ENGAGEMENT, LOYALTY, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS MANAGERS

Stanislava MINÁROVÁ

_____

Abstract

When staffing the public administration organizations it is not enough to define the necessary qualifications and knowledge to perform the work. One of the prerequisites for work performance and required work behaviour of employees is their positive attitude to work and organization. The paper deals with working attitudes and motivation as prerequisites for achieving effective work performance for managers in public administration. Job satisfaction is first of all understood as emotional response to which extent the employee perceives his organization and his job as satisfying his needs. Employee satisfaction represents a subjective process of comparing the expectations and the real conditions connected with the aspects of work The aim of the contribution is to identify differences in working attitudes (engagement, loyalty, organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and motivation by elected and appointed representatives of municipal and local authorities and district offices. It has been found that there are no differences in terms of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, loyalty, commitment and motivation among elected and appointed representatives of municipal and local authorities and district authorities.

Key words

public administration, engagement, loyalty, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, motivation

JEL Classification: M12, M54, M53

_____

Introduction

The aim of public administration organizations is to increase efficiency, economy and performance in the delivery of public services. One of the pillars for increasing organizational performance is people, their skills and knowledge. When staffing the public administration organizations it is not enough to define the necessary qualifications and knowledge to perform the work (Župová, 2014). One of the prerequisites for work performance and required work behaviour of employees is their positive attitude to work and organization. It was claimed by Bláha et al. (2016), who added engagement to the well-known function of employee performance. According to him, the performance, except the basic, social and professional competence, motivation and the support of organization, is also determined by engagement of employees understood as work attitude. According to Mercer´s Engagement Model (2016), the engagement is connected with other work attitudes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and, related to this, loyalty and motivation. The degree of work attitudes and motivation of employees does not differ only because of their individual characteristics but mainly because of the organizational variables, working environment and the nature of the work. These determinants of work attitudes in organizations are various and may also vary within organizations of one sector. The aim of the paper is to identify the

differences in the degree of work attitudes (engagement, loyalty, organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and the motivations of managers in state administration and local government organisations.

1. Theoretical basis

The first studies explaining work behaviour of employees considered the job satisfaction as a basic work attitude. Since the job satisfaction, which was observed in relation to fluctuation, did not prove the expected causal connections, the concepts like organizational commitment and loyalty were introduced. Job satisfaction is first of all understood as emotional response to which extent the employee perceives his organization and his job as satisfying his needs (Mitchell, Lason 1987). Employee satisfaction represents a subjective process of comparing the expectations and the real conditions connected with the aspects of work (Jung, Moon, Hahm, 2007). It is an indicator of psychic adjustment of a man with the work he performs (Kollárik, 1983). Employee satisfaction represents a subjective process of comparing the expectations and the real conditions connected with the aspects of work (Jung, Moon, Hahm, 2007). It is primarily determined by remuneration for the work performed, type of the work, style of senior management, possibility of

career growth, communication in organization and working team (Spector, 1985; Kollárik, 2002).

Shermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (1994) in their studies tried to find out whether the job satisfaction if the result of work performance or the performance is the result of job satisfaction. They found out that a satisfied employee, e. g. due to the content of the work, interpersonal relationships etc. gives the performance required by organization. If an employee gives the required performance, the extent of his/her job satisfaction increases. For the sufficient performance the employee gets an adequate remuneration, and this again makes the increase in his/her job satisfaction and thus he/she will continue giving the required performance.

Within the Mercer´s Employee Engagement Model (2016) the job satisfaction is described in connection with motivation. The motivation can be understood as "an intrapsychic process expressing the reasons of a one´s acting and behaviour in a situation, when he seeks to reach the goal, satisfy the perceived lack resulting from unsatisfied needs, habits, interests, values and ideals" (Kravčáková et al., 2013). Through the Public Service Motivation construct (PSM), it is possible to diagnose which motives motivate employees in the public service. The construct is defined as the predisposition of an individual to respond to stimuli in public institutions or organizations (Perry, Wise, 1990). Vandenabeele (2007) defines PSM as "the belief, values and attitudes that go beyond self-interest and organizational interest, that concern the interest of a larger political entity and that motivate individuals to act accordingly whenever appropriate (p. 547)". Perry and Wise (1990) divided the motives for work in public service into three categories: rational, norm-based and affective. Rational motives make an individual act to maximize his benefit. Norm-based motives include the contexts of loyalty to governmental entities, duty and justice. Affective motives represent the interest in public issues which follows from sincere conviction of their social meaning (Mesárošová, 2004).

The study of Ryan and Deci (2000) proved that the public service employees have different motives than the employees of private sector. The employees of public administration ignore external stimuli, such as salary and other rewards more, but they are more motivated by the values of work position characteristics, according to Hackaman and Oldham (Ryan, Deci, 2000; Harausová, 2015). Su and Bozeman (2009) observed the motives of public sector organization managers and they found out that highly motivated managers prefer the career and development, while the occupational safety, amount of salary and appropriate occupational environment does not influence their job satisfaction nor their motivation. The salary is not a significant determinant of motivation for managers in public institutions. Determination of motives for working in public service is connected with the assumption that the degree of motivation determines job search in public organizations, and is in a positive relation with the performance of an individual and achievement of the goals of organization. The goals of organization, according to Ademeymo (2000), are not attainable without the permanent commitment of members of the organization, and so the motivation contributes to the degree of commitment of a particular person to the organization. This relation was proved also in the researches of Altindisova (2011).

