

Good to be Disliked?

The Relationship Between Disapproval of Organizations and Job Satisfaction

Roulet Thomas

King's College, London (a partir d'aout 2015)

troulet@gmail.com

Résumé :

Scholars have found that a positive relationship exists between organizational-level constructs related to favorable perception of a firm and employees' job satisfaction: the more positively an organization is perceived, the happier are its workers. In this article, I specifically investigate the consequences of a negative corporate image, or disapproval of organizations. I observe that perception of disapproval of an organization has an adverse effect on job satisfaction, except if employees perceive criticism as illegitimate, in which case it can paradoxically improve job satisfaction. This study suggests the existence of social identity mechanisms that trigger micro-level reactions in case of unjustified disapprobation: employees stick together and hold the line against criticism, strengthening the collective identity and adding positive emotional value to the work experience.

Mots-clés : disapproval; corporate image; job satisfaction; job dissatisfaction; attractiveness; social identity.

Good to be Disliked?

The Relationship Between Disapproval of Organizations and Job Satisfaction

An organizational image is attractive when it contributes to enhancing the members' self-esteem. Several authors have linked organizational level constructs related to the organization's image with micro-level outcomes (Shenkar and Yuchtman-Yaar, 1997). Organizational prestige plays a role in employee retention (Herrbach, Mignonac and Gatignon, 2007; Mignonac, Herrbach and Guerrero, 2006; Hausknecht, Rodda, and Howard, 2008) and reputation is used as a signal of attractiveness by job seekers (Dögl and Holtbrügge, 2013; Turban, 2001; Cable and Turban, 2003; Wayne and Casper, 2012). Holtbrügge, Friedmann and Puck (2010) identify corporate image as a crucial determinant to attract qualified applicants. Riordan, Gatewood, and Bill (1997) have shown that a positive relationship exists between corporate image and job satisfaction. More recently, Helm (2012) has also established that perceived external reputation has a positive impact on job satisfaction.

In this study, I rather focus on the negative dimension of outsiders' perception of the organization. This study looks at the consequences of an organizational level construct - negative corporate image - on a crucial employee level outcome: job satisfaction. How is job satisfaction affected by a negative image? Dutton, Dukerich and Harquail (1994) raise the example of Exxon after the Valdez oil spill to show that employees in an organization with a negative image can feel "shame, disgrace, or embarrassment" (p. 242) as well as "depression and stress" (p. 240). Building on social identity theory, they suggest that a negative organizational image negatively affects employees. When their organization is disapproved of, employees are likely to suffer from contamination and be affected by Goffman's courtesy stigma (1963) and distance themselves from the organization (Devers, Dewett, Mishina, and Belsito, 2009), leading to lower job satisfaction. However, a growing body of literature explains employees' strategies to maintain self-esteem despite the bad image of their occupation or organization (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999; Kreiner, Ashforth and Sluss, 2006). In particular, when insiders have to face threats to the group identity,

they devalue outsiders' appraisal (Kreiner, Ashforth, and Sluss, 2006; Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999) and ultimately counterbalance the effects of disapprobation. Beyond buffering the negative influence, external threats to the collective identity might lead to stronger cohesion and organizational culture (Forsyth, 1990). Believing that one's organization is in the right against the rest of the world can be a source of self-image enhancement, and thus, a source of motivation and job satisfaction. Do employees of disapproved firms have more pride, like people who work in a stigmatized occupation (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999; Roulet, 2015)?

In this study, I formulate hypotheses regarding the effect of disapproval of organizations on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. I test those hypotheses with a large government dataset ($N = 3792$). By focusing on the negative side of corporate image – disapproval of organizations – I show that *a priori* negative organizational outcomes can have positive effects at the employee level. This paper is aimed at discarding the self-evidence of the negative consequences of disapproval of organizations by establishing that job satisfaction could be triggered by such an occurrence when the external criticism is perceived as illegitimate.

Hypotheses development

Employees define themselves in terms of the organization for which they work (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Outsiders also associate perceived organizational features with the employees of the organization (Cable and Turban, 2003). The literature on recruitment provides us with informative clues on how the perception of an organization, and in particular its human resources practice, affects attractiveness in terms of recruitment (Wayne and Casper, 2012). In itself, the difference in wages between non-profit and for-profit organizations suggests that white-collar workers are ready to trade off wages because they 'place a positive utility on contributing to social welfare' (Preston, 1989, p. 442). Beyond the impact of firm's reputation in terms of compensation and human resources practices on employees' attitudes towards the firm (Wayne and Casper, 2012), numerous scholars have more generally shown the positive impact of corporate image on human resource management. Herrbach et al. (2007) pointed out the role of organizational prestige in employee retention. Holtbrügge, et al. (2010) have shown how a positive corporate image enables the firm to be more attractive as a recruiter. Dögl and Holtbrügge (2013) show how "greener" companies have a better employer reputation and experience higher organizational commitment. Similarly, Turban and Greening (1997) have demonstrated that

potential job applicants are more attracted to socially responsible firms, while Cable and Turban (2003) have established that applicants use the firm's reputation as a signal regarding job attributes and the pride that they can derive from affiliation with the firm.

The way the organization is perceived by outsiders has another individual level outcome for insiders: Helm (2012) has shown that there is a relationship between perceived external reputation and job satisfaction. Pride of membership and job satisfaction are related to the perceived external reputation of the organization. Kjærgaard, Morsing, and Ravasi (2011) established that in-group members derive gratification from positive media coverage of their organization. Riordan, Gatewood, and Bill (1997) have shown a positive relationship between corporate image and job satisfaction.

