a few studies examined government employees in law enforcement agencies in Netherlands and China (Bartels et al., 2007; Wu, 2011), finding that when employees are pro-socially motivated, the perceived external prestige of their organizations positively affects their experience in meaningfulness of work (Wu, 2011). Only one study focused on the US context examining university employees (Fuller et al.,

2006). The study found that perceived external prestige contributes to organizational attachment and reduces withdrawal cognitions especially among university faculty.

It is important to note that in most research the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions is hypothesized to be mediated by organizational identification (Mignonac et al., 2006; Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015; Mishra, 2013) and its close conceptual neighbor - affective organizational commitment (Ciftcioglu, 2011; Herrbach et al., 2004; Rathi & Lee, 2015; Carmeli & Freund, 2009).

Table 2. The Effect of Perceived External Prestige (PEP) on Turnover Intentions

Title	Author	Participants/ Location	Findings
The Relationship between Perceived External Prestige and Turnover Intention: An Empirical Investigation	(Ciftcioglu, 2011)	University students/Turkey	PEP has an indirect and negative impact on turnover intention through the partially mediating effect of affective commitment to their organization and group-based self-esteem.
The interactive effects of perceived external prestige and need for organizational identification on turnover intentions	(Mignonac, Herrbach, & Guerrero, 2006)	Engineers, business managers, auditors/France	PEP influences turnover intentions, but this influence is moderated by individuals' need for organizational identification.
Exploring the role of perceived external prestige in managers' turnover intentions	(Herrbach, Mignonac, & Gatignon, 2004)	Managers/France	The impact of PEP on intentions to leave is partially mediated by the two determinants of turnover in the model: organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Yet there still remains a direct effect of PEP on intentions to quit.
Retaining talent by enhancing organizational prestige	(Rathi & Lee, 2015)	Retail employees/India	A negative relationship between PEP and turnover intentions. Affective commitment was observed to partially mediate the

			relationship between PEP and turnover intentions.
The impacts of perceived organizational prestige and organization identification on turnover intention: the mediating effect of psychological empowerment	(Akgunduz & Bardakoglu , 2015)	Hotel employees/Turkey	A strong relationship between organizational identification/organizational prestige and hotel employees' turnover intention.
Linking perceived external prestige and intentions to leave the organization: The mediating role of job satisfaction and affective commitment	(Carmeli & Freund, 2009)	Nonprofit healthcare employees/Israel	PEP results in higher employee commitment and satisfaction, which, in turn, leads to lower levels of intention to leave the organization.
Perceived External Prestige and Employee Outcomes: Mediation Effect of Organizational Identification	(Mishra, 2013)	Medical sales employees/India	PEP is negatively related to both emotional exhaustion and turnover intention. The finding indicated a partial mediation effect of organizational identification on the relationship between PEP and turnover intention.
The effects of perceived external prestige, ethical organizational climate, and leader-member exchange (LMX) quality on employees' commitments and their subsequent attitudes	(Kang, Stewart, & Kim, 2011)	Corporate employees/South Korea	PEP is a predictor of organizational commitment but not career commitment. Furthermore, as a mediator, each form of commitment also affects employees' training participation motivation and their turnover intention.
Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived External Prestige: Predicting Organizational Attachment for	(Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Frey, & Relyea, 2006)	University employees/USA	PEP contributes to organizational attachment. PEP was more strongly related to affective commitment and withdrawal cognitions of university faculty than to those of university staff and administrators.

University Faculty, Staff, and Administrators			
The Pursuit of Meaningfulness of Work: The Interaction between Prosocial Motivation, Task Significance, and Perceived External Prestige	(Wu, 2011)	High-tech and police employees/ China	When individuals are prosocially motivated, the perceived external prestige of their organizations positively affects their experience in meaningfulness of work.

Thus, the literature review shows that even though there are studies which explore the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions, they tend to feature private and nonprofit organizations and an international context. Therefore, there is a lack of research focusing on perceived external prestige and turnover intentions among government employees in the USA. Furthermore, since the overview of the previous literature shows that this relationship is found to be mediated by organizational identification, it is important to examine its theoretical foundations.

The Role of Organizational Identification

As it is often the case with complex abstract concepts, organizational identification has been defined in many different ways (e.g. van Dick, 2003; Edwards, 2005, Ashforth et al, 2008; Diamond, 2016). One of the widely used approaches to understanding organizational identification is based on the social identity theory. The theory states that a person's sense of who they are is based on their group memberships (Tajfel, 1974, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Dutton et al., 1994).

Tajfel (1978) distinguishes between personal and social identity. He defines social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership”. Tajfel describes three components of identification with a group: cognitive (a sense of awareness of the membership), affective (emotional attachment to the group) and evaluative (value assigned to the group). Thus, the social identity theory can be summarized as following:

- Individuals are motivated to achieve or maintain a positive self-esteem;
- Individuals’ self-esteem is based partly on their social identity, which derives from group memberships (e.g. employment with organizations);
- The request for a positive social identity leads to the need for positive evaluations of the group (organization) in comparison with relevant other groups.

Thus, social identity theory assumes that individuals strive for a positive self-concept and use their memberships in social groups to enhance it.

The social identity theory is one of the theoretical frameworks widely used to explain the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions in organizations (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Dutton et al., 1994). An application of the theory to an organizational context suggests that a place of employment, as one of important group memberships, impacts employees’ positive self-concept and a feeling of self-worth, if their organization is regarded as prestigious. In other words, if an employee believes that her organization is regarded as prestigious, she is more likely to feel good about oneself as a member of this organization and therefore is more likely to remain its employee. On the contrary, if an employee doesn’t believe that her organization

is regarded as prestigious, she may consider exiting the organization and seeking for an alternative employment to enhance her self-esteem. Thus, according to the social identity theory employees tend to identify themselves with their organizations and are more likely to stay if it helps them maintain a positive self-concept.

Thus, it will be particularly interesting to empirically test the theoretical foundations of social identity theory in the context of government by exploring the link between perceived external prestige, organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees.

Overall, the brief review of the literature shows that there is a lack of studies focusing on how workplace perceptions change over time, particularly in case of government employees. Additionally, perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige have been mostly conceptualized as determinants of a wide variety of organizational outcomes. However, there are no studies which focus on the joint role of these workplace perceptions in explaining organizational identification and turnover intentions. For instance, public administration literature mostly focused on perceptions of fairness, while perceived external prestige is an unexplored topic which may yield very interesting results for a variety of organizational outcomes, including organizational identification and turnover intentions among government employees. Thus, this dissertation aims to examine on the one hand, how years of public service affect workplace perceptions of government employees, and on the other hand, how these perceptions influence their organizational identification and turnover intentions.

CHAPTER 3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

In the previous chapter existing research on workplace perceptions, organizational identification and turnover intentions was reviewed. In this chapter the dissertation's conceptual framework is developed along with the testable hypotheses in order to answer the research questions. Although the cross-sectional design does not allow causal inferences, the conceptual framework is presented with hypothesized directions of the relationships between the concepts.

As mentioned earlier, this dissertation builds on the previous research in order to answer two research questions. First, what is the effect of years of public service on workplace perceptions of state employees? Second, how workplace perceptions influence organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees.

Research Question 1

The first question is descriptive in its nature and provides an insight into how workplace perceptions change depending on time spent working for the government. This approach differs from most studies, which conceptualize workplace perceptions as determinants of a variety of organizational attitudes and behavior (Rubin, 2009; Choi, 2011; Hassan, 2012; Cho & Sai, 2012; De Schrijver et al., 2010; Lavena, 2016; Ciftcioglu, 2011; Mignonac et al., 2006; Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Mishra, 2013; Bartels et al., 2007; Smidts et al., 2001; Fuller et al., 2006; Wu, 2011). In doing so, it builds on the findings of the previous studies and provides more insight into the characteristics of government employees who are more likely to perceive their workplace as fair and prestigious. Thus, the study develops a more dynamic view of workplace perceptions in public organizations

by focusing on how perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige vary among government employees reporting between 1 and 40 years of working for the government. Although the study does not track the same individuals over years, it provides an important perspective on how the perceptions differ at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of public service careers.

Assuming the predominance of the neoliberal ideology (Harvey, 2002) and anti-government sentiments in the society (Goodsell, 2015) as a contextual background of the study, perceived external prestige is expected to decrease with more years of work for the government:

H1.1: Perceived external prestige is negatively associated with years of public service.

Furthermore, the present study uses the three-dimensional conceptualization of workplace fairness, which includes distributive, procedural and interactional fairness. Based on the previous research which found negative correlation between years of public service and perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals (Harrington & Lee, 2015, loyalty to senior leadership and expectancy for career development (Cho & Sai, 2012, job satisfaction (Choi & Rainey, 2014), and public service motivation (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007), the dissertation hypothesizes that as years go by, government employees perceive their workplace as less fair in terms of compensation, procedures, and interactions at work:

H1.2a: Perceived distributive fairness is negatively associated with years of public service.

H1.2b: Perceived procedural fairness is negatively associated with years of public service.

H1.2c: Perceived interactional fairness is negatively associated with years of public service.

After studying the effect of years of public service on three dimensions of organizational fairness separately, the present study uses a composite score which includes all three dimensions of workplace fairness to determine its relationship with years of public service.

H1.2d: Perceived workplace fairness is negatively associated with years of public service.

Thus, due to challenges in operationalization of the concept of fairness, the study explores the effect of perceived workplace fairness among government employees by testing three dimensions of organizational fairness as separate dependent variables, and then compiling them to produce a cumulative score of organizational fairness. Next, the cumulative score is compared with a single-item measure of perceived workplace fairness to validate the explanatory power of the three-dimensional conceptualization of organizational fairness in public organizations.

Research Question 2

The second research question considers how workplace perceptions are related to organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees (Figure 1).

First, the dissertation focuses on the role of perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige as determinants of organizational identification. It is important to note that researchers tend to explore separately perceived external prestige (how employees think outsiders view their organization) and perceived workplace fairness (whether employees believe that they are treated with fairness at work). There are no

studies which synthesize these two distinct branches of the literature on organizational psychology. Additionally, while perceived external prestige has been found to be a significant factor in explaining organizational identification across a variety of organizational contexts (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Bartels et al., 2007; Smidts et al., 2001; Mignonac et al., 2006; Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015; Mishra, 2013; Mishra et al., 2012), studies focusing on state government employees were difficult to locate.

Perceived external prestige is based on employees' exposure to different types of information about their organization which may result in a variety of perceptions. In general, researchers found evidence that perceived external prestige positively affects organizational identification (e.g., Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Dutton et al., 1994; Pratt, 1998; Mignonac et al., 2006; Bartels et al., 2007; Mishra, 2013; Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015). Essentially, members feel proud to belong to an organization that is perceived as prestigious and having socially valued characteristics (Dutton et al., 1994; Smidts et al., 2001; Bartels et al., 2007). This leads to the hypothesis:

H2.1.: Perceived external prestige is positively associated with organizational identification.

A link between perceived workplace fairness and organizational identification can be explained by Tyler and Blader's group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2009). This model assumes that individuals' identification with groups depends on their judgments of fairness of decision-making processes - procedural fairness (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Thibaut et al., 1974, Thibaut & Walker, 1978), economic outcomes from group membership - distributive fairness (Adams, 1963, 1965), and treatment that people experience in groups - interactional fairness (Bies, 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler & Bies, 1990; Blader &

Tyler, 2003). These perceptions of fairness provide employees cues for evaluation of the nature of their relationship with their group in order to determine whether they can develop and maintain a positive social identity. Therefore, perceptions of fairness of everyday workplace experiences can be regarded as antecedents of whether employees identify with their group and organization (Blader, 2007a, b; Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006; Tyler & Degoey, 1995). Thus, the second hypothesis is:

H2.2.: Perceived workplace fairness is positively associated with organizational identification.

Since studies have already found the evidence that government employees' perceptions of fairness are associated with organizational identification and turnover intentions (e.g. Hassan, 2002, Choi, 2011), the primary focus is on perceived external prestige of government employees, as a possible determinant of organizational identification and turnover intentions among government employees that has not been studied yet. The dissertation uses social identity theory to hypothesize that organizational identification mediates the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions. The theory suggests that if people feel that their organization is regarded well externally, they are more likely to have higher levels of organizational identification and therefore are less likely to quit their jobs. Since previous studies found that workplace fairness is an important determinant of organizational identification and turnover intentions, the model will control for workplace fairness.