Organizational commitment characterizes the relationship between worker and organization, expresses the favour, the identification and is voluntary. This relationship is given by affective, continuance or normative commitment (Meyer, 1997). The commitment implies intention, obligation (Kemp, 1967) and relative strength of identification with a particular organization (Mowday, Steers, Porter, 1979; Newstorm, Davis, 1993). And so the organizational commitment relates to what extent employees belong to organization and are connected to it (Meyer et al., 2013; Van Dick, 2004).

Organizational commitment is given by the prestige of organization in a society and by a good reputation, relationship with the representatives of organization and their recognition by society. In connection with this, the organizational commitment is connected with the feeling of the employee's pride that he is working in such organization (affective commitment). Organizational commitment can also refer to so-called continuance commitment (Meyer, Allen, 1997) when an employee compares job deposits and job benefits as a consequence of potential fluctuations. If these deposits and benefits are higher in the current organization, the employee decides to stay and thus shows a certain amount of organizational commitment.

Employee loyalty is understood as the willingness of an employee to make a considerable effort on behalf of the organization and says about the employee's relationship with the organization (O'Reilly, Chatman, 1986; Greenberg, Baron, 2000; Allen, Grisaffe, 2001). Turkyilmaz et al. (2011) states that this relationship is reflected in the decision to leave the organization. Employee loyalty to an organization exists when employees believe in goals of the company (Mathieu, Zajac, 1990), accept them for their own, work for the welfare of the organization by investing their time and resources (Reichheld, 2001; Chow, Holden, 1998), they want to continue in the organization (Porter et al., 1974, Robbins 2005)

and identify themselves with the mission of the organization and its ethics (Varona, 2002; Wu, Norman, 2006). According to Rymeš (In Halík, 2008), employee loyalty concerns demonstrating a positive relationship to organization and labelling by the symbols of organization. In this context, employee loyalty can be understood as an external expression of the employee's organizational commitment.

According to Andrew and Sofian (2012), employee engagement includes emotional and psychological relationships and attitudes between employees and the organization, the expression of which may be negative or positive behaviour of employees at the workplace. Jenkins and Delbridge (2013) claim that employee engagement implies his/her participation in work tasks, procedures and decision-making. Also Kahn (1990) defines employee engagement as involvement of organization members in work tasks while the involvement is physical, cognitive and emotional. The cognitive aspect of employee engagement relates to his/her views on organization, management and work conditions determined by experience and conviction. The emotional aspect of engagement refers to the feelings of employees, their positive or negative attitudes towards organization and its management. The physical aspect of employee involvement relates to physical energy developed by an individual to achieve his/her working role.

Employee engagement is an increased emotional and intellectual involvement the employee expresses in his/her work, and it motivates him/her to make extra effort and energy at work (Aon Hewit, 2013). The basis of the formation of this work attitude is the possibility of self-realization as the highest of the needs according to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Richman, 2006). The basic preconditions for self-realization in this meaning are participation in decision-making in organization, opportunity to choose working methods, feedback, development support and career development opportunities.

Employee engagement is beneficial to the organization by the fact that employees perform such work tasks and in such a way that their work performance is excellent, i.e. higher than performance expected by the organization within performance standards (Halbesleben, Harvwey, Bolino, 2009). There is a general belief that there is a connection between employee engagement and the economic result of an organization, however, the causal connection between them has not been directly proved (Harter et al., 2002).

Bláha et al. (2013) mention differences between engagement and organizational commitment among employees. They state that engagement is connected with emotions involved in activities performed at work, and the commitment relates to organizations as a whole. According to them, these two concepts are interconnected. A great sense of commitment to organization can mean greater engagement, and a high level of engagement can be related to an increased sense of commitment to organization. However, people can engage in their work even if they are not committed to organization.

The relationship between the individual prerequisites for engagement was observed by several authors (Botham, Roodt, 2012; Field, Buitendach, 2011; Mendes, Stander, 2011; Newman, Joseph, Hulín, 2010; Salanova, Agut, Peiro, 2005; Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004). They claim that job satisfaction, motivation and organizational commitment are mutually correlated, i.e. that with the increase of one construct, the other one either appears or grows within their hierarchy. Even the Merecer's Employe Engagement Model (2016) says that in case of employee, it is not possible to achieve a higher level without a lower one, while there is job satisfaction at the lowest level and engagement at the highest level.

Employers should be interested in the work attitudes of their employees, especially in management positions, and where the relationship to work can have a significant impact on the relationship to client and on the provision of services. These positive work attitudes are the source of competitive advantage and they contribute to the achievement of organizational goals, especially in public administration organizations, where the financial means for the resources of transformation process are limited.

The presumption of the difference between the degree of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, loyalty, engagement and motivation among managers of state administration and local government organizations is based on fundamental differences in the functioning of these public administration pillars and the structure of competencies which for managers of state administration and local government organizations follow from the legal regulations.

Within the state administration the managers are appointed and it is characterized by a system of superiority and subordination with a strict assignment of competences and working procedures at each level of management. The objective of state administration is to respect the law and order (Papcunová, Gecíková, 2011).

Within the local government, elected managers act in relation to the performance of competences and appointed managers in relation to employees of the office. Local government is characterized by the legal assignment of competences with greater decision-making authority on the way they perform (Papcunová, Gecíková, 2011). This means that it is an activity with managing character. The managing

elements are represented in this case to greater extent than in the case of state administration. Consequently, Local Government means not only the performance but also the creation of self-governing power within the limits of law. Local government, and thus its representatives, independently and to a large extent set the targets to which their work and performance are directed (Prucha, 2004). Factors of positive working attitudes are also the degree of decision-making power of an employee, participation in decision-making or job characterization according to Hackaman and Oldham (1976), which are different within public administration, state administration and local government organizations. Working conditions within local government organizations are much closer to the factors of positive working attitudes.