Why focusing on disapproval of organizations?

In some studies, corporate reputation and image have been studied as continua (Helm, 2012; Riordan et al., 1997) in which positive and negative dimensions of these constructs have not been distinguished. Does a negative corporate image have the same effect (i.e. no effect) as the lack of a positive corporate image, or does it have an opposite effect? Although the positive consequences of a favorable external perception of the organization for the employees have been extensively studied (Hausknecht, et al. 2008; Holtbrügge, et al. 2010; Kjærgaard, et al. 2011; Helm, 2012), the consequences of a negative perception of the organization remain to be explored.

Disapproval of the firm is a negative social evaluation that expresses a 'criticism toward a firm's activities, values, and social behavior' (Vergne, 2012: 5), and occurs when social norms are violated (Deephouse and Suchman, 2008). Disapproval of an organization is a negative assessment of an organization's moral legitimacy by outsiders. The managers seem primarily affected when their organizations' image is threatened (Sutton and Callahan, 1987). If organizations violate social norms, they have more chances to be noticed and pointed out than when they conform (Glynn and Marquis, 2004). When stakeholders dissociate themselves from the organization, employees may also retract their support. Because employees are at the forefront of the interaction with organizational audiences and stakeholders, the retraction of those actors makes external criticism visible for employees (Sutton and Callahan, 1987).

The employees of badly reputed organizations suffer from decreased self-esteem (Cable and Turban, 2003). Suspecting that someone dislikes one's behavior is enough for one to feel

social disapproval (Rege and Telle, 2004): if an employee has the impression that his or her organization is disapproved of, he or she will also feel socially condemned.

Disapproval of organizations and job (dis)satisfaction

If employees feel that the organization for which they work is socially disapproved of, they will tend to keep their distance: individuals are unlikely to invest themselves in membership in a tainted group (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Goffman's (1963) concept of courtesy stigma suggests that one can become stigmatized when associated with stigmatized people. In this context, employees dissociate themselves with their organization in order to prevent contamination. In general, employees, as a stakeholder group, are expected to modify their ties with their organization if it is stigmatized (Devers et al., 2009). Considering individuals are seeking social approval (Rege and Telle, 2004), working for a disapproved organization will have adverse consequences on the relationship between the employee and his or her organization.

Employees are driven by self-esteem concerns (Benabou and Tirole, 2010). More specifically, in the context of organizations, workers are motivated by their willingness to maintain an enhanced image of themselves (Katz and Kahn, 1966; Shamir, 1991). In return, the way in which individuals construct their organizational reality is driven by their need for a positive self-concept (Kjærgaard, et al., 2011). Consequently, research has hypothesized that individuals are more satisfied with jobs that are consistent with a positive image of themselves (Korman, 1970). Similarly, in his self-concept theory, Shamir (1991) argues that people are motivated to maintain and enhance their self-worth: job motivation is determined by the congruence between the job context and the expectation of the individual regarding the contribution of this affiliation to his or her self-image. In other terms, job motivation is higher if the job context offers opportunities for increased self-worth. Inversely, if the job context is detrimental to self-worth, motivation is lower.

Spector (1997) simply defines job satisfaction as the extent to which employees like their jobs and feel good about different aspects of their work. The composite approach to job satisfaction examines attitudes towards different facets of the job (Bruck et al., 2002). The most common facets (co-workers, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, and the task itself) account for most of the variance in overall job satisfaction (Kinicki et al., 2002). Job satisfaction reflects the balance of satisfactions and dissatisfaction with those aspects of work (Malinowska-Tabaka, 1987). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the elements of the work context are often

considered as two sides of the same coin, where dissatisfaction is depicted as the negative dimension of job satisfaction (see for example Zhou and George, 2001; Saari and Judge, 2004; Farrell, 1983). However, the facet approach (Spector, 1997) enables to distinguish the sources of satisfaction and the sources of dissatisfaction (see for example Klassen and Andersen, 2009), although they are sometimes aggregated in a composite measure of job satisfaction (Malinowska-Tabaka, 1987). The main rationale is that the facets of work, which do not bring satisfaction to the employees, may not bring dissatisfaction either and the factors accounting for satisfaction and dissatisfaction may differ (Quarstein, McAfee & Glassman, 1992). Employees tend to censor out the sources of dissatisfaction if only asked about satisfaction, although sources of dissatisfaction are crucial elements to understand overall satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1999). The absence of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction also have different consequences: absence of satisfaction is expected to lead to turnover or absenteeism (Saari and Judge, 2004), while dissatisfaction is related to choices of exit (Kinicki, et al. 2002), voice (Farrell, 1983) or even to creativity (Zhou and George, 2001). As this paper focuses on a trigger of adverse consequences, it makes sense to hypothesize about the effects on the sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Considering the distinction between sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, the existence and the magnitude of the effects hypothesized thereafter may differ from job satisfaction to dissatisfaction. However, a consistent relationship can be expected: what negatively affects job satisfaction, positively affects job dissatisfaction, and inversely.