Assuming the predominantly negative perceptions of the government by its citizens, perceived external prestige of government may be one of the essential factors explaining low organizational identification and turnover intentions among government

employees. When mostly negative images of government are transmitted via social interactions and cultural channels (e.g. media portraits government mostly negatively), government employees, being agents of the government, may internalize them, developing low self-esteem, low organizational identification, and therefore, turnover intentions.

Figure 1. Conceptual framework²

Additionally, researchers who studied a variety of non-profit and for-profit organizations found that perceived external prestige is negatively associated with work outcomes, including turnover intentions (Mignonac et al., 2006; Ciftcioglu, 2011; Rathi & Lee, 2015) and emotional exhaustion (Mishra et al., 2012; Mishra, 2013), and is positively

² Based on conceptualizations of internal and external organizational image developed in Dutton, Jane E., Janet M. Dukerich, and Celia V. Harquail. (1994). Organizational Images and Member Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39(2): 239–63.

associated with job satisfaction (Herrbach et al., 2004; Carmeli & Feund, 2009). In many studies this relationship was found to be mediated by organizational identification. Thus, it seems that individuals are more likely to identify with and continue their employment with organizations perceived as prestigious, which leads to the hypothesis:

H2.3: Perceived external prestige of government negatively influences turnover intentions among government employees. This relationship is mediated by employees' organizational identification.

Thus, the study first explores the relationship between workplace perceptions and years of public service, hypothesizing that as years go by government employees tend to perceive their workplace as less fair and prestigious. Then, the relationship between workplace perceptions and organizational identification is examined. It is expected that if government employees perceive their workplace as fair and prestigious, they are more likely to identify themselves with their workplace. Lastly, the relationship between perceived external prestige, organizational identification and turnover intentions is examined, controlling for workplace fairness. A mediating effect of organizational identification is hypothesized. It is expected that when employees perceive their workplace as prestigious, they are more likely to identify themselves with their organization, and therefore, are less likely to report turnover intentions.

CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY

Data

The hypotheses stated in Chapter 3 will be tested using data collected via an on-line survey of employees of a large state agency in the Midwest. The agency employs 1,775 people who work across seven divisions responsible for a state government's budgeting, personnel and property management, as well as provision of IT services to other state agencies. This variety of functions within one agency creates a unique demographic diversity of respondents, summarized in Table 3. A typical respondent is a man between 45-54 years old, who has a 4-year college degree and earns an annual salary between \$30,000-39,000.

The survey was distributed in the spring of 2016 via an internal listserv, which includes all agency employees. Two recruitment emails were sent out internally one week apart from each other by a human resources specialist who had access to employees' emails. Due to the nature of the services provided by the agency, all employees have emails, and frequently check their mailboxes. The emails contained information regarding the purpose of the survey, its anonymity, confidentiality, and voluntary nature of participation in the survey, as well as a link to take the survey. The administration of the survey was monitored by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Missouri, IRB application # 2005314. The survey materials, including the consent form, the recruitment emails and the survey questionnaire are included in Appendix 2.

The survey consisted of 40 questions, 7 of which asked about demographic information. In order to ensure the clarity and reliability of the measures, before administering the survey the questions were piloted using a focus group of 16 state

government employees. The survey questions were based on the academic literature in the fields of organizational psychology and public administration, as well as the best practices of surveying government employees in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Most survey items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree). Overall, 716 usable surveys were received, with a dropout rate of 6%. The average response rate was 40%, ranging from 31% to 62% depending on the division. The final sample size is 522 observations.

Table 3. Characteristics of Survey Respondents

	Frequency	(%)
Gender		
Male	305	(58.4)
Female	217	(41.6)
Age		
Under 25	13	(2.5)
25-34	67	(12.8)
35-44	114	(21.8)
45-54	194	(37.2)
55-64	121	(23.2)
65 or older	13	(2.5)
Education		
Less than high school	3	(0.5)
High School or GED	62	(11.9)
Some College	102	(19.5)
2-year College Degree	83	(15.9)
4-year College Degree	204	(39.1)
Master's Degree	63	(12.1)
Ph.D. or Professional Degree (JD, MD)	5	(1)
Salary range		
Less than \$19,999	1	(0.2)
\$20,000 – \$29,999	63	(12.1)
\$30,000 – \$39,999	144	(27.6)
\$40,000 – \$49,999	118	(22.6)
\$50,000 – \$59,999	84	(16.1)
\$60,000 – \$69,999	58	(11.1)
\$70,000 – 79,999	43	(8.2)

More than \$80,000	11	(2.1)
Divisions		
Budgeting	16	(3.1)
Facilities Management	138	(26.4)
Information Technology Services	272	(52.1)
Accounting	25	(4.8)
General Services	28	(5.4)
Human Resources	31	(5.9)
Purchasing	12	(2.3)

Variables

Organizational fairness or workplace fairness is an abstract concept which is very difficult to operationalize, therefore, the present study uses three approaches to operationalization of the workplace fairness:

- 1) Three dimensions of workplace fairness, including distributive, procedural and interactional, are used as separate dependent variables in order to determine and compare the effect of years of public service and other determinants;
- 2) A composite score which combines 20 items used to measure the three dimensions of workplace fairness;
- 3) A single item scale of workplace fairness.

First, distributive, procedural and interactional dimensions of organizational fairness are used as separate dependent variables. Table 4 shows that the *distributive*

Table 4. Measures of Distributive Fairness

		M	SD	Min	Max
Salary fairness (.93)		2.52	1.16	1	5
Salary – responsibilities	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of salary considering the responsibilities that you have?	2.56	1.31	1	5
Salary – experience	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of salary in	2.56	1.32	1	5

	view of the amount of experience that you have had?				
Salary – effort	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of salary for the amount of effort that you put forth?	2.46	1.27	1	5
Salary – stress	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of salary for the stresses and strains of your job?	2.50	1.24	1	5
Benefits fairness (.94)		3.46	1.17	1	5
Benefits – responsibilities	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of benefits considering the responsibilities that you have?	3.58	1.27	1	5
Benefits – experience	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of benefits in view of the amount of experience that you have had?	3.47	1.25	1	5
Benefits – effort	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of benefits for the amount of effort that you put forth?	3.41	1.26	1	5
Benefits – stress	To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of benefits for the stresses and strains of your job?	3.36	1.26	1	5

fairness was operationalized as perceptions of the fairness of government employees' compensation, including salary and benefits. It was measured using Moorman's 4-item scale (Moorman, 1991), $\alpha=.90$.

In order to measure the *procedural fairness*, a 6-item score was developed ($\alpha=.89$). The score is based on items measuring fairness of hiring, promotions, career development, appeals, performance, and overall ethicality of procedures from a government employee' perspective. Table 5 shows descriptive statistics of the procedural fairness measures.

Table 5. Measures of Procedural Fairness

Procedural fairness (.89)		M	SD	Min	Max
Hiring	My division hires people who can do the job well.	3.28	1.24	1	5
Promotion	Promotions in my division are based on merit.	2.73	1.35	1	5
Appeal	I can initiate a formal complaint or appeal without fear of retaliation.	2.90	1.26	1	5
Career development	My division does a good job supporting employee career development.	2.98	1.32	1	5
Procedural ethicality	Overall, the procedures and policies in my division uphold ethical and moral standards.	3.50	1.25	1	5
Performance management	My division effectively manages poor performance.	2.71	1.26	1	5

A third dimension of workplace fairness, *interactional fairness*, was measured using a 6-item score ($\alpha=.90$) concerned with a perceived quality of supervision and communication among government employees. Specific survey items used to measure interactional fairness are described in more detail in Table 6.

Table 6. Measures of Interactional Fairness

Interactional fairness (.90)		M	SD	Min	Max
Voice	I have the opportunity to contribute my views before decisions that affect me are made.	3.15	1.34	1	5
Challenge status quo	It is safe to challenge the way things are done in my division.	3.02	1.31	1	5
Communication	Communication flows effectively between staff and management.	2.81	1.36	1	5

Supervision	I am satisfied with the quality of supervision I receive at work.	3.79	1.27	1	5
Meetings	I feel free to bring up issues that worry me during work meetings.	3.58	1.25	1	5
Interpersonal issues	Overall, I am satisfied with how interpersonal issues are resolved in my division.	3.04	1.23	1	5

The present study tests the validity of the three-dimensional conceptualization of organizational fairness—distributive, procedural, and interactional—by combining them into one cumulative score of overall workplace fairness, which includes 20 items ($\alpha=0.93$). Then, the composite score will be compared with a single-item measure “Overall, I believe that my organization treats me with fairness” a scale from 0 to 100 in terms of the direction and magnitude of the coefficients.

Perceived external prestige is measured using a single item “Generally speaking, I believe that citizens value the work of state government employees”. This statement aims to indirectly reveal beliefs of state government employees about whether citizens, as major external stakeholders, view their work as prestigious. Even though the question does not directly address prestige, it can be argued that the concepts of value and prestige overlap. Moreover, if the statement was formulated more directly “Generally speaking, I believe that citizens consider the work of state government employees as prestigious”, it would likely result in lower estimates, given a long tradition of citizens’ distrust toward government.

Years of public service is measured by asking a question: “In total, how many years have you been working for the state government?” This is a conservative measure of years of public service and is likely to be underreported. Since the question asks specifically

about years of public service in a state government, it may not include years of work for agencies of local or federal government. The study acknowledges this limitation; however, since it is more likely to cause underestimation of the reported years of public service, it will not significantly bias the estimations. A quadratic term of the years of public service was also included in the model to test for a curvilinear relationship between years of public service and perceived organizational fairness.

Positive affectivity, defined as a disposition to experience positive emotional states, was measured using a 2-item scale: “My division inspires me to do my best”, “I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things” ($\alpha=0.78$).

Work-life balance was measured using a single item “I achieve a good balance between my work and my private life” on a scale from 0-no balance to 100 - very good balance.

Turnover Intentions is measured using a composite score comprised of two items “I would prefer to continue working for the state government, even if a comparable job was available in the private for-profit sector”, “I would prefer to continue working for the state government, even if a comparable job was available in the nonprofit sector”, ($\alpha=.90$). The score is an average value of two responses, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). If a respondent has a score less or equal to 3, she is assigned to “Turnover Intentions” group, coded as 1. On the other hand, if a respondent scored higher than 3, she is assigned to “Intention to Stay” group, coded as 0.

It is important to note that turnover intentions are measured as a hypothetical situation which represents a preference to stay/quit employment with the state despite the availability of employment alternatives outside of the state government. Therefore, it

doesn't depend on the availability of actual alternatives to current employment, which can be limited given the fact that state government jobs in the Midwestern states tend to concentrate in small cities with limited employment alternatives.

Organizational identification, a disposition to identify oneself with the organization one works for, is measured using a 2-item score "I am proud when I tell others that I work for the state government", "The state government empowers its employees to work in the best interests of the citizens" ($\alpha=0.71$). While the first statement measures the affective component of organizational identification, the second statement measures its evaluative component. A cognitive component of organizational identification – awareness of group membership - is assumed due to the intentional nature of employment relationships. The score is an average value of two responses, which ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). If a respondent has a score less or equal to 3, she is assigned to "No organizational identification" group, coded as 0, whereas if a respondent scored higher than 3, she is assigned to "Organizational identification" group, which is coded as 1. Table 7 shows descriptive statistics of the variables.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variables	M	SD	Min	Max	Unit
Distributive fairness	3.02	.96	1	5	$\alpha = .90$
Procedural fairness	3.07	1.02	1	5	$\alpha = .89$
Interactional fairness	3.30	1.03	1	5	$\alpha = .90$
Overall fairness: composite score	3.12	.83	1	5	$\alpha=0.93$
Overall fairness: single-item scale	67.40	28.39	0	100	Overall, I believe that my organization treats me with fairness (0 = not fair at all; 100 = very fair)

Perceived external prestige	2.52	1.09	1	5	Generally speaking, I believe that citizens value the work of state government employees.
Organizational identification	.55		0	1	The state government empowers its employees to work in the best interests of the citizens. I am proud when I tell others that I work for the state government ($\alpha=0.71$)
Turnover intentions	.46		0	1	I would prefer to continue working for the state government, even if a comparable job was available in the private for-profit/nonprofit sector ($\alpha=.90$)
Years of public service	13.78	9.56	1	40	In total, how many years have you been working for the state government?
Years of public service ²	91.22	98.93	.05	687.49	The variable centered around M=13.78
Age	3.73	1.10	1	6	What is your age? (Less than 25 (1); 25 – 34 (2); 35 – 44 (3); 45 – 54 (4); 55 – 64 (5); 65 – 74 (6))
Education	4.21	1.28	1	7	What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Less than High School (1); High School / GED (2); Some College (3); 2-year College Degree (4); 4-year College Degree (5); Master's Degree (6); Ph.D. or Professional Degree (JD, MD) (7))
Male	.58		0	1	Male=1 (58%); Female=0 (42%)
Salary range	4.19	1.56	1	8	What is your salary range? (Less than \$19,999 (1); \$20,000 – \$29,999 (2); \$30,000 – \$39,999 (3); \$40,000 – \$49,999 (4); \$50,000 – \$59,999 (5); \$60,000 – \$69,999 (6); \$70,000 – 79,999 (7); More than \$80,000 (8))
Work-life balance	73.56	22.88	1	100	I achieve a good balance between my work and my private life (0- no balance; 100 - very good balance).