Based on these characteristics of working attitudes and differences within the functioning of public administration pillars, the following research question arises: *"Are there statistically significant differences in the average degree of motivation, job satisfaction, loyalty, organizational commitment and engagement in case of managers in state administration and local government?"*

Hypothesis 1: It is assumed that managers of local government organizations have higher average rate of motivation, job satisfaction, loyalty, organizational commitment and engagement than managers of state administration organizations.

Hypothesis 2: It is assumed that elected managers of local government organizations have higher average rate of motivation, job satisfaction, loyalty, organizational commitment and engagement than appointed managers of local government organizations.

2. Methodology

Method. The questionnaire was divided into 6 parts. The first part of the questionnaire contained 17 questions observing the rate of employee engagement – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), a standardized questionnaire formed by W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker (Schaufeli, Bakker, 2004). Respondents answered on a modified six-point evaluation likert scale in the range from 1 to 6, while 1 – strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. The overall score ranges from 17 to 102. When determining the engagement and non-engagement rate, the score is divided by median – 51. If the overall score is lower than the median value, it is a case of low engagement rate – non-engagement. If the score is higher than the median value, it is a high engagement rate – engagement.

The second part of the questionnaire consists of three questions concerning organizational commitment. It is inspired by a three-part model observing the rate of employee commitment (TCM; Meyer, Allen, 1991, 1997; revised version – Meyer, Allen, Smith, 1993). This model measures three forms of employee organizational commitment, namely an affective commitment – a desire; a normative commitment – an obligation; continuance commitment – costs. Each of these three forms of organizational commitment can be measured separately by one question, or overall, as a measure of organizational commitment, so called commitment profile. Respondents answered individual items using the six-point likert response scale, from 1 – strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. Values for the overall commitment profile range from 3 to 18. The low commitment rate is characterized by the score obtained below the median interval value and the high commitment rate is given by values above the median interval value.

The third part of the questionnaire consists of 3 questions and is focused on the analysis of employee loyalty. It is based on a standardized Employee Loyalty Scale developed by Chen and Wallace (2011). Respondents answered individual items using the six-point likert response scale, from 1 – strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. The score of the loyalty rate is from 3 to 18. Based on the median value of this score, it is possible to identify a loyalty rate, while a low loyalty rate is represented by a score below the median, and a high loyalty rate is above the median.

The fourth part of the questionnaire contains 5 questions. The individual questions concern work motivation. Respondents answered to what extent they agree with the reason they work for – money, contact with people, opportunities for self-realization, interest in work, improving their skills. Respondents answered individual statements by marking the value on a six-point likert scale from 1 – strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. The score of the overall motivation rate is from 5 to 30. Based on the median score, it is possible to identify a low and a high degree of motivation.

The fifth part of the questionnaire contains questions about partial and total job satisfaction. Partial work satisfaction was surveyed as satisfaction with work tasks, working conditions, superior, career growth opportunities, and co-workers. Respondents answered on individual statements by marking the value on a six-point likert scale from 1 – strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. The overall job satisfaction rate is given through scores of values from 5 to 30, the higher response score, the higher overall job satisfaction of the respondent. Based on the median value of the score, job satisfaction rate is

categorized into work dissatisfaction (score up to 17.5) and job satisfaction (scores above 17.5).

The final part of the questionnaire contains open and closed issues regarding socio-demographic variables – age, gender, education, practice, job classification and work area.

Research Design. The survey was carried out in June, July, August and September 2017. At the beginning of the survey, all municipal, local and district offices of the Slovak Republic were addressed electronically. The mayors and the representatives of the city authorities (140 SR; 22 Košice; 17 Bratislava) and the representatives of the district offices (72) were electronically sent information containing the reasons of the research realization, the research procedures, the use of the obtained data and the request for consent to the realization of the research in the organization. Information about the research was sent to the managers of the organizations in two rounds, in June and in August.

Consent to the carrying out of the questionnaire survey at municipal authorities was expressed by 28 municipal authorities (15.65%), out of total of 179 municipal and local authorities. One municipal authority disagreed (0.55%). 150 municipal authorities (83.80%) did not express their opinion on participation in the questionnaire survey. From the total number of 72 district offices within the Slovak Republic, 36 of them gave the consent to participation in the research, which represents 50%. Seven district offices (9.8%) showed disapproval and 29 district offices (40.2%) did not express their opinion on research participation.

After the expression of approval, online questionnaires were electronically sent to the managers of municipal, local and district authorities. The questionnaires were sent in two rounds. The first round of sending questionnaires was realized in July. In the first round, 92 questionnaires were sent. The second round was realized in September. In the second round, 92 questionnaires were sent.

Statistical processing. The obtained data were processed and the hypotheses were verified based on descriptive statistics (median, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, etc.) and difference statistics for testing the variance between three independent selections through the non-parametric replacement of Kruskal–Wallis one-way analysis of variance and for testing the variance between two independent selections non-parametric Mann–Whitney U test.

The research sample. The research sample was selected by a group selection from public administration organizations. Within the state administration organizations, managers of district offices from all territory of the Slovak Republic were selected, and within the local government organizations managers of municipal and local authorities from all territory of the Slovak Republic were selected. Total return was 39.01%, which represented 71 completed and returned questionnaires. 70 completed questionnaires were included into the survey.