Putting the previous theoretical developments in perspective, I argue that the negative perception of an organization by outsiders, as a crucial element of job context, affects job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in two ways. First, it requires the employees to dissociate themselves from the organization, because disapproval of the organization would affect their own social approval outside the organization. Second, employees' need for a positive image of themselves is threatened by their affiliation with this external criticism, which results in the employees' detachment. The various facets of the job in a disapproved organization will become, consequently, less appealing. Thus, I hypothesize that disapproval of an organization is negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to job dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 1: *When employees perceive external disapproval of their organization, (a) job satisfaction decreases and (b) job dissatisfaction increases.*

When an organization is disapproved of, its employees may not necessarily consider the criticism to be legitimate. Organizational identity is constructed through iterative processes of interaction between insiders and outsiders where both sides try to impose their views (Coupland and Brown, 2004). Employees may actually defend their organization if they believe that disapproval is unfair or unjustified. They may justly consider that they know their organization better than external stakeholders do. The perceived responsibility for an illegitimate practice will increase the perceived incongruence with social norms (Devers et al. 2009; Clemente & Roulet, 2015). Consequently, outsiders and insiders might have a different perspective on who holds the responsibility for violating social norms. If outsiders perceive an organization as responsible and thus disapprove it publicly, insiders might at the same time believe that their organization is innocent, or that it has had no other choice in order to survive. As a consequence, employees will perceive the criticism as illegitimate.

In addition, social identity theory research suggests that insiders tend to affirm their group's values and see them more favorably in comparison to outsiders' values: external threats to a group's identity trigger defense mechanisms aimed at preserving the group members' self-esteem (Kreiner, Ashforth, and Sluss, 2006). These mechanisms are aimed at responding to perceptions of the organization that are incongruent with the members' need for self-enhancement (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996). Specifically, members of a deprecated group devalue outsiders' judgments when those are negative, in order to maintain their pride (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). The appreciation of the legitimacy of the external judgments is an outcome of social creativity processes, wherein insiders build a line of reasoning in order to discount out-group perceptions (Kreiner et al., 2006). This identity defense mechanism may buffer the effects of perceived disapproval on both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: *When employees perceive the external disapproval of their organization as illegitimate, (a) the negative relationship between disapproval of the organization and job satisfaction is weaker (b) the positive relationship between disapproval of the organization and job dissatisfaction is weaker.*

However, a consistent stream of qualitative research on stigmatized occupations has shown that people performing a defamed activity were able to maintain a high level of occupational esteem and pride (see Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999), suggesting that external negative judgments can actually have a positive effect on insiders' identity. In this case, the effects of the

perceived illegitimacy of disapproval might go beyond buffering the negative effects of disapproval on job satisfaction. Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) imply that the way in which insiders tend to ‘condemn the condemners’ by devaluating their judgments brings about a polarization. Insiders are prone to dig in their heels in order to face criticism and ‘socially withdraw in order to look for social validation and affirmation within their own group’ (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999: 425). Research has also shown that external threats foster group cohesion because insiders tend to stick together against outsiders (Forsyth, 1990). Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) explain that when groups coalesce this way, they build psychological boundaries around themselves for the purpose of self-affirmation. In addition, because disapproval generates distinctiveness, it can increase identification (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 1994). In a situation of disapproval of the organization, when their self-concept is threatened, group members give sense to the organization in a way that preserves the manner in which they define themselves (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996): insiders perceive themselves as members of a group that is in the right despite what the rest of the world thinks, and they share this faith in their organization with their peers. The feeling of being in the right together with the rest of the organization and their peers – especially because the common cause strengthens organizational culture and cohesion – can have a positive impact on employees’ self-concept and is thus an important motivational drive (Shamir, 1991). Ultimately, disapproval can have a positive effect on job satisfaction and negative effect on job dissatisfaction, because it implies to hold the line against the rest of the world. Thus, I formulate the following alternative hypotheses:

***Hypothesis 3:** When employees perceive the external disapproval of their organization as illegitimate, (a) their job satisfaction increases and (b) their job dissatisfaction decreases.*

Method

The data I used in this study comes from the ‘Histoire de Vie’ survey conducted in 2003 by the French National Institute of Statistics (INSEE) (Histoire de Vie, 2003), aimed at exploring the construction of identity in French society. This large dataset includes a comprehensive set of questions on work, as well as questions on demographics, marital information, sociability, political and religious activities, and disability. The survey was conducted through face-to-face interviews lasting 70 minutes, which were conducted in the respondents’ homes. The response rate was 62%. Among the 8,403 respondents, the dataset includes 3,886 professionally active

individuals on which I can test the hypotheses. I removed the observations for which some variables were missing and ended up with a total of 3,792 observations. Their demographic, job, and firm characteristics are summarized in Table 1. The objective of this survey was to understand the elements that constitute an individual's identity and how it affects his or her social integration. Some questions on specific dimensions of social identity did not have enough respondents to meet minimum requirements and could not, therefore, be tested. As a result, the survey designers slightly over-represented three populations (disabled individuals, descendants of immigrant parents and immigrants) compared to the French populationⁱ. The survey initially involved a total of 13,500 individuals, mainly sampled from the 1999 French census, but also from other sources, in order for the survey designers to over-represent those populations (Ardilly, 2003). These surveys' sampling design was designed to over-represent respondents with those characteristics. As explained in subsequent sections, I control for these three characteristics, and considering the size of the dataset, they do not affect the findings.

Dependent variables: To measure job satisfaction, I used a composite approach (Stanton, et al. 2002): I aggregated a number of dummies corresponding to questions in which the respondents were asked, for each dimension of the job, whether they would definitely like to keep a given element ("yes" being 1 and "no" being 0). These elements are occupation, colleagues, schedule, salary, job status (employee or independent worker), workplace, advancement opportunities, hierarchical position, and the organization itself. These elements represent those that explain the majority of variance in job satisfaction (Kinicki et al., 2002). The job satisfaction variable is the summed composite of the responses, where higher scores indicate greater satisfaction. It ranges from 0 (not satisfied with any of these elements) to 7 (no individuals in the sample are satisfied with more than 7 elements).