Positive affectivity toward work	3.60	1.12	1	5	My division inspires me to do my best. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things ($\alpha=0.78$)
----------------------------------	------	------	---	---	--

Methods

Research Question 1

The first research question considers the effect of years of public service on perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige. Ordered logistic regression analysis will be conducted due to the ordinal nature of the dependent variables used to measure the workplace perceptions. Using OLS for ordinal dependent variables is inappropriate since OLS assumes that the distances between categories are the same (Agresti, 2002): the distance “between strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” is the same as from “somewhat agree” to “neither agree nor disagree”. However, since it is often difficult to make this assumption, ordered logistic regression is used.

First, ordered logistic regression is used for 4 models with dependent variables representing distributive, procedural and interactional fairness along with a composite workplace fairness. Lastly, OLS regression analysis is used for a continuous dependent variable measured as single-item scale of workplace fairness. The results of the OLS regression analysis will be compared with the ordered logistic regression results of the composite-score workplace fairness in order to test the validity of the three-dimensional conceptualization of workplace fairness. Standardized coefficients will be used to compare the results. All models will also include control variables: individual and organizational characteristics, including age, education, gender, salary range, division, work-life balance and positive affectivity toward work.

Table 8. Summary of Empirical Models for Research Question 1

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	Regression Method
Distributive fairness	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	Ordered Logit
Procedural fairness	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	Ordered Logit
Interactional fairness	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	Ordered Logit
Composite score overall workplace fairness	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	Ordered Logit
Single-item overall workplace fairness	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	OLS
Perceived external prestige	Years of public service, years of public service ² , individual and organizational characteristics	Ordered Logit

Research Question 2

The second research question considers how workplace perceptions influence organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees. First, logistic regression analysis is conducted in order to estimate the effect of workplace perceptions on organizational identification. The model will estimate the effect of perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige, controlling for demographic and organizational characteristics of government employees.

Next, organizational identification is hypothesized as a mediator variable in the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions of state

employees. The mediation analysis is conducted following the approach proposed by Baron & Kenny (1986). It is calculated with the three equations:

1. $Y = cX + E1$
2. $M = aX + E2$
3. $Y = bM + c'X + E3$

Where Y - is an outcome variable (turnover intentions), X - is a predictor variable (perceived external prestige), M - is a mediator variable (organizational identification), c – is a total effect, c' - is a direct effect, ab – is an indirect effect or mediation, calculated as a product of coefficients a and b from equations (2) and (3). Thus, the total effect= direct effect + indirect effect or using symbols $c = c' + ab$. Figure 2 represents the mediation analysis graphically.

Figure 2. Mediation Analysis

Thus, in order to demonstrate the mediation effect of organizational identification 4 conditions should be met:

1. Perceived external prestige (X) is associated with turnover intentions (Y). The first step shows that there is an effect of X on Y that may be mediated.

2. Perceived external prestige (X) is associated with organizational identification (M). This step essentially shows the effect of X on M, in this step M is represented as an outcome variable.
3. Organizational identification (M) is associated with turnover intentions (Y); mediator variable has an effect on an outcome variable.
4. The association between perceived external prestige (X) and turnover intentions (Y) is not statistically significant or has decreased when organizational identification (M) is included in the model. If the relationship between X and Y becomes not statistically significant after including M in the model, then it suggests full mediation. If the coefficient decreases but is statistically significant, then partial mediation is assumed.

Since previous studies found the evidence that perceived workplace fairness is associated with both organizational identification and turnover intentions, workplace fairness will be included in the model as a control variable along with individual and organizational characteristics.

To conduct the mediation analysis Stata command *binary_mediation* will be used. In order to make coefficients comparable across the equations, the coefficients will be standardized. This is accomplished by multiplying each coefficient by the standard deviation of the predictor variable in the equation and then dividing by the standard deviation of the outcome variable (MacKinnon & Dwyer, 1993). Stata automatically standardizes the coefficients.

Furthermore, *bootstrap* command will be used to obtain standard errors and confidence intervals based on 1000 resamplings. Bootstrapping is a non-parametric method

widely used for testing the indirect effect (Bollen & Stine, 1990; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). It is based on resampling with replacement done many times. The indirect effect is computed for each sample and a sampling distribution can be empirically generated. If a confidence interval does not contain zero, then the indirect effect is different from zero.

Thus, the hypotheses stated in Chapter 3 will be tested using regression analyses of the survey data collected from state employees in the Midwest.

CHAPTER 5. STATE EMPLOYEES' WORKPLACE PERCEPTIONS: THE EFFECT OF YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Based on the hypotheses stated in Chapter 3, the present chapter is concerned with assessing the effect of years of public service on workplace perceptions. Table 9 shows correlations between the variables of primary interest. Perceived external prestige is negatively correlated with years of public service, with a coefficient of $-.13$ ($p < .05$). At the same time, years of public service is negatively correlated with 4 variables measuring perceived workplace fairness. The correlation coefficient of procedural and interactional fairness are $-.18$ ($p < .05$) and $-.17$ ($p < .05$), while correlation coefficient for distributive fairness is not statistically significant. As a result, the composite score of organizational fairness which includes all three dimensions of fairness has a correlation coefficient of $-.14$ ($p < .05$), which is slightly lower, but still statistically significant. Interestingly, a single-item organizational fairness has a correlation coefficient of $-.15$. Thus, two measures of overall perceived organizational fairness are negatively associated with years of public service and are consistent with each other. Overall, there is a moderate negative correlation between the dependent variables and the independent variable of primary interest.

Table 10 presents coefficients and odds ratios of the ordered logistic regression analysis of distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness. In general, the odds ratio represents a relative measure of the probability of the dependent variable to occur given the event of the independent variable under study. When the score is above one or higher, it means that there is a positive association between dependent and independent variables. On the other hand, when the score is below one, there is a negative association between dependent and independent variables.

Table 9. Correlations Between Variables (*p<0.05)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1	Distributive fairness	1													
2	Procedural fairness	0.44*	1												
3	Interactional fairness	0.38*	0.83*	1											
4	Perceived workplace fairness (composite)	0.77*	0.88*	0.85*											
5	Perceived workplace fairness (single)	0.45*	0.74*	0.73*	0.76*	1									
6	Perceived external prestige	0.18*	0.37*	0.33*	0.34*	0.25*	1								
7	Years of public service	-0.03	-0.18*	-0.17*	-0.14*	-0.15*	-0.13*	1							
8	Age	-0.09*	-0.22*	-0.19*	-0.20*	-0.16*	-0.01	0.46*	1						
9	Education	0.17*	0.16*	0.09*	0.17*	0.11*	-0.05	-0.03	-0.14*	1					
10	Male	-0.15*	-0.12*	-0.06	-0.14*	-0.16*	0.11*	-0.19*	0.09*	-0.03	1				
11	Salary	0.19*	0.16*	0.12*	0.19*	0.14*	-0.14*	0.36*	0.11*	0.43*	-0.05	1			
12	Work-life balance	0.25*	0.28*	0.30*	0.33*	0.48*	0.16*	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03	-0.17*	-0.04	1		
13	Positive affectivity	0.34*	0.72*	0.78*	0.72*	0.70*	0.36*	-0.12*	-0.15*	0.04	-0.13*	0.10*	0.31*	1	
14	Turnover intentions	-0.27*	-0.38*	-0.34*	-0.39*	-0.37*	-0.30*	0.04	0.08	-0.01	0.10*	-0.04	-0.17*	-0.41*	1
15	Organizational identification	0.28*	0.59*	0.58*	0.56*	0.52*	0.40*	-0.11*	-0.07	0.01	-0.06	0.03	0.26*	0.56*	-0.37*

The effect of years of public service on each dimension of organizational fairness was analyzed controlling for individual and work-related characteristics of state government employees, including age, gender, education, salary range, division, work-life balance and positive affectivity.

Association Between Distributive Fairness and Years of Public Service

The analysis indicates that overall, the perceived fairness of compensation decreases with more years of public service. This relationship is curvilinear and decreases at an increasing rate. In other words, over time, government employees tend to perceive their compensation as less fair. However, after a certain period, their perceptions of compensational unfairness become less intense. Every additional year of working for the state government would result in a .029 unit decrease in the ordered log-odds of having higher score of perceived distributive fairness while the other variables in the model are held constant. The odds ratio is lower than 1 which suggest a negative association between years of public service and distributive fairness. Since an ordered logistic regression estimates a single equation across all levels of the dependent variable, the formal interpretation is based on comparing two groups: people who are in groups greater than k versus those who are in groups less than or equal to k , where k is the level of the dependent variable (Agresti, 2002). For example, the proportional odds ratio for years of public service is .972, which means that for every additional year of working for the state government, the odds of perceiving high distributive fairness versus the combined middle and low distributive fairness categories are .972 times lower, holding all other variables constant. Similarly, for every additional year of working for the state government, the odds of the combined high and middle perceived distributive fairness versus lower levels of

distributive fairness are .972 times lower, holding all else constant. Thus, the analysis indicates that long-term state government employees are more likely to perceive their compensation as not fair.

Gender is another important factor that explains variation in the perceptions of distributive fairness among state government employees. Men are less likely to perceive their compensation as fair compared to women. Perceived distributive fairness is .505 ordered log odds lower for men compared to women, holding else constant.

Furthermore, the education and salary range of government employees are positively associated with their perceived fairness of compensation. A correlation coefficient between education and a salary range is .43, which means that people reporting higher levels of education tend to have higher salaries; therefore, they are more likely to perceive their compensation as fair. For example, as salary increases, ordered log-odds of having higher score of perceived distributive fairness increase by .224, holding else constant.

Likewise, work-life balance and positive affectivity are also positively associated with perceived fairness of compensation. A correlation coefficient between work-life balance and positive affectivity is .31, meaning that government employees who report work-life balance, are more likely to experience positive emotional states, and perceive their compensation as fair. For example, one unit increase in positive affectivity score would result in .525 increase in the ordered log-odds of having higher score of perceived distributive fairness while the other variables in the model are held constant.

Table 10. Ordered Logistic Regression on Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Fairness

Variables	Distributive fairness			Procedural fairness			Interactional fairness		
	Coefficient	SE	Odds ratio	Coefficient	SE	Odds ratio	Coefficient	SE	Odds ratio
Years of Public Service	-.029***	.011	.972	-.040***	.011	.961	-.025**	.011	.976
Years of Public Service ²	.003***	.001	1.003	.001	.001	1.001	.001	.001	1.001
Age	-.028	.083	.973	-.034	.087	.966	-.071	.084	.931
Education	.195***	.072	1.216	.023	.071	1.024	.007	.070	1.007
Male	-.505***	.178	.604	.065	.178	1.067	.369**	.175	1.447
Salary range	.224***	.066	1.251	.188***	.064	1.207	.112*	.064	1.119
Work-life balance	.013***	.004	1.013	.009**	.004	1.009	.011***	.004	1.011
Positive affectivity	.525***	.087	1.690	1.816***	.113	6.149	2.294***	.127	9.915
Pseudo R-squared	.040			.138			.163		
Chi2	134.83***			450.62***			529.38***		

Notes: Number of observations = 522. *** p<0.01, **, p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Association Between Procedural, Interactional Fairness and Years of Public Service

Overall, the regression analysis results for procedural and interactional fairness are quite similar and suggest that government employees with more years of public service tend to perceive their workplace as less fair in terms of both formal procedures and social interactions at work. In other words, government employees who report many years of public service are more likely to perceive internal policies—including hiring, promotions, and career development as well as social interaction at work—as unfair. Every additional year of working for the state government would result in a .04 unit decrease in the ordered log-odds of having higher score of perceived procedural fairness while the other variables in the model are held constant. The odds ratio is $.961 < 1$ which suggest a negative association between years of public service and procedural fairness. Similarly, every additional year of working for the state government would result in a .025 unit decrease in the ordered log-odds of having higher score of perceived interactional fairness while the other variables in the model are held constant. The odds ratio is $.976 < 1$ which suggest a negative association between years of public service and interactional fairness. While results for distributive fairness suggested a curvilinear relationship with years of public service, for procedural and interactional fairness the squared term of years of public service is not statistically significant.