Table 1. The description of the research sample in terms of job classification

Variable		Number	%
State administration	Representative	26	37.14%
Local government	Representative	21	30.00%
	Mayor	23	32.86%
Total		70	100 %

The sample was composed of 70 respondents. Respondents were classified into three compared groups according to work area and job classification within the organization they work in (Table 1). The sample from the area of state administration consisted of 26 representatives of district authorities, what represents 37.14%. There were 21 representatives of municipal and local authorities (30.00%) and 23 city mayors (32.86%) within the Slovak Republic.

Table 2. The description of the socio-demographic variables in case of representatives of district authorities

Variable		Number	%
Sex	men	24	92.30%
	women	2	7.70%
Age	up to 30 years old	6	23.07%
	from 31 to 40 years old	8	30.80%
	from 41 to 50 years old	10	46.13%
	from 51 years old	2	7.70%
Education	secondary	2	7.70%
	university	24	92.30%
Practice	up to 10 years old	19	73.07%
	from 11 to 20 years old	5	19.23%
	from 21 years old	2	7.70%
Total		26	100 %

26 heads of district authorities participated in the research, 92% from them were men and less than 8% women (Table 2). The average age of the representatives is 38.38, while the youngest one is 25 years old and the oldest one is 58 years old. Only two of them have not reached any university degree. The average time of the practice of representatives is 8.94 years. The time of the practice of representatives ranges from 1 to 41 years.

Table 3. Description of socio-demographic variables in case of representatives of municipal and local authorities

Variable		Number	%
Sex	men	16	76.20%
	women	5	23.80%
Age	up to 30 years old	3	14.28%
	from 31 to 40 years old	5	23.80%
	from 41 to 50 years old	7	33.33%
	from 51 to 60 years old	4	17.39%
	from 61 years old	2	11.20%
Education	secondary	3	14.28%
	university	18	85.72%
Practice	up to 10 years old	12	57.14%
	from 11 to 20 years old	4	17.39%
	from 21 to 30 years old	5	25.47%
Total		21	100 %

From the area of local government, 21 representatives of municipal and local authorities within the Slovak Republic participated in the survey. In the position of the researched representatives of municipal and local authorities, there were 76.20% of men and 23.8% of women (Table 3). The age of the representatives of municipal and local authorities ranges from 25 to 63 years old, while the average age is 44.52 years. 85% of the representatives have completed university education. The average time of practice among the representatives is 11.4 years, interval of practice time among the representatives of municipal and local authorities ranges from 0.5 years to 26 years.

Table 4. The description of socio-demographic variables in case of city mayors

Variable		Number	%
Sex	men	16	69.56%
	women	7	30.44%
Age	up to 30 years old	3	13.04%
	from 31 to 40 years old	2	8.70%
	from 41 to 50 years old	8	34.78%
	from 51 to 60 years old	9	39.13%
	from 61 years old	1	4.35%
Education	secondary	2	8.70%
	university	21	91.30%
Practice	up to 10 years old	13	56.52%
	from 11 to 20 years old	4	17.40%
	from 21 to 30 years old	6	26.08%
Total		23	100

23 city mayors of the Slovak Republic belonging to the area of local government organizations also participated in the survey. Less than a third of mayors involved in research were women and 70% men (Table 4). The age of Mayors of cities ranged from 25 to 61 years, the average age was 46.78 years. More than 90% of mayors of cities have completed university education. The practice of mayors of cities ranges from 1 year to 30 years, while the average length of practice for mayors of cities is 12.95 years.

3. Results

Quality employees in managerial positions, their competencies and work performance are extremely important for the success of organization in the market. For the development of high-quality and efficient employees, it is important that in their work they find challenge, interest, satisfaction, fulfilment, and a good feeling of work performed (Hart, Thompson, 2007). Positive work attitudes and sufficient motivation can also contribute to this. The aim of the paper is to identify the differences in working attitudes (engagement, loyalty, organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and motivation of elected and appointed managers of municipal and local authorities and district authorities. The assumptions about the differences in the rate of these working attitudes and motivations are based on the differences in the functioning of the public administration pillars and on the structure of competencies which, for the managers of public administration organizations, follows from legal regulations.

Work satisfaction is surveyed like a basic job attitude that relates to the performance of the employee and the show of his work behaviour. Satisfied employees like their work, they are satisfied with working conditions, they work reliably; however, they are not willing to work beyond their job responsibilities (Bláha et al., 2016). Earlier studies of public administration employees found out that these employees showed a lower rate of job satisfaction than employees working in private enterprises (Baldwin, Farley, 1991; Rainey, 1989). However, studies by DeSantis and Durst (1996), Emmert and Taher (1992), Gabris and Simo (1995), and Bašistová and Ferencová (2014) came to the conclusion that job satisfaction among public administration employees has a growing trend. Already in 1934 Uhrbrock organization found out that employees who are higher in the organization hierarchy show a higher degree of job satisfaction (Berry, 2009). Kollárik (1983) also claims that the highest degree of satisfaction is achieved by senior executives. Satisfaction of senior employees increases proportionally with their position.

The degree of job satisfaction among managers of state administration and local government organizations was surveyed (Table 5). Total degree of job satisfaction was surveyed as the satisfaction with work tasks, working conditions, senior staff, with career growth opportunities, with co-workers. On the basis of earlier surveys it is assumed that there is a high level of job satisfaction in case of managers of state administration and local government organizations.