This composite approach to job satisfaction measures each facet of satisfaction with a single -item, as suggested by Nagy (2002). It is motivated by simplicity, the face validity offered by single-item measures compared to the multiple items approach (such as the one used for the Job Descriptive Index, JDI; P. C. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969), as well as the significant correlation of single-item with multiple-item measures for each facet (Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy, 1997; Nagy, 2002). Although the measure of job satisfaction is not as rich as it would have been if I had collected the data myself, I believe it offers sufficient accuracy on the basis that the use of single-item measures has been accepted as a sufficient substitute (Wanous, et al. 1997). The measure does affect the choice of model (see below). I use single-item measures of facets of job

satisfaction to construct an ordinal overall satisfaction scale instead of using multiple-item measures, which would have allowed us to use a continuous variable. Nevertheless, internal consistency reliability is satisfactory (the average of the 8 Cronbach's alphas are above 0.70). In addition to this composite measure of job satisfaction, the survey provides us with another dependent variable. The respondents were asked whether 'at work, the motives for satisfaction (respectively dissatisfaction) prevail' or if 'the motives of satisfaction and dissatisfaction balance each other'. I modeled a dummy equal to 1 if the motives of satisfaction prevail. This measure is similar to the global single-item dichotomous measure of job satisfaction used by Scarpello and Campbell (1983) as an alternative to multiple-item measures, and to a global single-item measure of job satisfaction.

Because the level of job satisfaction is "a function of the different satisfactions and dissatisfactions a person experiences with respect to different aspects of work" (Malinowska-Tabaka, 1987: 454), I distinguish job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and build consistent hypotheses across those two dependent variables. The objective is to observe if the results differ from one dependent variable to the other, especially in terms of magnitude. Hypothesis 2 suggests the existence of a buffering effect of the legitimacy of disapproval. Hypothesis 3 implies an effect that goes beyond buffering. Hypotheses 2 and 3 are thus mutually exclusive, but hypothesis 3 takes stock on hypothesis 2: hypothesis 3 denotes a more radical effect of the legitimacy of disapproval than hypothesis 2. Thus, despite the consistent hypotheses across job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the difference in the magnitude of the tested effects is crucial. In addition, the items for which employees might report no satisfaction are not necessarily the same than those for which they report dissatisfaction. In addition, distinguishing the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction limits the biases implied by self-censorship (Oshagbemi, 1999). Although consistent results can be expected across the two dependent variables, the magnitude of the effects may diverge.

To measure job dissatisfaction, I use another sequence of questions in which individuals answered, whether they would like to change the same elements as mentioned in the job satisfaction items (occupation, colleagues, schedule, salary, job status, workplace, advancement opportunities, hierarchical position, organization). I use those 9 items to build a measure to test the hypotheses 1b, 2b and 3b. I added the seven dummies to obtain a score from 0 (not dissatisfied with any of those elements) to 7 (dissatisfied with the highest number of elements, considering there are no individuals that are dissatisfied with more than 7 elements). The internal consistency

reliability is a bit lower for this variable than for job satisfaction (mean of Cronbach's alphas = 0.65) but is still acceptable. Finally, I used the global item to build an additional dichotomous variable equal to 1 when respondents acknowledge that 'at work, motives for dissatisfaction prevail'.

Independent variables: To build the independent variables, I used an item from the survey in which the respondents were asked how they react 'when [they] hear someone criticizing [their] firm or administration'. Based on this item, I built a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondents felt that their organization was criticized and 0 if their organization was not criticized or if the individual was indifferent to the criticism. I do not screen for the reasons of this disapproval, as I want to evaluate the perception of the disapproval rather than its actual presence. Depending on their position and role in the organizations, employees might be sensitive to different sources of disapproval. High-level executives will be more reactive to the disapprobation of the shareholders, while lower ranked workers will be more attuned to the criticism from their community. The measure of disapproval enables me to cover this variety of disapproval. In addition, if the organization was criticized (when the previously mentioned dummy is equal to 1), the respondents had to say if the criticism seemed justified, unjustified, or 'exaggerated but sometimes justified'. This reflects the level of perceived legitimacy of the disapproval. I coded three dummies corresponding to these three responses.

Table 1: Sample characteristics (N = 3,792) and descriptive statistics for the independent variables of disapproval of the organization and legitimacy of this disapproval

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
Age	40.85	10.40	18	81
Revenues	9.59	2.49	0	16
Job tenure	19.03	12.29	1	64
Gender	50.05% (Male)		French nationality	85.71%
Married	56.86%			

Job and firm characteristics:	
Occupation	Type of Contract

Unskilled worker	7.36%	Apprentice	0.55%
Skilled worker	16.82%	Intern	0.16%
Technician	7.62%	Temporary Worker	1.85%
Foreman or Salesman	12.13%	Fixed-Time Contract	8.99%
Executive or Engineer	17.25%	Open-Ended Part-Time Contract	76.56%
Employee	36.18%	Open-Ended Full-Time Contract	11.66%
None of the previously mentioned	2.64%	Student-Public Servant Contract	0.24%
Working conditions:		Firm:	
Unusual working hours	38.03%	Government	17.43%
Work on Sundays and Legal		Public Organization or Local	
Holidays	23.87%	Authority	10.68%
Work at Night	15.30%	Public Company	4.67%
Business Trips	15.80%	Private Company	67.22%
Interaction with external			
stakeholders	56.28%		