The perceived fairness of formal procedures and social interactions at work also tends to be higher among state government employees who report higher salary, work-life balance and positive affectivity. For example, as salary range increases, the ordered log odds of procedural fairness score increase by .188, holding else constant. At the same time, the effect of positive affectivity on both procedural and interactional fairness is quite large.

As positive affectivity score increases by one unit, the ordered log odds of procedural fairness increase by 1.816, and the ordered log odds for interactional fairness increase by 2.294 holding else constant.

Interestingly, men are more likely to perceive social interactions at work as fair compared to women. Perceived interactional fairness is .369 ordered log odds higher for men compared to women, holding else constant. However, gender doesn't seem to affect perceptions of procedural fairness. At the same time, education and age are not statistically significant.

It is also important to note that salary range is positively correlated with all three dimensions of organizational fairness. A higher salary range in government agencies typically corresponds to a higher position within the organizational hierarchy. This means that government employees with higher salaries, more power, and supervisory responsibilities are more likely to perceive procedures, interactions, and compensation as fair. These findings are consistent with the previous research (Rubin, 2009).

Additionally, while years of public service are negatively associated with perceptions of workplace fairness, age is not associated with any of the three dimensions of workplace fairness. However, age and years of public service are positively correlated with the correlation coefficient of .46. Thus, while older employees tend to work longer for the state government, their age does not influence their perceptions of workplace fairness, while their tenure does.

The analysis of the magnitude of the coefficients shows that positive affectivity is one the most important factors explaining the variation in perceptions of fairness of both formal procedures and social interactions at work. In other words, state government

employees who feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things, who are inspired to do their best have higher levels of perceived procedural and interactional fairness.

Years of public service retains its negative coefficient and statistical significance across all three dimensions of workplace perceptions, however, the magnitude of the coefficient is quite small. Nonetheless, years of public service are consistently negatively associated with perceived organizational fairness across all three dimensions, which suggests that more seasoned government employees are more likely to perceive compensation, procedures, and interactions at work as unfair.

Workplace Fairness, External Prestige and Years of Public Service

Table 11 shows the results for an OLS regression analysis of a single-item organizational fairness, ordered logistic regression analysis of workplace fairness measured using a composite score, and ordered logistic regression of perceived external prestige.

In general, the results are consistent with earlier findings across three dimensions of organizational fairness and suggest that government employees who spent more years working for state government are less likely to perceive their workplace as fair. This relationship is curvilinear for both multi-item and single-item measures of organizational fairness. Similar to results for distributive fairness, it decreases at an increasing rate. Thus, every additional year of working for the state government would result in a .478 point decrease in a single-item perceived workplace fairness scale, holding all other variables in the model constant. However, this effect becomes less intense as years go by.

The formal interpretation of the results for ordered logistic regression on a composite measure of organizational fairness is: every additional year of working for the state government would result in a .042 unit decrease in the ordered log-odds of having high score of perceived organizational fairness while the other variables in the model are held constant. Again, this relationship decreases at an increasing rate.

The magnitude of standardized coefficients suggest that composite and single-item measures of organizational fairness are consistent with each other as well as with most results reported in Table 10, which validates a three-dimensional conceptualization of organizational fairness. For example, the beta coefficient for years of public service in OLS regression is -.161, while a fully standardized coefficient for years of public service from ordered logistic regression is -.142. Thus, one standard deviation increase in years of public service decreases the perceived workplace fairness by -.161 standard deviations, holding else constant.

However, years of public service is not the most powerful determinant of workplace fairness. Standardized coefficients for both measures of workplace fairness show that positive affectivity - a disposition to see things in a positive light – is the factor with highest explanatory power with a standardized coefficient of .57 for a single-item organizational fairness and .64 for ologit. Thus, one standard deviation increase in positive affectivity increases the perceived workplace fairness by .6 standard deviations, holding else constant. Overall, this finding suggests interesting topics for future research, including how an individual's predisposition to see things in a positive light influences workplace perceptions.

At the same time, the salary range and the work-life balance also play a significant role in explaining perceptions of workplace fairness. Employees who earn higher salaries and report a work-life balance are more likely to perceive their workplace as fair. One standard deviation increase in salary increases the perceived workplace fairness by .137 standard deviations, holding else constant. Similarly, one standard deviation increase in work-life balance increases the perceived workplace fairness by .127 standard deviations, holding else constant.

Perceptions of external prestige. While years of public service are negatively associated with perceptions of workplace fairness, there seems to be no effect on perceived external prestige: the coefficient is not statistically significant. At the same time, gender, salary and positive affectivity are statistically significant determinants of perceived external prestige. Male government employees are .181 standard deviations more likely to perceive their workplace as externally prestigious compared to women. Additionally, one standard deviation increase in salary decreases the perceived external prestige by .172 standard deviations, holding else constant. As in case with workplace fairness, positive affectivity is positively associated with perceived external prestige, with a fully standardized coefficient of .405. Therefore, one standard deviation increase in positive affectivity increases the perceived external prestige by .405 standard deviations, holding all other variables constant. Along with years of public service, age, education and work-life balance are not statistically significant.

In sum, the hypotheses concerning workplace fairness are confirmed – years of public service are negatively associated with perceived workplace fairness, measured as 1) three separate dimensions: distributive, procedural and interactional; 2) a composite score

which combines all three dimensions of workplace fairness into a cumulative measure; 3) a single-item workplace fairness. However, the Hypothesis 1.1. is not confirmed: the negative association between years of public service and perceived external prestige is not statistically significant. Even though the two variables are negatively correlated (-.13, $p < .05$), when individual and work-related controls are included in the model the relationship becomes insignificant.

Thus, the findings suggest that perceived organizational fairness is lower among employees with more years of public service, and it is higher among employees who have higher salaries and report positive affectivity, as well as work-life balance. Whereas, perceived external prestige is higher among men and employees who report positive affectivity, while it is lower among employees who earn higher salaries. Among individual characteristics of government employees, age does not have a statistically significant effect on workplace perceptions, including both perceived organizational fairness and external prestige. Education is positively associated only with perceived workplace fairness measured as a composite score, being statistically significant at $p < .05$. Gender seems to matter only in case of perceived external prestige, while work-life balance is significant as a factor explaining workplace fairness.

Table 11. Regression Results on Perceived Workplace Fairness and External Prestige

Variables	Workplace fairness (single item)		Workplace fairness (composite score)		Perceived external prestige	
	Coefficient	Beta	Coefficient	Beta	Coefficient	Beta
Years of public service	-.478***	-.161	-.042***	-.142	-.004	-.017
Years of public service ²	.022**	.077	.003***	.098	-.001	-.038
Age	.243	-.010	-.027	-.011	.130	.070
Education	.539	.025	.163**	.075	-.017	-.011
Male	-2.817	-.049	-.164	-.029	.751***	.181
Salary range	2.259***	.124	.249***	.137	-.225***	-.172
Work-life balance	.364***	.293	.016***	.127	.005	.059
Positive affectivity	16.396***	.570	1.848***	.644	.839***	.405
R-squared/Pseudo R-sq.	0.09	.60	0.01	.11	0.01	.081
F/Chi2	9.78***	54.73***	54.25***	466.90***	15.54***	122.76***

Notes: Number of observations = 522. *** p<0.01, **, p<0.05, * p<0.1.

CHAPTER 6. WORKPLACE PERCEPTIONS AS DETERMINANTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS

Chapter 5 focused on the first research question regarding the effect of years of public service on workplace perceptions of state employees. The present chapter is concerned with the second research question which examines the relationship between workplace perceptions, organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees.

The Effect of Workplace Perceptions on Organizational Identification

To assess the effect of perceived workplace fairness and perceived external prestige on organizational identification, this study uses logistic regression analysis. Table 6 presents unstandardized and fully standardized coefficients as well as standard errors. Overall, the hypothesized relationships are confirmed: both perceived external prestige and perceived workplace fairness are positively associated with organizational identification. The results hold after controlling for employees' tenure, age, education, gender, and salary range, work-life balance and positive affectivity. Thus, for one unit increase in perceived external prestige, the log odds of identifying with one's organization increase by .581, holding else constant. Similarly, for a one unit increase in perceived workplace fairness, the log odds of identifying with one's organization increases by 1.305, holding all other variables constant.

At the same time, the analysis of the magnitude of the fully standardized coefficients shows that one standard deviation increase in perceived external prestige increases organizational identification by .222 standard deviations, holding all other variables constant. One standard deviation increase in workplace fairness increases

organizational identification by .381 standard deviations, holding all other variables constant. Overall, employees are more likely to identify themselves with their organization when they perceived their workplace as fair and prestigious. However, workplace fairness has a larger effect on organizational identification compared to perceived external prestige.

Additionally, the results suggest that there is a significant effect of positive affectivity on organizational identification: employees who feel inspired and encouraged by their organization are more likely to have higher levels of organizational identification. One standard deviation increase in positive affectivity increases organizational identification by .305.

Table 12. Logistic Regression on Organizational Identification

Variables	Coefficient	SE	Beta
External prestige	.581***	.124	.222
Workplace fairness	1.305***	.235	.381
Tenure	-.011	.016	-.038
Age	.204	.128	.079
Education	-.107	.104	-.049
Male	-.030	.256	-.005
Salary	-.044	.096	-.024
Work-life balance	.009	.006	.071
Positive affectivity	.877***	.180	.305

Notes: Number of observations = 522. *** p<0.01, **, p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Explaining Turnover Intentions Among State Employees

Furthermore, Table 12 presents the results of three logistic regression analyses which test for the mediation effects of organizational identification. Model 1 demonstrates that perceived external prestige has a significant effect on turnover intentions ($\beta = -.401$,

p<.01), therefore meeting the first condition for mediation effect: independent variable affects dependent variable. For one unit decrease in perceived external prestige, the log

Table 13. Mediation Effect of Organizational Identification on Turnover Intentions

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Turnover intentions	Organizational identification	Turnover intentions
<i>Independent variable</i>			
Perceived external prestige	-.401***	.581***	-.353***
<i>Mediator variable</i>			
Organizational identification			-.549**
<i>Control variables</i>			
Workplace fairness	-.514***	1.305***	-.405**
Tenure	-.006	-.011	-.007
Age	.026	.204	.042
Education	.060	-.107	.051
Male	.306	-.030	.304
Salary range	-.028	-.044	-.031
Work-life balance	-.002	.009	-.001
Positive affectivity	-.516***	.877***	-.441***
<i>Pseudo-R2</i>	.17	.37	.18
<i>LR Chi2</i>	122.01***	267.15***	127.20***

Notes: Number of observations = 522. *** p<0.01, **, p<0.05, * p<0.1.

odds of turnover intentions increase by .401, holding else constant. Model 2 shows that perceived external prestige is positively associated with organizational identification ($\beta=.581$, $p<.01$), which satisfies the second condition for mediation effect: mediator variable is related to the independent variable of primary interest. Next, the mediator variable was added to the Model 3, organizational identification has a significant effect on turnover intentions ($\beta=-.549$, $p<.01$), which supports the third mediation condition. In other words, for one unit decrease in organizational identification, the log odds of turnover

intentions increase by .549, holding else constant. Lastly, the effect of perceived external prestige on turnover intentions was reduced from $\beta=.401$, $p<.01$ to $\beta=.353$, $p<.01$, when organizational identification was included in the model, however it remained statistically significant. For one unit decrease in perceived external prestige, the log odds of turnover intentions increase by .353, holding else constant. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational identification partially mediates the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions, which provides the evidence in support of the social identity theory.

Furthermore, Table 14 shows the standard errors and confidence intervals based on 1000 bootstrap replications. The indirect effect, i.e. the mediation, is $-.047$ with a p-value of $.034<.05$, thus, it is statistically significant at .05 level. The direct effect of perceived external prestige on turnover intentions is $-.202$ and it is statistically significant at .01 level. The total effect, which accounts for both direct and indirect effects, is $-.25$, it is also statistically significant at .01 level. Thus, the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions is partially mediated by organizational identification and it is statistically significant at .05 level. However, it is important to note that the indirect effect is smaller than direct effect. A ratio of indirect to direct effect is .23, while a proportion of total effect mediated is .19.