Table 5. The job satisfaction rate among the respondents

Variable		N	Average	Standard deviation	Min.	Max.
Job satisfaction	**Mayor**	23	20.43	5.71	5.00	30.00
	Representative LG	21	19.52	4.96	11.00	30.00
	Representative SA	26	19.12	5.37	7.00	30.00
	Total	70	19.67	5.32	5.00	30.00

The average rate of total job satisfaction for all respondents is 19.67; it is above the median score and represents job satisfaction. Higher rates of job satisfaction are shown by city mayors (20.43); representatives of district authorities are less satisfied.

According to Taylor and Westover (2011), Jung and Shin (2014), the relationship between high rates of job satisfaction and motivation was confirmed. High rate of job satisfaction influences the employee motivation and motivation prerequisites a high level of job satisfaction in fulfilling the work tasks within the public service. They stated that higher level of job satisfaction in case of the employees in public sector is predicted by different internal motives than among the employees in private enterprises.

The level of work motivation in case of managers of state administration and local government organizations was also surveyed (Table 6). Work motivation was surveyed through the potential motives for work performance based on the reasons why managers perform their work – money, contact with people, opportunities for self-realization, interest in work, improving their abilities. The assumption of a higher degree of work motivation in case of city mayors is based on the initiative and candidature voluntariness in municipal authorities elections and thus in the work performance in the area of municipal government.

Table 6. The work motivation rate among the respondents

Variable		N	Average	Standard deviation	Min.	Max.
Work motivation	**Mayor**	23	21.22	5.06	5	30
	Representative LG	21	22.52	3.68	14	30
	Representative SA	26	22.88	3.93	11	29
	Total	70	22.23	4.27	5	30

The average rate of motivation of all the respondents is above the median score, indicating that respondents are motivated to perform their work. The highest rate of work motivation is shown by the representatives of district authorities, despite the fact that their opportunities of work performance are markedly limited by legal regulations. City mayors show slightly lower degree of work motivation.

Motivated employees should be characterized by working energetically and highly focused but preferring their individual goals to the goals of the organization in which they work (Bláha et al., 2016). This is unacceptable for managers in public administration organizations. Private interest and individual goal should not be preferred to the goals of the organization in public administration. However, if motivation relates to the organizational commitment

of employee, it is assumed that such an employee will perform the work primarily to achieve the goals of organization.

Porter and Smith (1976) characterized the organizationally committed employee as the one who considers the problems of the organization to be his/her own problems, he/she is emotionally bound to the organization and the organization has a meaning for him, he feels togetherness. Shepherd and Mathews (2000) supplemented the basic characteristics of the organizationally committed employees. They state that organizationally committed employees are convinced of the goals of organization. They are willing to be members and part of the organization (Korpulu, 2013).

The level of organizational commitment in case of managers of state administration and local

government organizations was also observed (Table 7). The above-mentioned characteristics of an organizationally committed employee according to Porter and Smith (1976) are more characteristic for elected managers working in local government organizations. Therefore, there is an assumption for a higher degree of organizational commitment in case of city mayors.

Table 7 The rate of organizational commitment among the respondents

Variable		N	Average	Standard deviation	Min.	Max.
Organizational commitment	Mayor	23	11.09	3.74	3	18
	Representative LG	21	11.48	3.68	6	18
	Representative SA	25	11.60	3.46	6	18
	Total	70	11.39	3.58	3	18

Organizational commitment rate among the respondents, based on their work area, does not differ considerably; it is above the median score. It can be said that the managers of both state and local-government organizations show the degree of organizational commitment which collides at the median score.

According to the findings, the organizational commitment of employees is shown through their loyalty. And thus the loyalty is an external expression of organizational commitment. A loyal employee has several characteristics that are reflected in his work behaviour. Employee loyalty is reflected in the behavioural field by the employee recommending working in that organization to known and other people, expressing the pride he feels thanks to working in the organization. A loyal employee remains in the organization despite other job opportunities from outside. He often speaks about his organization in public or in a circle of friends in a positive way, is open to express his favour, has good relationships in team, and his attitudes and behaviour are in accordance with the values, visions and goals of the organization (Meyer Allen, 1997). Employee loyalty as well as proclaiming of a positive relationship with the organization and labelling with the organization symbols (wearing company shirts, uniforms, etc.). Fully loyal employees work in an organization because they want and they want to work in it in the future as well. They spread a lot of positivism in the organization (Rao, 2006).

The level of loyalty in case of managers of state administration and local government organizations was surveyed (Table 8). The degree of employee loyalty is reflected by their organizational commitment. Based on a description of behavioural manifestations of loyalty, there is the assumption of a higher degree of loyalty among city mayors, in connection with their pre-election campaign and the candidacy to municipalities.

Table 8. The rate of loyalty among the respondents

Variable		N	Average	Standard deviation	Min.	Max.
Loyalty	Mayor	23	14.26	3.49	3	18
	Representative LG	21	15.10	2.95	8	18
	Representative SA	26	14.38	3.49	6	18
	Total	70	14.56	3.31	3	18

The average rate of loyalty among the respondents is markedly above the median score. The highest degree of loyalty is shown by representatives of municipal and local authorities. On the contrary, city mayors show the lowest degree of loyalty, even though they are representatives of local governments and are expected to behave like a loyal employee.

The Mercer's Employee Engagement Model (2016) assumes that high job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment and loyalty as its expression are prerequisites for the employee to be engaged in his/her work tasks. Such an engaged employee is described by many positive features related to his/her activity, thinking about work, set

goals, internal motivation, satisfaction (Alfes et al., 2010).