Control variables: I used a variety of controls. I first included basic demographics: sex, age, and a dummy variable corresponding to marital status. I also include control variables related to the job and the organization: annual revenues (split into 16 levels), job tenure in years, a dummy variable for type of contract (whether it is an open-ended contract, which is the most secured), seven dummies for occupation (unskilled worker, skilled worker, technician, foreman or salesman, executive or engineer, employee, none of these), four dummies for the type of organization (government, local authority or public organization (such as a hospital), public company, or private company), and five dummies for specific working conditions (unusual working hours, work on Sundays and legal holidays, work at night, business trips, and interaction with external stakeholders beyond colleagues). Considering that the primary use of this dataset was to investigate the potential issues faced by immigrants and individuals suffering from disabilities, and that those populations are slightly over-represented, I controlled for those characteristics by adding a dummy equal to 1 if the individual was born in France, a dummy equal to 1 if the individual was a descendant of immigrant parents, and a dummy equal to 1 if the individual suffered from a disability. In addition, to avoid multicollinearity issues, as the dummies for occupation and type of organization were mutually exclusive groups of variables, I did not

include in the analysis the local authority and public organization dummy or the unskilled worker dummy.

Multicollinearity and common method bias: Although I only found moderate levels of correlation between the variables (see Table 2), I checked for multicollinearity by calculating the variance inflation factors (VIF) and the condition indices. The mean VIF was 1.74; all VIF values were below the cutoff value of 5 and the condition number was below 30 (Hair et al., 1998). Thus, multicollinearity was not a concern.

The fact that a one-wave survey provides both dependent and independent variables may generate common method biases: the correlation between dependent and independent variables may be inflated (Podsakoff et al., 2003). As argued by Podsakoff and Organ (1986), self-reported measures of job characteristics and job satisfaction are likely to overlap with the variance of their actual values, which would prove their validity, but it may not tell us that the actual values are related to each other. Although measures were not self-reported (every respondent was interviewed on a personal basis by a questioner who came to his or her home), I formally assessed the impact of common method bias. I conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986): I entered the items of the independent and control variables into a factor analysis. It extracted 7 factors with eigenvalues superior to 1. The first factor accounted for 19.6% of the variance, while the following three accounted for a bit more than 10% of the variance. No single factor accounted for the majority of the variance. The results of this factor analysis suggest that common method bias is not a problem in the current study and is unlikely to confound the interpretation results. In addition, I used the marker variable technique to assess the presence of common method variance (Lindell and Whitney, 2001). Common method variance can be assessed based on the correlation between an exogenous perceptual variable (theoretically unrelated) and the research variables, to rule out the existence of an artificial correlation between the variables in the study. As a marker variable, I used the perception by the interviewee of the frequency of interaction with other family members. This ordinal variable has 5 levels from “once a week” to “never”. The analysis shows non-significant correlations with job satisfaction (-1.10% with the ordinal scale, 0.54% with the dichotomous measure) and with job dissatisfaction (1.70% with the ordinal scale, 2.88% with the dichotomous measure). According to the marker variable technique, these correlations can be used as an assessment of the artificial correlation generated by the common method bias, and then as a tool to adjust the correlations between the independent and dependent variables. Predictor-criterion correlations after adjustment can be checked to ensure

the absence of common method variance. The marker variable shows non-significant correlations with predictor variables (whether the organization is criticized and the three dummies for the perceived legitimacy). After adjusting for the common method variance – following Lindell and Whitney (2001) – all of the predictor-criterion correlations (the three dummies for the perceived legitimacy of the criticism on one side and job satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the other side) remained statistically significant. The marker-variable analysis confirms that common method variance is unlikely to bias the results.

Model: The main dependent variable (job satisfaction) as well as the alternative dependent variable (job dissatisfaction) take ordinal values respectively from 0 to 7. Their outcomes can be ranked in a meaningful sequential order, but the distance between them is unknown, which violates the assumptions needed to use a linear regression model (Long and Freese, 2006). If the dependent variable computed the accumulation of similar occurrences, I could take into consideration count models (poisson or negative binomial regression). However, the dependent variable reflects the addition of different elements indicating a degree of overall satisfaction. The dependent variable reflects a degree of satisfaction and the distances between two different levels are unknown and not necessarily similar. For such ordinal outcomes, ordered logit or probit regressions would be the most adapted (Long and Freese, 2006; Menard, 2001). However, the ordered logit model makes the assumption of ‘proportional odds’ (i.e. the fact that the coefficients are identical across all pairs of outcomes). For example, do I need a different set of coefficients for the independent variables when satisfaction goes from 0 to 1 compared to when it goes from 1 to 2 (in which case, the proportional odds assumption would be violated)? Following Long and Freese (2006), I test the proportional odds assumption by testing the hypotheses on a generalized ordered logit (Fu, 1999) and by conducting a Brant test to see if the coefficients for each variable are consistent across the different pairs of outcomes (Brant, 1990). The generalized ordered logit looks at the impact of independent variables separately for each pairs of outcomes. For the regression of job satisfaction, the Brant test is not significant for the coefficient of the “clearly justified criticism” and “clearly unjustified criticism” variables, suggesting that the coefficients of those variables are identical across all pairs of outcome groups. The Brant test is significant for the neutral level of legitimacy because the coefficient for this variable changes signs when the dependent variable goes from the 6th to the 7th degree. However, less than 3% of the respondents reach such a high level of job satisfaction. For the regression of job satisfaction, the Brant test is non-significant for the three variables reflecting the levels of legitimacy of

disapproval. With the exception of the variable reflecting a neutral level of legitimacy, the results of the Brant tests show that the coefficients of the independent variables of interest do not change across the different pairs of outcomes, and I can thus conclude that the ordered logit model is perfectly valid. Consequently, I used ordered logit regressions to test the hypotheses for both ordinal variables of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Finally, as robustness checks, negative binomial models and classic OLS regressions (Menard, 2001) were conducted and exhibit similar results to the ordered logit model. The two global items of satisfaction and dissatisfaction can be analyzed using a traditional logistic regression.