Table 14. Bootstrap Replication Results

	Observed Coefficient	Bootstrap SE	z	P>z	Normal-based [95% Conf. Interval]	
Indirect effect	-0.047	0.022	-2.12	0.034	-0.0911	-0.0036
Direct effect	-0.202	0.057	-3.54	0.000	-0.3143	-0.0903
Total effect	-0.250	0.057	-4.39	0.000	-0.3610	-0.1382

Overall, the hypotheses based on research question 2 are confirmed. Workplace perceptions are positively associated with organizational identification, which means that employees who believe that they are treated with fairness at work and their work is regarded as prestigious by citizens are more likely to identify themselves with their organization. Moreover, the Hypothesis 2.3. is also confirmed: organizational identification partially mediates the relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions after controlling for workplace fairness among other control variables.

CHAPTER 7. DISCUSSION

The previous two chapters reported findings to the research questions. While chapter 5 focused on the effects of years of public service on workplace perceptions, chapter 6 described the findings to the second research question: the effect of workplace perceptions on organizational identification and turnover intentions of state employees. The present chapter will discuss the findings and their theoretical as well as practical implications.

Perceptions Matter

An extensive amount of research has found that there is a clear relationship between perceptions of workplace fairness and external prestige on the one hand, and employees' attitudes and behavior at work on the other hand. However, not much is known about how workplace perceptions differ depending on time spent working for government and whether workplace perceptions influence organizational identification and turnover intentions of government employees.

Looking at both new and seasoned employees, the study found that government employees' perceptions of workplace fairness decrease with more years of public service and are at their lowest level among employees who are in the middle of their public service career. The finding is disturbing as this group of employees may be considered the core personnel who have the necessary institutional knowledge, experience, and skills that are essential for ensuring effective performance of the state government as well as passing on this knowledge to younger and less-experienced colleagues.

As it was already noted, perceived organizational fairness is essential for all organizations that aspire to have high-performing and committed employees. It is especially important for public organizations that are responsible for using taxpayers' money to advance the general welfare. If government employees do not perceive their workplace as fair, they may be less likely to do their best at work. Thus, when employees in the middle of their careers are less likely to perceive their workplace as fair, it may have a variety of organizational outcomes that are detrimental for the effective delivery of public services.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that as time goes by, some government employees who perceive their workplace as unfair choose to leave, while many continue their public service and with time develop a more favorable attitude toward their workplace. These results are consistent with empirical findings in social psychology which suggest that people have a psychological need to have a favorable attitude toward self, a social group they belong to, and society in general. To do so, they tend to justify and accept the status quo, especially if they believe that it cannot be changed (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost et al., 2004; Jost et al., 2003).

These findings warrant more attention to the perceived fairness of compensation and formal procedures, including hiring, promotions, career development, and performance management, especially during budget cuts, high rates of employee turnover, and problems with hiring new employees. It seems that state government employees who remain in public service are expected to maintain the same quality of work, even if their colleagues are leaving the job, vacancies remain open for extended periods, and they are

not compensated for an increased workload. This is not fair from the perspective of government employees committed to public service.

In addition, the findings offer a possible explanation for the contradiction found in the previous literature, namely, the decreasing job satisfaction of government employees along with relatively low turnover rates. One could argue that as government employees devote many years of their lives to public service, they become more embedded in the system and committed to their jobs and its relative security. However, the fact that people stay at their jobs does not automatically mean that they perceive their workplace as fair or that they are satisfied with their jobs. On the contrary, the present study indicates that perceived workplace fairness decreases with more years of public service. Thus, public organizations end up having a long-term workforce with low levels of perceived workplace fairness, job satisfaction and organizational identification.

It seems that state employees are likely to comply with the status quo that they perceive as unfair. For example, the surveyed agency is responsible for managing personnel systems for the state government. This agency has the authority to propose and implement changes that can improve perceived distributive, procedural, and interactional justice for all state agencies, including itself. However, it seems that most employees do not believe that they can change the policies perceived as unfair. This pervasive dissatisfaction and compliance with the unfair status quo among long-term employees could easily create an unwillingness to critically analyze, challenge and improve policies and practices that would benefit government agencies. Hence, the impact of long-term employees who perceive their workplace as unfair on the effectiveness of state agencies is potentially significant and is further examined in the second research question.

While the findings suggest that perceived workplace fairness decreases with more years of public service, the association between length of public service and perceptions of external prestige is not statistically significant when individual and work-related characteristics are controlled. Thus, the hypothesized negative relationship is fully confirmed for perceptions of workplace fairness and is not confirmed in case of perceived external prestige. This means that there is no difference in perceptions of external prestige among employees at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of their public service. One of the possible explanations of this finding is that perceptions of external prestige may be influenced by anti-government sentiments that are widely spread in the American society. Being a part of the political culture these sentiments are held by many citizens, regardless of their age, occupation and work experience. Government employees as citizens hired by the government, are influenced by these sentiments irrespective of the length of their tenure. Outside of work, public servants constantly interact with members of their communities and are persistently influenced by their views of the government. Therefore, government employees' perceptions of external prestige do not vary depending on the length of public service.

Interestingly, the majority (57%) of the state employees who participated in the survey disagreed with the statement "Generally speaking, I believe that citizens value the work of state government employees", which was used to measure perceived external prestige in the present study. While 21% of respondents strongly disagreed and 36% - somewhat disagreed, 24% neither agreed, nor disagreed with the statement. Moreover, only 16% of respondents somewhat agreed, while the number of state employees who strongly believed that citizens value their work is only 3%. Such pessimistic beliefs of state

employees reflect an overwhelming consensus which is shared by both short-term and long-term government employees.

Organizational Identification and Its Implications

While the findings to the first research question suggest that perceptions of workplace fairness decrease with more years of work for the government, the findings to the second research question suggest that both perceived external prestige and perceived workplace fairness contribute to organizational identification of state employees. The previous studies considered the effects of these two factors on organizational identification separately, whereas this dissertation looked at how perceptions of external prestige and workplace fairness together affect organizational identification. Thus, state government employees who believe their work is valued by citizens and they are treated with fairness at work, are more likely to identify themselves with their government agency. Hence, on the one hand, perceptions of workplace fairness are negatively associated with length of tenure, and on the other hand, these perceptions influence employees' organizational identification. This means that long-term government employees tend to have decreased organizational identification.

At the same time, organizational identification is an essential antecedent of high-performing organizations. Government employees who identify themselves with their organizations, who feel proud to serve the citizens, are more likely to make sure that government provides its services both effectively and efficiently. Empirical studies consistently show that employees who identify with their organizations are more likely to demonstrate positive work attitudes and behavior. For example, organizational identification is found to be positively associated with such work attitudes as job

involvement (Hassan, 2012; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), job satisfaction (van Dick et al., 2004; van Dick et al., 2008; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000) and affective organizational commitment (e.g., Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Marique & Stinglhamber, 2011; Riketta, 2005; Lee et al., 2015). Moreover, employees' organizational identification influences their behavior at work, including in-role performance, i.e. how well employees perform their formal job responsibilities (Haslam & Ellemers, 2005; van Knippenberg, 2000; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000; Riketta, 2005), and extra-role performance - actions beyond formal job requirements, also known as organizational citizenship behavior (Christ et al., 2003; Dukerich et al., 2002; Johnson et al., 2012; van Dick et al., 2006; Riketta, 2005; Lee et al., 2015, Tyler & Blader, 2009; Rho et al., 2015). Thus, long-term government employees may have not only decreased organizational identification, but also work attitudes and behavior which do not contribute to the effective delivery of public services.

Additionally, researchers found that employees who lack identification with their organization are more likely to show counter-productive work attitudes and behavior, including absenteeism (Rho et al., 2015), cynicism (Chiaburu et al., 2013) and turnover intentions (Mignonac, 2006). Thus, lack of identification with one's government agency may lead not only to poor work performance but also to counterproductive work behavior and misconduct. This may be particularly unfortunate since government employees are responsible for advancement of general welfare using taxpayers' money.

These findings have important practical implications for work performance of government employees. By highlighting the role of perceived external prestige and perceived workplace fairness in explaining organizational identification of government

employees, the study brings attention to the importance of understanding not only employees' work attitudes and behavior, but also perceptions of workplace.

Therefore, human resources practices which focus on ensuring that government employees perceive their workplace as fair in terms of compensation, procedures, and interactions among colleagues may contribute to employees' organizational identification and improved work performance. However, this practical implication leads to important ethical considerations. There is a fine line between influencing perceptions of employees in order to make them feel that their organization treats them with fairness and creating actual conditions of employees being treated with fairness. In other words, human resources practices should avoid manufacturing organizational identification by influencing perceptions, but rather aim for genuinely fair treatment of its employees.

On the other hand, negative effects of organizational identification maybe associated not only with under-identification, but also with over-identification, which may lead to workaholism, decreased well-being (Avanzi et al, 2012), and even unethical pro-organizational behavior (Chen et al, 2016). Therefore, human resources practices should be cautious about over-identification which also can become an issue, especially if employees protect interests of their organization by engaging in unethical pro-organizational behavior. This can be especially dangerous for government organizations with high levels of authority over the public, such as law enforcement agencies. For example, organizational over-identification may create us-versus-them dynamics with police officers protecting their own interests instead of the interests of the citizens. Thus, in case of government organizations both underidentification and overidentification may damage effective provision of government services.

Escaping Vicious Circle

It is important to note that one of the possible outcomes of low organizational identification is turnover intentions (Abrams et al., 1998). Public administration studies have already found that workplace fairness is positively associated with organizational identification and negatively associated with turnover intentions among government employees (Hassan, 2012; Choi, 2011). Building on the previous research the dissertation examined the effects of perceived external prestige on organizational identification and turnover intentions controlling for perceptions of workplace fairness. The results of the mediation analysis showed that organizational identification partially mediates relationship between perceived external prestige and turnover intentions of government employees. In other words, the hypothesized relationship is confirmed: employees who perceive their workplace as prestigious are more likely to identify themselves with their organization and less likely to report turnover intentions. Additionally, the findings suggest that the direct effect of perceived external prestige on turnover intentions is larger than the indirect effect, i.e. the mediation. Thus, the effect of perceptions of external prestige holds even without the mediating role of organizational identification. This means that it is a major factor contributing to turnover intentions of government employees which has been ignored in the previous public administration literature.

In terms of practical implications, the findings show that a persistent negative bias toward the government that is often transmitted by the media and society in general, has a significant impact on individuals and organizations who work on behalf of the government. Many state employees internalize the negative image of government and do not believe that their work is valued by the citizens whom they serve. As a result, they develop turnover intentions. Since turnover intentions are often associated with feelings of withdrawal and

lack of commitment at work among employees who are willing to quit but are continuing their employment (possibly for an extended period of time), employees may be less efficient and productive. This may result in a self-fulfilling prophecy of government failure: when employees believe that their work is not valued by the citizens whom they serve, they intend to quit and reduce their effort at work, thus making the government work less efficient and, therefore, contributing to its negative image, which projects back to government employees. Of course, this is not true for all government employees, as there are a lot of exceptional employees with strong work ethic and exemplary public service motivation. Therefore, this speculation should be considered as a possible average effect.

Consequently, the government as an institution within a market society needs to better market and promote itself to inform citizens about the important work that is being performed by the government employees, creating a more balanced image of the government based on both successes and failures. A balanced image of the government as an institution will have a good impact on government as an organization, creating a better working environment where government employees feel that they are not only doing an important and meaningful work, but also that citizens value their work and consider it prestigious. In addition, there is a need to establish organizational policies which channel a positive feedback from citizens to government employees in order to construct and maintain more optimistic views among employees about external prestige and value of their work. These policies may enhance government employees' organizational identification which in its turn is associated with job satisfaction, better work performance, and less turnover intentions. Moreover, overcoming the negative public attitudes toward the government may help not only retain highly qualified employees, but also may

influence decisions of potential public servants with valuable expertise to join government employment.

Thus, the government's image which reflects both successes and failures can improve not only citizen-government relations but also enhance organizational identification of current government employees, which in its turn may improve government performance in general. Since government employees are citizens who perform functions on behalf of the government, it is important to make them feel valued and appreciated not only by co-workers, but also by their family, friends, neighbors, other members of their communities and society in general.

CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSION

What is it like to be a government employee when government is being constantly critiqued by almost everyone: citizens, industry, academia and media? The present study aimed to answer this question by bringing attention to government as a human organization and examining employees' perceptions of government as a workplace. Essentially, it provided an internal perspective of how government views itself in terms of external prestige, workplace fairness and organizational identification.

Summary of the Results

The first research question focused on the effect of years of public service on workplace perceptions of state government employees. The findings suggest that as years go by, employees perceive their workplace as unfair. However, this relationship is decreasing at an increasing rate. In other words, experienced employees in the middle of their government careers are more likely to perceive their workplace as unfair, especially in terms of compensation. Furthermore, many employees who do not perceived their workplace as fair and do not believe that their work is valued by citizens report low organizational identification and turnover intentions. Thus, it seems that for many long-term employees, public service is not as rewarding as it is often assumed.

Overall, the findings are quite disturbing: as time goes by, government employees internalize a negative image of government transmitted by the society which results in low organizational identification and increased turnover intentions. As a result, many employees may develop counterproductive work behavior and reduce their work efforts, thus making the government as a whole work less efficiently. This further contributes to a

negative image of government, which then affects government employees, and becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy of government inefficiency.

Implications of the Study

The findings suggest important practical implications for public personnel management as well as citizen-government relations in general. In terms of public personnel management, it is important to develop policies which improve government employees' perceptions of workplace fairness and external prestige. Since organizational identification to a large extent depends on how employees view their workplace, it is essential that human resources policies are genuinely fair in terms of compensation, procedures and interactions and are regarded as such by employees. Furthermore, government employees need to feel that their work is being valued and appreciated not only by colleagues, but also by members of their communities and society in general. Channeling a positive feedback from citizens and informing its own employees about the important and meaningful work that is being performed by the government may help construct and maintain a more balanced image of the government based on both successes and failures. This will have a positive impact on government as an organization, by enhancing organizational identification and creating a better working environment where government employees feel empowered to promote the general welfare.

However, it is important to note that both underidentification and overidentification may create an unwillingness to critically analyze and develop organizational policies that would benefit government agencies and public services they provide. While underidentification may cause poor work performance and psychological withdrawal, overidentification may result in unethical pro-organizational behavior with employees

protecting interests of their organization rather than public interest. This is particularly unsettling since government employees as public servants are responsible for protection of public interest from special interests and advancement of general welfare using taxpayers' money.

Furthermore, in terms of citizen-government relations, the government as an institution needs to better inform citizens about the important and valuable work performed by the government and its employees (Mettler, 2011). In other words, government needs to better promote itself, learning from private sector industries which work hard to create a favorable public reputation. Improving government-citizen relations also depends on creating an alternative to existing neoliberal propaganda by popularizing a belief that governments and markets need to balance each other's failures for the benefit of the society. Moreover, there is a need to overcome government-versus-citizens dynamics by viewing government employees as citizens who perform government functions, rather than bureaucrats, and by constructing a more positive image of government as an important mechanism for solving social problems and promoting general welfare. These changes may help overcome the negative bias toward the government supported by the neoliberal ideology. Helping individuals who work on behalf of the government feel valued will enhance their public service motivation and attract potential public servants with valuable expertise. At the same time, citizen-government relations based on mutual trust and respect will ensure that government does not abuse its power and acts in the public interest.

Limitations and Future Research

The study uses cross-sectional data which limits causal inferences about the relationship between years of public service, workplace perceptions, organizational

identification and turnover intentions of state employees. Therefore, a reverse causality is plausible, for example, employees who identify themselves with their government agency may be more likely to view their organization as prestigious and fair. Experimental studies which manipulate perceptions of external prestige and workplace fairness will be helpful to explore the causality between workplace perceptions on the one hand, and organizational identification and turnover intentions on the other hand.

At the same time, since the inferences are based on data collected at one point in time, there is a need to conduct longitudinal studies to explore how government employees' workplace perceptions, organizational identification and turnover intentions change over time. Additionally, studies which track the same individuals over the course of their government careers would bring a valuable insight into how workplace perceptions, organizational identification and turnover intentions are related to work performance and actual turnover over time.

Furthermore, the sample is limited to a single government agency in one state. Thus, the findings may not be generalizable to other government agencies as well as other states. Future studies should confirm the validity of the findings across a variety of local, state and federal agencies as well as different geographic regions, with a specific focus on states with more positive attitudes toward government.

It is also important to note that the present study is based on abstract concepts that are very difficult to measure. Therefore, future studies should use different operationalization of such concepts as perceived external prestige, perceived workplace fairness and organizational identification. For example, organizational identification and perceived external prestige could be measured using survey items developed by Mael &

Ashforth's (1992), whereas workplace fairness can be conceptualized using a multi-item scale offered by Moorman (1991).

Additionally, qualitative studies should further examine workplace perceptions using in-depth interviews of government employees which will highlight more nuances in the relationship between workplace perceptions, organizational identification, and turnover intentions. These qualitative studies will also advance our understanding of the link between people's actual experiences and abstract concepts used to describe them.

Future research should further develop an organizational psychology perspective of viewing the government as a human organization. This will advance a currently predominant approach to studying government as an institution by helping extend our knowledge about its underlying mechanisms and processes. For example, it would be particularly interesting to explore the effects of organizational identification on unethical pro-organizational behavior among government employees as an extreme outcome, alternative to turnover intentions.

Thus, the present study is one of the first steps in exploring the links between workplace perceptions, including perceived external prestige, organizational identification and turnover intentions in US government agencies. A continuous development of the human capital in government requires further studies focusing on the link between perceptions, attitudes and behavior of government employees.

APPENDIX 1. TRUST IN GOVERNMENT 1958-2017 BY GENERATION

Source: Pew Research Center, 2017

APPENDIX 2. SURVEY MATERIALS

Recruitment Email#1:

Dear Employee of the _____!

Please let me introduce myself. My name is Darima Butitova and I am a Ph.D. Candidate at the Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri. I am working with the _____ to use an online employment survey as a method to research _____ employees' work experiences. The online survey only takes 10-15 min. This study involves research.

The purpose of the survey is to identify whether, and to what extent, employees' workplace experiences affect their job satisfaction, work performance and decision to leave employment.

The major benefit for participants is that the aggregate results of the survey will be summarized and shared with all employees of the _____. The results may be used to inform the employment policies and help identify opportunities for further development of the state government's human capital.

The survey will not ask any personally identifiable information, including your name. All of the collected data will be analyzed eliminating any association to you as an individual.

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and confidential. You can choose to skip questions that you are not comfortable answering.

Please [click here to take a survey](#) (press ctrl+click to follow the link).

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you will participate in the survey!

With kind regards,

Darima Butitova

PhD Candidate

Harry S Truman School of Public Affairs

University of Columbia

120 Middlebush Hall

Columbia Missouri

Email: dbnc2@mail.missouri.edu.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the MU Campus Institutional Review Board at 483 McReynolds Hall, Columbia, MO 65211, (573) 882-9585.

Recruitment Email#2 (one week later):

Dear Employee of the _____!

My name is Darima Butitova, I am a Ph.D. Candidate at the Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri. About a week ago you received an email asking to participate in the online survey about your workplace experiences as the employee of the _____. This study involves research and takes 10-15 minutes. This study involves research.

This is a kind reminder to take the online survey if you haven't done so already. If you already participated in the survey, please disregard this email.

The purpose of the survey is to identify whether and to what extent the employees' work experiences effect their job satisfaction, work performance and intention to leave.

The major benefit for participants is that the summary results of the survey will be shared with all employees of the _____. The results may be used to inform the employment policies and help identify opportunities for further development of the state government's human capital.

The survey will not ask any personally identifiable information, including your name. All of the collected data will be analyzed eliminating any association to you as an individual.

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and confidential. You can choose to skip questions that you are not comfortable answering.

Please [click here to take a survey](#) (press ctrl+click to follow the link).

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you will participate in the survey!

With kind regards,

Darima Butitova

PhD Candidate
Harry S Truman School of Public Affairs
University of Columbia
120 Middlebush Hall
Columbia Missouri
Email: dbnc2@mail.missouri.edu.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the MU Campus Institutional Review Board at 483 McReynolds Hall, Columbia, MO 65211, (573) 882-9585

Consent Form

Dear Employee of the _____!

You are being asked to participate in a research study titled “Workplace Experiences of State Government Employees” conducted by Darima Butitova, Ph.D. Candidate at the Truman School of Public Affairs, University of Missouri. You have been selected as a potential participant because of your employment with the _____.

Procedures. If you choose to participate, you will be given a set of questions about your workplace experiences. The questionnaire includes 14 questions and will take 10-15 minutes, it will be conducted via an online Qualtrics survey.

Benefits. The major benefit for participants is that the summary results of the survey will be shared with all employees of the _____. The results may be used to inform the employment policies and help identify opportunities for further development of the state government’s human capital.

Risks/Discomforts. There are no major risks and there are no costs to you for participating in this study. One foreseeable risk to you as a participant is the potential discomfort of revealing your personal opinion about your workplace experiences. However, personally identifiable information (including your name) will *not* be recorded.

Confidentiality. All of the collected data will be analyzed eliminating any association to you as an individual. This project will not affect your employment, even if you choose not to participate or decide to withdraw from answering the survey questions. All questionnaires will be concealed, and no one other than the primary investigator (Darima Butitova) will have access to them.

Participation. Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you desire to withdraw, please close your internet browser. If you have any questions, please contact Darima Butitova at dbnc2@mail.missouri.edu and/or Dr. Michael Diamond at diamond@missouri.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Campus Institutional Review Board at 483 McReynolds Hall, Columbia, MO 65211, (573) 882-9585.

By clicking “Yes”, I indicate that I have read this consent form and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Survey Questionnaire

Q1 Please read the following statements and mark whether you agree or disagree.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I try to help people at work more than is generally expected. <i>[This question is adopted from Colquitt (2001) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
My division inspires me to do my best. <i>[This question is adopted from the Civil Service People Survey (B53) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
My division does a good job supporting employee career development. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q53) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
I am willing to use my energy to make the world a more just place. <i>[This question is adopted Perry (1991) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
Overall, I like my job. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q19) and modified for this survey.]</i>					

Q2 Please read the following statements and mark whether you agree or disagree.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things. <i>[This question is adopted from the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (Q3)]</i>					
I have the opportunity to contribute my views before decisions that affect me are made. <i>[This question is adopted from the Civil Service People Survey (B48)]</i>					
It is safe to challenge the way things are done in my division. <i>[This question is adopted from the Civil Service People Survey (B49) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
Communication flows effectively between staff and management. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q43) and modified for this survey.]</i>					
The state government empowers its employees to work in the best interests of the citizens. <i>[This question is adopted from the Employee Engagement Survey (Q14) and modified for this survey.]</i>					

Q3 Please read the following statements and mark whether you agree or disagree.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<p>My division hires people who can do the job well. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q26) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>Promotions in my division are based on merit. <i>[This question is adopted from the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (Q22) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>I can initiate a formal complaint or appeal without fear of retaliation. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q50) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>Overall, the procedures and policies in my division uphold ethical and moral standards. <i>[This question is adopted from Colquitt (2001) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					

Q4 Please read the following statements and mark whether you agree or disagree.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<p>I feel free to bring up issues that worry me during work meetings. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q51) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>I am satisfied with the quality of supervision I receive at work. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q36).]</i></p> <p>My division effectively manages poor performance. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q28) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>Overall, I am satisfied with how interpersonal issues are resolved in my division. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q24) and modified for this survey.]</i></p> <p>I am proud when I tell others that I work for the state government. <i>[This question is adopted from the Civil Service People Survey (B50) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					

Q5 To what extent are you fairly compensated in terms of salary (column 1) and benefits (column 2)...

[This question is adopted from Moorman (1991) and modified for this survey.]

	Salary					Benefits (including health insurance, retirement, paid leave, holidays, etc.)				
	Very unfairly	Somewhat unfairly	Neutral	Somewhat fairly	Very fairly	Very unfairly	Somewhat unfairly	Neutral	Somewhat fairly	Very fairly
considering the responsibilities that you have?										
in view of the amount of experience that you have had?										
for the amount of effort that you put forth?										
for the stresses and strains of your job?										