The level of engagement among managers of state administration and local government organizations was surveyed (Table 9). Jenkins and Delbridge (2013) claim that employee engagement is given by engaging in work tasks, processes, decisions and opportunities for self-realization. These work performance conditions imply a higher degree of engagement among elected managers of local government organizations – representatives of towns.

Table 9. The rate of engagement among the respondents

Variable		N	Average	Standard deviation	Min.	Max.
Engagement	**Mayor**	23	70.61	20.68	17	102
	Representative LG	21	71.90	16.37	38	102
	Representative SA	25	72.76	17.09	37	100
	Total	70	71.78	17.92	17	102

The average engagement rate for respondents is 71.78, which is markedly above the median score. The highest level of engagement can be observed among the representatives of district authorities, despite the fact that the nature of the work and the statutory competencies do not make conditions for a high level of engagement. The lowest rate of engagement is shown by city mayors.

The high level of engagement of respondents implies that such employees are characterized by high levels of energy and psychological resistance at work, willing to invest an effort and persistence to work, the employee perceives the work as his being, experiences the feeling of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge (Schaufeli et al., 2001). According to Bláha et al. (2013) engagement means that employees are interested in their work, have a positive relation with it and are ready to give an extraordinary performance to do their job best. This is also related to the statement of Jackson, Schuler and Werner (2009), who describe engaged employees as those who are highly motivated. The engaged employee, within the behavioural expressions, is characterized by being fully concentrated, working time runs fast for him/her, he/she has a problem to finish working even after the end of working time (Schaufeli et al., 2001), makes extraordinary effort and is able to do anything to make the company successful (Richman, 2006). This characteristic of an engaged employee is in accordance with the understanding of engagement as the performance of work tasks, supported by emotionality and voluntariness, according to, for example, Richman (2006) and Shaw (2005). An engaged employee is internally devoted to the values and goals of the company, is trying to excel and knows that his daily contribution to the goals of the company enriches his own development and contributes to his self-confidence. Armstrong (2009) defines engaged employees as the ones who keep an overview of the latest approaches and practices in their field. Engaged employees are willing to work beyond their duties to achieve better performance. An engaged manager solves the problems of the company while travelling home not because he has to, but because he enjoys it (Hay Group, 2011). An engaged employee when solving problems and tasks takes an initiative on him/her, is active and focused, believes he/she can achieve a change (Macey et al., 2009). Such characteristics of working behaviour and attitudes in case of employees are expected primarily among representatives of local governments, whose main task is to work on bringing the entrusted territory to prosperity.

The assumptions about statistically significant differences in the average level of motivation, job satisfaction, loyalty, organizational commitment and engagement between managers of local government organizations and managers of state administration organizations (Hypothesis 1) and elected and appointed managers of local government organizations (Hypothesis 2) were verified on the basis of statistical tests.

In order to compare the level of job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, loyalty and engagement in three groups of respondents – mayors of cities, representatives of municipal and local authorities and representatives of district authorities (Hypothesis 1), a non-parametric replacement of one-way analysis of variance – Kruskl – Walis test was used (Table 10).

Table 10. Kruskal – Walis test

Variable	Test Statistics	s.v.	p
Engagement	0.003	2	0.999
Organizational commitment	0.098	2	0.952
Loyalty	0.098	2	0.952
Work motivation	0.621	2	0.733
Job satisfaction	1.817	2	0.403

Based on Kruskal – Walis test, it can be said that there are no statistically significant differences in the level of job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, loyalty and engagement between city mayors, representatives of municipal and local authorities, and representatives of district authorities. Hypothesis 1 has not been confirmed.

A non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the degree of work satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, loyalty, and engagement between two groups of respondents – elected mayors of cities and appointed representatives of municipal and local authorities (Hypothesis 2).

Table 11. Mann-Whitney U test

Variable	U	Standardized Test Statistics	p
Engagement	240	-0.035	0.972
Organizational commitment	232	-0.225	0.822
Loyalty	232	-0.225	0.822
Work motivation	208.5	-0.784	0.433
Job satisfaction	204	-0.889	0.374

Based on the Mann-Whitney U test, it can be said that there are no statistically significant differences in job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, loyalty, and engagement between elected mayors of cities and the appointed representatives of municipal and local authorities. Hypothesis 2 has not been confirmed.

Conclusion

The aim of the paper was to identify differences in working attitudes (engagement, loyalty, organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and motivations of elected and appointed managers of municipal and local authorities and district authorities. The assumptions about the differences in the extent of these working attitudes and motivations were based on the differences in the functioning of the public administration pillars and the structure of competencies which for these managers of public administration follows from the statutory regulations.

It has been found out that rate of job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, loyalty, and engagement does not differ among respondents based on whether they work in state administration or local

government, or whether they are elected or appointed managers in local government.

The highest rate of engagement has been shown by representatives of district authorities, despite the fact that the nature of the work and the statutory competence do not create the conditions for a high level of engagement. According to Bláha et al. (2013) engagement means that employees are interested in their work, have a positive relation to it and are ready to perform extraordinary performance to do their job best. Engaged employees are those who like their work, willing to give something more to the organizations they work for, not because it is required, but for their own conviction and joy.

The research has shown that organizational factors manifested in the nature of the work do not contribute to the creation of working attitudes and work motivation to any significant extent. It can be said that

socio-demographic and individual personality variables are more important factors in the formation

References

Adeyemo, D. A. (2000). Job involvement, career commitment, organizational commitment and job satisfaction of the Nigerian police. A multiple regression analysis. *Journal of Advance Studies in Educational Management.* Vol. 5(6), pp. 35-41.