Results

The means, standard deviations, and correlations are shown in Table 2. The dependent variables exhibit a low level of correlation with the independent variables. The highest correlation between a dependent variable and an independent variable is between the two measures of job satisfaction and revenues, which are slightly related ($r = .12$ and $r = .14$, $p < 0.01$). Revenues are also slightly negatively correlated with the two measures of job dissatisfaction ($r = -0.04$ and $r = 0.07$ respectively, $p < 0.01$). Interestingly, revenues are also positively related to male gender ($r = .29$, $p < 0.01$). The correlations between the various dependent variables also deserve closer examination. The ordinal scale of job satisfaction is moderately related to the dichotomous measure of job satisfaction ($r = .18$, $p < 0.01$), and the pattern is similar for job dissatisfaction ($r = .24$, $p < 0.01$). The ordinal scales of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are, on the other hand, not related ($r = .03$, $p < 0.1$). Considering these moderate correlations, the fact that the results are similar when using the two different measures of job satisfaction (and, respectively, job dissatisfaction) carries even more weight.

The results of the ordered logistic regressions and the ordered log-odds regression coefficients are presented in Table 3 (models 1 to 4 look at job satisfaction as the dependent variable) and 5 (models 5 to 8 look at job dissatisfaction as the dependent variable). More specifically, models 3, 4, 7 and 8, look at the dichotomous dependent variables. First, I explore how the control variables affect the logarithmic odds of both the ordinal and dichotomous dependent variables job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The higher the revenues are, the higher the job satisfaction and the job dissatisfaction. In general, working in a private company is consistently related to lower job satisfaction and higher job dissatisfaction. There can be a number

of explanations for such a result. This can be explained by unobserved working conditions in private firms, but also by the climate of suspicion against private firms in France (Landier, 2006). More generally, there is country-level heterogeneity in the perception of the role of private firms (Roulet & Touboul, 2014)

Hypothesis 1b predicts that disapproval is positively related to job dissatisfaction. The positive and significant ($p < 0.001$) coefficients on the disapproval measure in the models using job dissatisfaction as the dependent variable supports this hypothesis. Hypothesis 1a is consistent with hypothesis 1b and predicts a negative relationship between disapproval and job satisfaction. On the contrary, the positive sign on the disapproval measure ($p < 0.001$) in models 1 and 2 suggests that disapproval has overall a positive effect on job satisfaction. How can this paradoxical result be explained? The only non-significant coefficient on disapproval comes in model 3, which uses a dichotomous job satisfaction dependent variable. However, when the variable is split up into the three dummies reflecting the perceived legitimacy of the disapproval, the three coefficients are significant but exhibit different signs. This element suggests that the coefficient for disapproval is not significantly different than 0 because the effect of disapproval depends on its level of perceived legitimacy.

Hypothesis 2a and 2b predict that the relationship between perceived disapproval of the organization and job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are weaker if the external disapproval is seen as illegitimate. Hypotheses 3a and 3b predict that the level of perceived legitimacy of the disapproval can invert the effects, respectively, on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In order to test these hypotheses, in models 2, 4, 6 and 8, the independent variable was split into three dummy variables corresponding to the perception of disapproval when it occurs. The three variables show a gradation in the legitimacy attributed by the respondent to the outsiders' criticism from a clearly justified to a clearly unjustified disapprobation. For the models looking at job satisfaction, the parameter estimate for a clearly justified criticism is negative and significant (at the $p < 0.1$ level when looking at the ordinal scale of job satisfaction, at the $p < 0.001$ level when looking at the dichotomous measure of job satisfaction). When disapproval is perceived as clearly legitimate, it does have an adverse impact on job satisfaction. For the 'exaggerated but justified' disapproval, the coefficient is positive and significant ($p < 0.001$) when looking at the ordinal scale of job satisfaction, but negative at the $p < 0.05$ level when looking at the dichotomous measure. Finally, the positive sign on the 'clearly unjustified' disapproval on both models (at the $p < 0.001$ level) provides strong support for hypothesis 3a: when employees perceive disapproval as unfair, it

actually has a positive impact on their job satisfaction. The level of legitimacy of the disapproval inverts the effect on job satisfaction. This result explains the positive relationship between disapproval and job satisfaction in models 1 and 3: only when respondents find that the criticism is legitimate does disapproval have a negative impact on job satisfaction.