Q6 Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<p>I would prefer to continue working for the state government, even if a comparable job was available in the private for-profit sector. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q60) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					
<p>I would prefer to continue working for the state government, even if a comparable job was available in the nonprofit sector. <i>[This question is adopted from the Public Service Employee Survey (Q60) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					
<p>Generally speaking, I believe that citizens value the work of state government employees. <i>[This question is adopted from the Civil Service People Survey (B28) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					
<p>I believe that government can do much to make society more just. <i>[This question is adopted from Perry (1991) and modified for this survey.]</i></p>					

Q7 What is your age?

Less than 25

25 - 34

35 - 44

45 - 54

55 - 64

65 - 74

75 and older

Q8 In total, how many years have you been working for the state government?

Q9 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than High School

High School / GED

Some College

2-year College Degree

4-year College Degree

Masters Degree

Doctoral Degree

Professional Degree (JD, MD)

Q10 What is your gender?

Male

Female

Q11 What division of the _____ do you work at?

Q12 Your position is...

Full-time, permanent

Part-time, permanent

Full-time, temporary

Part-time, temporary

Other (please specify) _____

Q13 What is your salary range?

Less than \$19,999

\$20,000 - \$29,999

\$30,000 - \$39,999

\$40,000 - \$49,999

\$50,000 - \$59,999

\$60,000 - \$69,999

\$70,000 - 79,999

More than \$80,000

Q14 Using the slider below, please answer the final two questions.

_____ I achieve a good balance between my work and my private life (0-no balance; 100 - very good balance).

_____ Overall, I believe that my organization treats me with fairness (0 - not fair at all; 100 - very fair).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, D., Ando, K., & Hinkle, S.W. (1998). Psychological Attachment to the Group: Cross-Cultural Differences in Organizational Identification and Subjective Norms as Predictors of Workers' Turnover Intentions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(10), 1027–1039.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 167-297.
- Agresti, A. (2002). *Categorical Data Analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Akgunduz, Y., & Bardakoglu, O. (2015). The impacts of perceived organizational prestige and organization identification on turnover intention: *the mediating effect of psychological empowerment*. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 0(0), 1–17.
- Allen, D.G., Weeks, K.P., Moffitt, K.R. (2005). Turnover Intentions and Voluntary Turnover: The Moderating Roles of Self-Monitoring, Locus of Control, Proactive Personality, and Risk Aversion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 980-990.
- Alvesson, M. (1990). Organization: from substance to image? *Organization studies*, 11(3), 373-394.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 947–965. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978\(02\)00037-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00037-7).
- Aquino, K., Galperin, B. L., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(5), 1001–1029. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02581.x>.
- Aryee, S., & Chay, Y. W. (2001). Workplace justice, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions in a union context: Examining the mediating role of perceived union support and union instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 154–160. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.1.154>.
- Aryee, S., Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267–285. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.138>.

- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34, 325–374. 10.1177/0149206308316059.
- Ashforth, B., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Avanzi, L., van Dick, R., Fraccaroli, F., Sarchielli, G. (2012). The downside of organizational identification: Relations between identification: Relations between identification, workaholism and well-being. *Work & Stress*, 26(3), 289-307.
- Balfour, D. L., & Wechsler, B. (1991). Commitment, performance, and productivity in public organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 19, 355–367.
- 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.
- Bartels, J., Pruyn, A., de Jong, M., & Joustra, I. (2007). Multiple Organizational Identification Levels and the Impact of Perceived External Prestige and Communication Climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (2), 173.
- Basar, U., & Sigri, U. (2015). Effects of teachers' organizational justice perceptions on intention to quit: Mediation Role of Organizational identification. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. 15(1), 45-59.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-esteem as distinct predictors of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 555–577.
- Berman, E. M. (1997). Dealing with cynical citizens. *Public Administration Review*, 105-112.
- Beugre, C. D., & Baron, R. A. (2001). Perceptions of systemic justice: The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(2), 324–339. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00199.x>.
- Bidarian, S., & Jafari, P. (2012). The Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Trust. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1622–1626. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.873>.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication criteria of justice. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations*, 1, 43–55. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Blader, S. L. (2007a). What determines people's justice judgments? Identification and outcomes influence procedural justice evaluations under uncertainty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(6), 986–994. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.10.022>.
- Blader, S. L. (2007b). What leads organizational members to collectivize? Injustice and identification as precursors of union certification. *Organization Science*, 18(1), 108–126. <http://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1060.0217>.
- Bollen, K. A., & Stine, R., (1990). Direct and indirect effects: Classical and bootstrap estimates of variability. *Sociological Methodology*, 20, 115–40.
- Brewer, G. A. (2003). *Building social capital: Civic attitudes and behavior of public servants*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(1), 5–25.
- Brockner, J., Tyler, T., & Cooperschneider, R. (1992). The Influence of Prior Commitment to an Institution on Reactions to Perceived Injustice - the Higher They Are, the Harder They Fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(2), 241–261. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2393223>.
- Byrne, Z. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). The history of organizational justice: The founders speak. *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice*, 2, 3–26.
- Campbell, J. L., & Pedersen, O. K. (2001). *The rise of neoliberalism and institutional analysis*. Princeton University Press.
- Carmeli, A. (2005). *Perceived External Prestige, Affective Commitment, and Citizenship Behaviors*. *Organization Studies*, 26(3), 443–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605050875>
- Carmeli, A., & Freund, A. (2009). Linking perceived external prestige and intentions to leave the organization: The mediating role of job satisfaction and affective commitment. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 35(3), 236–250.
- Carpenter, D. P., & Krause, G. A. (2012). Reputation and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 72(1), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02506.x>.
- Ceylan, A., & Sulu, S. (2011). Organizational Injustice and Work Alienation. *E & M Ökonomie a Management*, 14(2), 65–78.
- Civil Service People Survey (2014). Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/469847/csps2014_demographics.csv/preview.

- Chen, M., Chen, C., & Sheldon, O. (2016). Relaxing moral reasoning to win: How Organizational Identification Relates to Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(8), 1082–1096. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000111>.
- Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 343–362.
- Cheung, M. F. Y., & Law, M. C. C. (2008). Relationships of Organizational Justice and Organizational Identification: The Mediating Effects of Perceived Organizational Support in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 14(2), 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602380701430879>.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I.-S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.007>.
- Cho, Y. J., & Sai, N. (2012). Does organizational justice matter in the federal workplace? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 0734371X12458126.
- Cho, Y.J., Lewis G.B. (2011). Turnover Intention and Turnover Behavior: Implications for Retaining Federal Employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(1), 4-23.
- Choi, S. (2011). Organizational Justice and Employee Work Attitudes: The Federal Case. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(2), 185–204. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010373275>.
- Choi, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2014). Organizational Justice and Diversity Management in Public Organizations Does Justice Matter in Managing Diversity? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34(4), 307–331. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X13486489>.
- Christ, O., van Dick, R., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extra mile: Foci of organisational identification as determinants of different forms of organisational citizenship behaviour among schoolteachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 329–341. 10.1348/000709903322275867
- Ciftcioglu, A. (2011). The Relationship between Perceived External Prestige and Turnover Intention: An Empirical Investigation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 13(4), 248–263. <https://doi.org/10.1057/crr.2010.22>.
- Wu, H.L. (2011). The Pursuit of Meaningfulness of Work: The Interaction between Prosocial Motivation, Task Significance, and Perceived External Prestige.

- Cohen, G., Blake, R.S., Goodman, D. (2016). Does Turnover Intention Matter? Evaluating the Usefulness of Turnover Intention Rate as a Predictor of Actual Turnover Rate. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(3), 240-263.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2015). Measuring justice and justice. *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*, 1, 187.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: a meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C.L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317–372). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Davis, E., & Ward, E. (1995). Health Benefit Satisfaction in the Public and Private Sectors - the Role. *Public Personnel Management*, 24(3), 255–270.
- De Schrijver, A., Delbeke, K., Maesschalck, J., & Pleysier, S. (2010). Justice Perceptions and Organizational Misbehavior: An Empirical Study. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(6), 691–703. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010363742>.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(3), 225–231. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(02\)00289-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00289-8).
- deLeon, L., & Ewen, A. J. (1997). Multi-Source Performance Appraisals Employee Perceptions of Justice. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 17(1), 22–36. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X9701700103>.
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). The new public service revisited. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 664-672.
- Denhardt, R.B., Catlaw, T.J. (2015). *Theories of Public Organization*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

- Denhardt, R.B., Denhardt, J.V. (2000). *The New Public Service: Serving Rather Than Steering*. Public Administration Review, Vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 549-559.
- Diamond, M. A. (1997). Administrative assault - A contemporary psychoanalytic view of violence and aggression in the workplace. *American Review of Public Administration*, 27(3), 228–247. <http://doi.org/10.1177/027507409702700302>.
- Diamond, M.A. (2016). *Discovering Organizational Identity*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Duijts, S. F. A., Kant, I., Swaen, G. M. H., van den Brandt, P. A., & Zeegers, M. P. A. (2007). A meta-analysis of observational studies identifies predictors of sickness absence. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 60(11), 1105–1115. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.04.008>.
- Dukerich, J. M., Golden, B. R., & Shortell, S. M. (2002). Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: The impact of organizational identification, identity, and image on the cooperative behaviors of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 507–533. 10.2307/3094849.
- Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 517-554.
- Dutton, Jane E., Janet M. Dukerich, and Celia V. Harquail. 1994. Organizational Images and Member Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2): 239–63.
- Edwards, M. R. (2005). Organizational identification: A conceptual and operational review. *International journal of management reviews*, 7(4), 207-230.
- Elovainio, M., Ferrie, J. E., Gimeno, D., De Vogli, R., Shipley, M., Brunner, E. J., Kivimäki, M. (2009). Organizational Justice and Sleeping Problems: The Whitehall II Study. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 71(3), 334–340. <http://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181960665>.
- Elovainio, M., Leino-Arjas, P., Vahtera, J., & Kivimäki, M. (2006). Justice at work and cardiovascular mortality: a prospective cohort study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 61(2), 271–274. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2006.02.018>.
- Elovainio, M., Linna, A., Virtanen, M., Oksanen, T., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J. (2013). Perceived organizational justice as a predictor of long-term sickness absence due to diagnosed mental disorders: Results from the prospective longitudinal Finnish Public Sector Study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 91, 39–47. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.05.008>.
- Employee Engagement Survey. (2012). Retrieved from: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dmva/SoM_Employee_Engagement_Survey_Report_395764_7.pdf

- Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.fedview.opm.gov/>
- Ferris, D. L., Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2012). Interpersonal Injustice and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Esteem Threat. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1788–1811. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310372259>.
- Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Organizational injustice and psychological strain. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science-Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 37(4), 250–261. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0087260>.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1990). *Public Administration and Social Equity*. *Public Administration Review*, 50(2), 228-37.
- Frederickson, H. G. (2010). *Social equity and public administration*. ME Sharpe.
- Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea, C. (2006). Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived External Prestige: Predicting Organizational Attachment for University Faculty, Staff, and Administrators. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 327–347.
- Garrett, R. S., Thurber, J. A., Fritschler, A. L., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (2006). Assessing the Impact of Bureaucracy Bashing by Electoral Campaigns. *Public Administration Review*, (2), 228.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2003). *The case for bureaucracy: A public administration polemic*. Sage.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2014). *The new case for bureaucracy*. CQ Press.
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 58–69. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.58>.
- Greenberg, J., & Scott, K. S. (1996). Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol 18, 1996, 18, 111–156.
- Grynderup, M. B., Mors, O., Hansen, A. M., Andersen, J. H., Bonde, J. P., Kaergaard, A., Kolstad, H. A. (2013). Work-unit measures of organisational justice and risk of depression-a 2-year cohort study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 70(6), 380–385. <http://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2012-101000>.
- Harrington, J. R., & Lee, J. H. (2015). What Drives Perceived Justice of Performance Appraisal? Exploring the Effects of Psychological Contract Fulfillment on Employees' Perceived Justice of Performance Appraisal in US Federal Agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 214–238. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014564071>.