Allen, N. J., Grisaffe, D. B. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: mapping the linkages. Human Resource Management Review. Vol. 11(3), pp. 209-236.

Altindis, S. (2011). Job motivation and organizational commitment amog the health professionals: A questionnaire survey. *African Journal of Business Management*. Vol. 5(21), pp. 8601-8609.

Andrew, O., Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 40, pp. 498-508.

Aon Hewit, (2013). Trends in Global Emoloyee Engagement Report Higlights. 2013, s. 4. Dostupné online: http://www.aon.com/attachments/humancapitalconsulting/2013_Trends_in_Global_Employee_Engagement_Report.pdf

Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan Page Limited, 2009.

Armstrong, M. (2007). *Odměňování pracovníků*. 2.vyd. Praha: Grada. 448 s. ISBN 978-80-247-2890-2.

Baldwin, J. N., Farley, Q. A. (1991). Comparing the public and private sectors in the United States: A review of the empirical literature. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Handbook of comparative and development public administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker. pp. 27-39.

Bašistová, A., Ferencová, M. (2014). Analýza spokojnosti zamestnancov v kontexte zmien pracovných podmienok a faktorov. *Psychológia práce a organizácie 2014*. Spoločensko-vedný ústav SAV, Košice 2014. s. 27 – 37.

Berryová, L. M. (2009). *Psychológia v práci*. 2. vyd. Bratislava: Ikar, 2009. 693 s. ISBN 978-80-551-1842-0.

Bláha, J. et. al. (2013). *Pokročilé řízení lidských zdrojů*. Brno: Edika, 2013. s. 264. ISBN 978-80-266-0374-0.

Bláha, J. et. al. (2016). *Řízení lidských zdroju. Nové trendy*. Praha: Management Press, 2016. s. 428. ISBN 978-80-7261-430-1.

Bothma, F. C., Roodt, G. (2012). Work-based identity and work engagement as potential antecedents of task performance and turnover intention: Unravelling a complex relationship. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*. Vol. 38(1), Art. #893, 17 pages. doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v38i1.893

Desantis, V. S., Durst S. L., (1996). Comparing job satisfaction among public and private sector employees. *American Review of Public Administration*. Vol. 26(3), pp. 327-343.

Emmert, M. A., Taher, W. A. (1992). Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *American Review of Public Administration*. Vol. 22(1), pp. 37-48.

Field, L. K., Buitendach, J. H. (2011). Happiness, work engagement and organisational commitment of support staff at a tertiary education institution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*. Vol. 37(1), pp. 1-10.

Gabris, G. T., Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management*. Vol. 24(1), pp. 33-51.

Greenberg, J., Baron A. R. (2003). Behaviour in Organisations", Prentice Hall, Vol. 8, pp. 188-215.

Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. Vol. 16, pp. 250-279.

Halbesleben, J. R., Harwey, J., Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagment and work intefferece with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2009. Nov. 94(6), pp. 1452-1465. doi: 10.1037/a0017595.

Halík, J. (2008). *Vedení a řízení lidských zdrojú*. Praha: Grada, 2008. 128s. ISBN 978-80- 247-2475-1.

Harausová, H. (2015). *Motivácia - pracovná spokojnosť - výkonnosť a výkon zamestnancov organizácií verejnej správy*. Košice: Univerzita P. J. Šafárika v Košiciach. 105 s. ISBN 978-80-8152-362-5.

Hart, D. W., Thompson, J. A. (2007). Untangling employee loyalty: A psychological contract perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. Vol. 17, pp. 297-323.

Harter, J. K. et. al. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 87, pp. 268-279.

Hay Group. (2011). *Engage Employees and Bcast Performance*, 2011, s. 7 [online]. [15.12.2015]. Dostupné z: http://www.haygroup.com/us/downloads/details.aspx?id=7343.

of working attitudes and work motivation.

Chow, S., Holden, R. (1997). Toward an Understanding of Loyalty: The Moderating Role of Trust. *Journal of Managerial Issues*. Vol. 9, no. 3, pp 275-298.

Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S., Werner, S. (2009). *Managing human resources* (10 ed.). Mason: Cengage.

Jenkins S., Delbridge R. (2013). Context Matters: Examining Soft and Hard Approaches to Employee Engagement in Two Workplaces. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Vol. 24(14), pp. 2670-2691.

Jung, J., Shin, J. Ch. (2014). *Administrative staff members' job competency and their job satisfaction in a Korean research university*. Studies in Higher Education. 2014.

Jung, K., Moon, M. J., Hahm, J. S. (2007). Do age, gender, and sector affect job satisfaction? Results from the Korean labor and income panel data. In: *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. Vol. 27, no. 2, p. 125-146.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 33(4), pp. 692–724.

Kemp, P. E. (1967). Commitment and Job Satisfaction. Journal of coopeerative extension, vol. X, pp. 171–177.

Kollárik, T. (1983). *Človek v sociálnom systéme práce*. 1. vyd. Bratislava: Práca. 214. s. 1983.

Kollárik, T. (2002). *Sociálna psychologia práce*. Bratislava : UK. s. 190. 2002. ISBN 80-85943-57-3.