In models 6 and 8, which look at job dissatisfaction, the coefficients for ‘clearly justified’ disapproval and ‘exaggerated but sometimes justified’ disapproval are all positive (with significance level ranging from $p < 0.001$ to $p < 0.01$). However, the magnitude of the coefficient clearly suggests that a ‘clearly justified’ criticism has the strongest positive relationship with job dissatisfaction. This result suggests that the more legitimate is the disapproval the stronger is the relationship with job dissatisfaction, which provides support for hypothesis 2b. The coefficient for the ‘clearly unjustified’ disapproval comes up positive and non-significant. However, when running the regression with one dummy for ‘clearly justified’ disapproval, and one dummy equals to 1 if the disapproval is ‘exaggerated but sometimes justified’ or ‘clearly unjustified’, the second dummy exhibits a coefficient of 0.249 with a p-value of 0.051. Hypothesis 3b is not supported. The perception of external disapproval is positively related with the identification of sources of satisfaction, but does not cancel out the sources of dissatisfaction: it simply attenuates dissatisfaction. One explanation could be that sources of satisfaction are more malleable and more easily influenced than sources of dissatisfaction. Sources of dissatisfaction are more likely to persist. This result is in line with Oshagbemi’s finding (Oshagbemi, 1999) regarding the underestimation of dissatisfaction when only looking at overall job satisfaction.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1
1	Job Dissatisfaction	-1.88	1.47	1											
2	Job Satisfaction	2.30	1.64	-0.03**	1										
3	Clearly justified criticism	0.11	0.31	-0.14***	-0.06***	1									
4	Exaggerated but Sometimes Justified	0.37	0.48	-0.06***	0.08***	-0.26***	1								
5	Clearly unjustified criticism	0.17	0.38	0.05***	0.06***	-0.16***	-0.34***	1							
6	Gender: Male	0.50	0.50	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.03**	1						
7	Age	40.85	10.40	0.21***	0.01	-0.05***	0.01	0.06***	0.02	1					
8	Revenues	9.59	2.49	0.03**	0.11***	0.03*	0.19***	0.02	0.29***	0.15***	1				
9	Job Tenure	19.03	12.29	0.15***	-0.03*	-0.02	0.04**	0.00	-0.03*	0.47***	0.08***	1			
10	Open-Ended Contract	0.88	0.32	-0.10***	0.09***	0.04**	0.06***	0.03**	0.02	0.08***	0.23***	0.06***	1		
11	Employed by the Government	0.17	0.38	0.04**	0.03**	0.00	0.19***	0.00	-0.05***	0.04**	0.16***	0.10***	0.12***	1	
12	Employed by a Public Company	0.05	0.21	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.04***	0.03*	0.01	0.04***	0.05***	0.02	0.07***	-0.09***	
13	Employed by a Private Company	0.67	0.47	-0.14***	-0.01	0.01	-0.19***	-0.02	0.09***	-0.15***	-0.06***	-0.13***	0.26***	-0.52***	-0.2
14	Married	0.57	0.50	0.11***	0.02	-0.03	0.02	0.04**	0.07***	0.34***	0.10***	0.17***	0.08***	0.01	0.
15	Skilled worker	0.17	0.37	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	-0.10***	0.02	0.31***	0.01	-0.08***	0.02	0.03*	-0.17***	-0.0
16	Technician	0.08	0.27	-0.06***	0.01	0.02	0.03*	0.00	0.16***	0.00	0.07***	0.00	0.05***	-0.10***	0.0
17	Foreman or Salesman	0.12	0.33	0.00	0.04**	0.02	0.11***	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.15***	0.04**	0.07***	0.17***	0.0
18	Executive or Engineer	0.17	0.38	0.09***	0.04***	0.03*	0.16***	-0.03*	0.11***	0.09***	0.49***	0.01	0.10***	0.21***	0.
19	Employee	0.36	0.48	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.02	-0.06***	0.02	-0.44***	-0.05***	-0.35***	-0.04**	-0.05***	-0.04**	0.
20	Other Occupation	0.03	0.16	0.02	-0.06***	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.03**	-0.02	-0.14***	-0.01	-0.0
21	Unusual working hours	0.38	0.49	-0.06***	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.11***	-0.02	0.01	-0.05***	-0.09***	-0.02	-0
22	Work on Sundays and Legal Holidays	0.24	0.43	-0.04***	0.02	0.03*	0.03**	0.03**	0.08***	-0.04**	0.02	-0.05***	-0.16***	-0.02	-0.0
23	Work at Night	0.15	0.36	-0.05***	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.18***	-0.04***	0.07***	-0.04**	-0.07***	0.00	-0
24	Business Trips	0.16	0.36	-0.01	0.07***	-0.01	0.08***	0.03	0.22***	0.01	0.29***	-0.05***	0.04**	0.02	0.0
25	Interaction with External Stakeholders	0.56	0.50	-0.03**	0.11***	0.05***	0.13***	0.00	-0.04**	-0.04**	0.13***	-0.06***	0.00	0.09***	-0.
26	French Nationality	0.86	0.35	-0.05***	0.03*	0.02	0.11***	0.02	-0.01	-0.06***	0.07***	-0.03*	0.01	0.07***	0.0