- Harvey, D. (2007)¹. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press;
- Haslam, S. A., & Ellemers, N. (2005). Social identity in industrial and organizational psychology: Concepts, controversies, and contributions. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 20, pp. 39–118, Sussex, UK: Wiley. 10.1002/0470029307.ch2.
- Hassan, S. (2012). Does fair treatment in the workplace matter? An assessment of organizational justice and employee outcomes in government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 275074012447979.
- Herrbach, O., Mignonac, K., & Gatignon, A.-L. (2004). Exploring the role of perceived external prestige in managers' turnover intentions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(8), 1390–1407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519042000257995>
- Hjarsbech, P. U., Christensen, K. B., Bjorner, J. B., Madsen, I. E. H., Thorsen, S. V., Carneiro, I. G., Rugulies, R. (2014). A multi-wave study of organizational justice at work and long-term sickness absence among employees with depressive symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment & Health*, 40(2), 176–185. <http://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3401>.
- Irving, P. G., Coleman, D. F., & Bobocel, D. R. (2005). The moderating effect of negative affectivity in the procedural justice-job satisfaction relation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science-Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 37(1), 20–32. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0087242>.
- Janssen, O. (2004). How justice perceptions make innovative behavior more or less stressful. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(2), 201–215. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.238>.
- Johnson, M. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 1142–1167. 10.1002/job.1787
- Johnson, N. B., & Jarley, P. (2004). Justice and union participation: An extension and test of mobilization theory. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(3), 543–562. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2004.00329.x>.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1–27.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–919.

- Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B. N. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 13–36.
- Kang, D., Stewart, J., & Kim, H. (2011). The effects of perceived external prestige, ethical organizational climate, and leader-member exchange (LMX) quality on employees' commitments and their subsequent attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 40(6), 761–784.
- Kickul, J. (2001). When organizations break their promises: Employee reactions to unfair processes and treatment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(4), 289–307. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010734616208>.
- Kim, J. (2015). What Increases Public Employees' Turnover Intention? *Public Personnel Management*, 44(4), pp. 496-519.
- Kim, S. (2005). Factors Affecting State Government Information Technology Employee Turnover Intentions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 35(2), 137–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074004273150>
- Kim, S. E., & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived Justice of Performance Appraisals in the Federal Government Does It Matter? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(4), 329–348. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11428903>.
- Kim, S., (2012). The Impact of Human Resource Management on State Government IT Employee Turnover Intentions. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(2), 257-279.
- Kouvonen, A., Kivimaki, M., Elovainio, M., Vaananen, A., De Vogli, R., Heponiemi, T., Vahtera, J. (2008). Low organisational justice and heavy drinking: a prospective cohort study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 65(1), 44–50. <http://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2007.032755>.
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841–866. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307307635>.
- Lavena, C. F. (2016). Whistle-Blowing Individual and Organizational Determinants of the Decision to Report Wrongdoing in the Federal Government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(1), 113–136. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0275074014535241>.
- Lawson, K. J., Noblet, A. J., & Rodwell, J. J. (2009). Promoting employee wellbeing: the relevance of work characteristics and organizational justice. *Health Promotion International*, 24(3), 223–233. <http://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dap025>.
- LeBlanc, M. M., & Barling, J. (2004). Workplace aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(1), 9–12.

- Lee, E.-S., Koo, B., & Park, T.-Y. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a basis for attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(5), 1049–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000012>.
- Lee, S. Y., & Whitford, A. B. (2007). Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Pay: Evidence from the public workforce. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 647-671.
- Lin, T.C., & Huang, C.C. (2009). Understanding social loafing in knowledge contribution from the perspectives of justice and trust. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(3, Part 2), 6156–6163. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2008.07.014>.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- MacKinnon, D. P., & Dwyer, J. H. (1993). Estimating mediated effects in prevention studies. *Evaluation Review*, 17, 144-158.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103-123.
- Marique, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Identification to proximal targets and affective organizational commitment: The mediating role of organizational identification. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10, 107–117. [10.1027/1866-5888/a000040](https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000040).
- Marmot, M., & Bell, R. (2012). Fair society, healthy lives. *Public Health*, 126, S4–S10. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2012.05.014>.
- Marvel, J. D. (2015). Public opinion and public sector performance: Are individuals' beliefs about performance evidence-based or the product of anti-public sector bias? *International Public Management Journal*, 18(2), 209-227.
- Meier, K., & Hicklin, A. (2008). Employee Turnover and Organizational Performance: Testing a Hypothesis from Classical Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 573-590. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25096385>
- Melkers, J., & Thomas, J. C. (1998). What do administrators think citizens think? Administrator predictions as an adjunct to citizen surveys. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4), 327–334. <https://doi.org/10.2307/977562>
- Mettler, S. (2011). *The submerged state: How invisible government policies undermine American democracy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mignonac, K., Herrbach, O., & Guerrero, S. (2006). The interactive effects of perceived external prestige and need for organizational identification on turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 477–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.006>.

- Milward, H. B., & Rainey, H. G. (1983). Don't Blame the Bureaucracy! *Journal of Public Policy*, 3(2), 149-168.
- Minkler, L. (2004). Shirking and motivations in firms: survey evidence on worker attitudes. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 22(6), 863-884. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2004.03.003>.
- Mishra, S. K. (2013). Perceived External Prestige and Employee Outcomes: Mediation Effect of Organizational Identification. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 16(3), 220-233. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1057/crr.2013.9>.
- Mishra, S. K., Bhatnagar, D., D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2012). Linkage between perceived external prestige and emotional labor: Mediation effect of organizational identification among pharmaceutical representatives in India. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 204-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2011.04.007>.
- Mitchell, J. I., Gagné, M., Beaudry, A., & Dyer, L. (2012). The role of perceived organizational support, distributive justice and motivation in reactions to new information technology. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 729-738. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.11.021>.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Justice Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Nissly, J. A., & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and meta-analysis. *Social Science Review*, 75(4), 625-661.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Landuyt, N. (2008). Explaining turnover intention in state government: Examining the roles of gender, life cycle, and loyalty. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 28(2), 120-143.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). The Ties that Bind: Social Networks, Person-Organization Value Fit, and Turnover Intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 205-227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum013>.
- Moynihan, D., & Pandey, S. (2007). Finding Workable Levers Over Work Motivation: Comparing Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 803-832. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707305546>.
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33-41. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.05.001>.

- Narisada, A., & Schieman, S. (2016). Underpaid but Satisfied: The Protective Functions of Security. *Work and Occupations*, 43(2), 215–255. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0730888415625332>.
- Ndjaboue, R., Brisson, C., & Vezina, M. (2012). Organisational justice and mental health: a systematic review of prospective studies. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 69(10), 694–700. <http://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2011-100595>.
- Noblet, A. J., & Rodwell, J. J. (2009). Integrating Job Stress and Social Exchange Theories to Predict Employee Strain in Reformed Public Sector Contexts. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(3), 555–578. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mun019>.
- Olkkonen, M.-E., & Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100(2), 202–215. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.08.007>.
- Parker, R. J., & Kohlmeyer III, J. M. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: a research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30(4), 357–369. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2004.05.001>.
- Perry, J. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. By: Perry, James L., *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 6(1), 5-22.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public administration review*, 367-373.
- Pratt, M. G. (1998). Central questions in organizational identification. In Whetten, D.A, Godfrey, P.C. (Eds.) *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory through Conversations*, pp. 171-207, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Public Service Employee Survey. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pses-saff/2014/results-resultats/bq-pq/00/org-eng.aspx>
- Rathi, N., & Lee, K. (2015). Retaining talent by enhancing organizational prestige. *Personnel Review*, 44(4), 454.
- Pew Research Center. (2017). Retrieved from: <http://www.people-press.org/2017/05/03/public-trust-in-government-1958-2017/>
- Rho, E., Yun, T., & Lee, K. (2015). Does Organizational Image Matter? Image, Identification, and Employee Behaviors in Public and Nonprofit Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 75(3), 421–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12338>.
- Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational Identification: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 358–384.

- Rubin, E. V. (2009). The Role of Procedural Justice in Public Personnel Management: Empirical Results from the Department of Defense. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 125–143. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum035>.
- Rubin, E. V. (2011). Exploring the Link Between Procedural Justice and Union Membership in the Federal Government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(2), 128–142. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11408571>.
- Saunders, M. N. K., & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organisational justice, trust and the management of change - An exploration. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 360–375. <http://doi.org/10.1108/00483480310467660>.
- Schaarschmidt, M. (2016). Frontline employees' participation in service innovation implementation: The role of perceived external reputation. *European Management Journal*, 34(5), 540–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.02.005>.
- Seifert, D. L., Sweeney, J. T., Joireman, J., & Thornton, J. M. (2010). The influence of organizational justice on accountant whistleblowing. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 35(7), 707–717. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2010.09.002>.
- Selden, S. C., & Moynihan, D. P. (2000). A Model of Voluntary Turnover in State Government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 20(2), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X0002000206>.
- Selden, S., Schimmoeller, L., & Thompson, R. (2013). The influence of high performance work systems on voluntary turnover of new hires in US state governments. *Personnel Review*, 42(3), 300–323.
- Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 422–445.
- Smidts, A., Pruyn, A. T. H., & Riel, C. B. M. van. (2001). The Impact of Employee Communication and Perceived External Prestige on Organizational Identification. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1051–1062. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069448>.
- Spell, C. S., & Arnold, T. J. (2007). A multi-level analysis of organizational justice climate, structure, and employee mental health. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 724–751. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307305560>.
- Stone, D. (2002). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making*, revised edition. London and New York, NY: WW Norton and Company.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*. 13 (2): 65–93.

- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity, and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, UK: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin. *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tett, R.P., Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention, and Turnover: Path Analyses Based on Meta-analytic Findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1978). A Theory of Procedure. *California Law Review*, 66, 541-566.
- Thibaut, J., Walker, L., LaTour, S., & Houlden, P. (1974). Procedural Justice as Justice. *Stanford Law Review*, 26(6), 1271-1289.
- Thomas, C. W. (1998). Maintaining and restoring public trust in government agencies and their employees. *Administration & Society*, 30(2), 166-193.
- Tremblay, M., Sire, B., & Balkin, D. B. (2000). The role of organizational justice in pay and employee benefit satisfaction, and its effects on work attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(3), 269–290. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601100253004>.
- Tyler, T. (1994). Governing Amid Diversity - the Effect of Fair Decision-Making Procedures. *Law & Society Review*, 28(4), 809–831. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3053998>.
- Tyler, T. R., & Bies, R. J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. *Applied social psychology and organizational settings*, 77, 98.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The Group Engagement Model: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Cooperative Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 349–361. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_07.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2009). Testing and Extending the Group Engagement Model: Linkages Between Social Identity, Procedural Justice, Economic Outcomes, and Extrarole Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94(2), 445–464.
- Tyler, T., & Degoey, P. (1995). Collective Restraint in Social Dilemmas - Procedural Justice and Social Identification Effects on Support for Authorities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(3), 482–497. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.3.482>.
- van Dick, R. (2003). Identification in Organizational Contexts: Linking Theory and Research from Social and Organizational Psychology. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(4). 10.1111/1468-2370.00068.

- van Dick, R., Christ, O., Stellmacher, J., Wagner, U., Ahlswede, O., Grubba, C., Tissington, P. A. (2004). Should I stay or should I go? Explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job satisfaction. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 351–360. 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2004.00424.x.
- van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O., & Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the extra mile: Relationships between organizational identification and organizational citizenship behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 17, 283–301. 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00520.x.
- van Dick, R., van Knippenberg, D., Kerschreiter, R., Hertel, G., & Wieseke, J. (2008). Interactive effects of work group and organizational identification on job satisfaction and extra-role behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 388–399. 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.11.009.
- van Dijke, M., De Cremer, D., Mayer, D. M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2012). When does procedural justice promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(2), 235–248. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.10.006>.
- van Knippenberg, D. (2000). Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 49, 357–371. 10.1111/1464-0597.00020.
- van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 137–147. 10.1348/096317900166949.
- Whitford, A. B., & Lee, S. Y. (2015). Exit, Voice, and Loyalty with Multiple Exit Options: Evidence from the US Federal Workforce. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(2), 373–398.
- Yang, K. (2005). Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00453.x>.
- Ybema, J. F., & van den Bos, K. (2010). Effects of organizational justice on depressive symptoms and sickness absence: A longitudinal perspective. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(10), 1609–1617. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.027>.
- Zapata-Phelan, C. P., Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & Livingston, B. (2009). Procedural justice, interactional justice, and task performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 93–105. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.08.001>.

VITA

Darima Butitova was born on March 14, 1981. After finishing high school in 1998, she studied at Chita State University and received her B.A in American Studies and Law. Between 2004 and 2009 Darima worked as a lecturer at the Chita State University teaching Local Governance and Public Administration. In 2011 she completed her Master's degree in Public Affairs at the University of Missouri under the Fulbright Fellowship. Darima received her PhD in Public Affairs in 2017.