Koprulu, O. M. (2013). Examining the antecedents of organizational commitment in the context of un and eu police contingents in conflict and terror areas. Dostupné online:http://dga.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012//10/Examining-theAntecedentsofOrganizational-Commitment-in-the-Context-of-UN-and-EU-Police-Contingents-inConflict-and-Terror-Areas.pdf

Kravčáková G. a kol. (2013). *Organizačné správanie*. 1. vyd. Košice: UPJŠ v Košiciach. 192 s. ISBN 978-80-8152-214-7.

Macey, et al. (2009). *Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice and competitive advantage*. Wiley-Blackwell Ltd. UK. 2009.

Mathieu, J., Zajac, D. (1990). A review of meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 108 No. 2, pp. 171-94.

Mendes, F., Stander, M. W. (2011). Positive organisation: The role of leader behaviour in work engagement and retention. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*. Vol. 37(1), pp, 1-13. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v38i1.900.

Mercer´s Employe Engagement Model. (2017): Dostupné online:

https://www.slideshare.net/PingElizabeth/mercer-whats-working-research.

Mesárošová, M. (2004). Motivácia verejnej služby a komunikácia študentov verejnej správy. *Podniková ekonomika a manažment*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brne, s. 240-247.

Meyer, J. P. (1997). Organizational commitment. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 12, pp. 175 – 228.

Meyer, J. P. (2013). The science-practice gap and employee engagment: Its a matter of principle. *Canadian Psychology*. Vol. 54, pp. 235–245.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 1, pp. 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organization and occupations: Extensions and tests of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 78, pp. 538 – 551.

Mitchell, T. R., Lason, J. R. (1987). People in Organization. 3rd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., Porter, L. M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. Vol.14, pp. 224–227.

Newman, D. A, Joseph, D. L., Hulin Ch. L. (2010). Job attitudes and employee engagement: Consedering the attitude A-factor. *The handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice*. p. 43 – 61.

Newstrom, J.W., Davis, K. (1993). Organizational behavior. Human behavior At work. 9th Edition, New York:McGraw-Hill.

OReilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied psychology*. Vol. 71, pp. 492-499.

Papcunová, V., Gecíková, I. (2011). *Metódy a techniky regionálnej analýzy*. Bratislava: VŠEMvs,. 2011, 148 s. ISBN 978-80-89393-39-8.

Perry, J. L., Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 50(3) pp. 367–373.

Porter, L. W. et. al. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric techni- cians. *Journal of Applled Psychology*. Vol. 59, no 603-609.

Prucha, P. (2004). *Správní právo*. Obecná část. 6. doplněné a aktualizované vydání. Masarykova univerzita a nakladatelství Doplněk. Brno 2004, ISBN 80-210-1814-3.

Rainey, H. G. (1997). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. 2nd ed San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1997.

Reichheld, F. F. (2001). Loyalty Rules! How Today s Leaders Build Lasting Relationships. Boston, MA: Havard University Press.

Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it? *Workspan*. Vol. 49, pp. 36-39.

Robbins, S. P. (2005). Organizational Behavior, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Pearson, Prentice Hall

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. Vol. 25(1), pp. 54–67.

Salanova, M., Agut, S., Peiro, J. M. (2005). Linking organisational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 90(6), pp. 1217–1227. doi: http://dx.doi. org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217.

Shaw, K. (2005). An engagement strategy process for communicators. *Strategic Communication Management*. Vol. 9(3), no 26-29.

Shepherd, J. L., Mathews, B. P. (2000). Employee commitment: academic vs practitioner perspectives. *Employee Relations*. Vol. 22 Iss: 6, pp. 555 – 575.

Shermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., Osborn, R. N. (1994). Managing Organizational Behavior. John Wiley a Sonc, Inc., New York, 1994.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 25, pp. 293-315.

Schaufeli, W. B., et. al. (2001). Maakt arbeid gezond? Op zoek naar de bevlogen werknemer [Can work produce health? The quest for the engaged worker]. *De Psycholoog*. Vol. 36, pp. 422–428.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of Human Servise Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal o Community Psychology*. Vol. 13, no. 6.

Su, X., Bozeman, B. (2009). Do Expectations Meet Aspirations? The Relation of Public Managers Job Choice Motives to Job Satisfaction. *International Review of Public Administration*. Vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-9.

Taylor, J., Westover, J. H. (2011). Job Satisfaction in the public service: The effects of public service motivation, workplace attributes and work relations. *Public Management Review*. Vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 731-753.

Turkyilmaz, A. et. al. (2011). Empirical study of public sector employee loyalty and satisfaction. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. Vol. 111(5), pp. 675-696.

Van Dick, R. (2004). Commitment und Identifikation mit Organisationen. Gottingen: Hogrefe.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a Public Administration Theory of Public Service Motivation: An Institutional Approach. *Public Management Review*. Vol. 9(4), pp. 545–556.

Varona, F. (2002). Conceptualization and Management of Communication Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Three Guatemalan Organizations. *American Communication Journal*. Vol. 5(3), pp. 114-136.

Wu, L., Norman, I. J. (2006). In investigation of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and role conflict and ambiguity in a sample of Chinese undergraduate nursing student. *Nurse Education Today*. Vol. 26, pp. 304-314.

Župová, E. (2014). Vzťah kompetentnosti, pracovného výkonu a výkonnosti organizácie v organizácii verejnej správy. *Aplikácie informačných technlógií = Information Technology Applications*. Vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 33-38.

Contact

PhDr. Ing. Stanislava Minárová
Faculty of Public adminnistration UPJŠ in Košice
Department of social study
Popradská 66
041 32 Košice
stanislava.minarova@student.upjs.sk