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	:
1																				
2																				
3																				
4																				
5																				
6																				
7																				
8																				
9																				
10																				
11																				
12	1																			
13	0.18***	1																		
14	0.12***	0.04*	1																	
15	0.03*	0.03†	-0.10	1																
16	-0.11***	0.01	-0.66***	-0.32***	1															
17	0.16***	0.18***	0.03	0.02	-0.01	1														
18	0.02	0.03**	-0.18***	-0.05***	0.24***	0.04*	1													
19	0.00	0.05**	-0.10***	0.05**	0.10***	-0.01	-0.13***	1												
20	0.04*	0.07***	0.17***	0.04*	-0.17***	0.04	-0.17***	-0.11***	1											
21	0.01	0.10***	0.21***	0.00	-0.12***	0.06**	-0.21***	-0.13***	-0.17***	1										
22	-0.04*	-0.06**	-0.04†	0.01	-0.08***	-0.07***	-0.34***	-0.22***	-0.28***	-0.34***	1									
23	-0.02	-0.15***	0.01	-0.03	-0.04**	-0.02	-0.07***	-0.05***	-0.06***	-0.08***	-0.12***	1								
24	-0.06**	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.08***	-0.03*	0.00	-0.02	-0.06**	0.05**	1							
25	-0.08***	0.00	0.02	-0.03†	-0.07**	-0.04**	-0.04**	0.00	0.03*	0.00	0.01	0.06***	0.37***	1						
26	-0.05**	-0.01	0.02	0.00	-0.03*	-0.02	0.07***	0.05**	0.03†	-0.05**	-0.09***	0.05**	0.34***	0.54***	1					
27	-0.06***	0.05**	0.02	0.04**	0.01	0.01	-0.06***	0.06***	0.03*	0.29***	-0.02***	0.02	0.11***	0.18***	0.20***	1				
28	-0.05**	0.04**	0.11***	-0.02	-0.12***	-0.03†	-0.20***	-0.02	0.07***	0.16***	0.09***	0.03**	-0.03†	0.17***	0.04*	0.20***	1			
29	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.01	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.03*	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.03†	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0	0.01	-0.02	1		
30	0.06***	0.01	-0.07***	-0.03	0.09***	0.13***	0.04*	-0.03†	-0.06**	-0.03*	0.04**	-0.03†	-0.03†	-0.05**	-0.02	-0.04*	-0.09***	-0.03*	1	
31	-0.08***	0.00	0.03*	0.01	-0.05**	-0.14***	-0.02	0.03	0.03†	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04*	0.01	0.02	0.09***	0.01	-0.57***	

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, † p<0.1

Table 3: Results of Ordered-Logit (Ordinal Scale of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction) and Logit Regressions (Global Dichotomous Measure of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE VARIABLES	Job Satisfaction (Ordinal variable)		Job Satisfaction (Global dichotomous variable)		Job Dissatisfaction (Ordinal variable)		Job Dissatisfaction (Global dichotomous variable)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Disapproval	0.23*** (0.07)		-0.07 (0.08)		0.52*** (0.07)		0.48*** (0.12)	
Clearly Justified Criticism		-0.19 † (0.1)		-0.68*** (0.12)		0.99*** (0.10)		1.22*** (0.16)
Exaggerated but sometimes justified		0.31*** (0.07)		-0.19* (0.09)		0.57*** (0.08)		0.46** (0.14)
Clearly Unjustified Criticism		0.34*** (0.09)		0.49*** (0.10)		0.15 (0.09)		-0.20 (0.18)
Gender: Male	-0.13 † (0.07)	-0.16 † (0.07)	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.07)	0.00 (0.07)	0.14 (0.13)	0.18 (0.13)
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)
Revenues	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.07** (0.02)	-0.08** (0.03)
Job Tenure	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01* (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Open-ended contract	0.10	0.12	-0.16	-0.15	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.14

	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.18)	(0.18)
Employed by the government	-0.22 †	-0.23**	0.29*	0.30*	-0.10	-0.10	0.02	0.03
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Employed by a public firm	-0.13	-0.14	-0.08	-0.10	0.18	0.19	-0.03	-0.02
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Employed by a private firm	-0.27**	-0.26**	-0.24*	-0.24*	0.21*	0.21 †	0.35 †	0.34 †
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Married	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.04	-0.15*	-0.15*	-0.18	-0.16
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Skilled worker	0.46**	0.46***	0.43**	0.44**	-0.10	-0.11	-0.47*	-0.48*
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.21)
Technician	0.30 †	0.30*	0.61***	0.66***	0.05	0.01	-0.50 †	-0.55*
	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Foreman or Salesman	0.21	0.21	0.81***	0.86***	-0.25	-0.27 †	-0.55*	-0.57*
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Executive or Engineer	0.09	0.09	0.95***	1.04***	-0.63***	-0.68***	-0.54*	-0.59*
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Employee	0.15	0.15	0.50***	0.50***	-0.15	-0.15	-0.36 †	-0.34 †
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Other occupation	-0.67**	-0.68**	0.66**	0.71**	-0.52*	-0.54*	-0.19	-0.22
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.35)	(0.35)
Unusual working hours	-0.09	-0.08	-0.19*	-0.20**	0.21***	0.22***	0.22 †	0.23*
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Work on Sundays and Legal	-0.00	0.00	0.07	0.06	0.17*	0.17*	0.06	0.06
Holidays	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.15)	(0.15)

Work at Night	0.14 (0.10)	0.13 (0.10)	-0.22 † (0.12)	-0.20 † (0.12)	-0.01 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.11)	-0.07 (0.18)	-0.08 (0.18)
Business Trips	0.12 (0.09)	0.10 (0.09)	0.19 † (0.10)	0.16 (0.11)	0.02 (0.09)	0.06 (0.09)	-0.19 (0.17)	-0.14 (0.18)
Interaction with external stakeholders	0.29*** (0.06)	0.30*** (0.06)	0.034 (0.07)	0.06 (0.07)	0.15* (0.06)	0.13* (0.06)	-0.08 (0.11)	-0.10 (0.12)
Disabled	0.07 (0.21)	0.07 (0.21)	-0.06 (0.23)	-0.09 (0.23)	-0.06 (0.24)	-0.06 (0.24)	0.28 (0.31)	0.29 (0.31)
Descendants of Immigrant Parents	0.17 (0.11)	0.15 (0.11)	-0.01 (0.12)	-0.04 (0.12)	0.02 (0.10)	0.04 (0.10)	-0.02 (0.19)	0.01 (0.19)
Born in France	0.35*** (0.10)	0.33*** (0.10)	0.08 (0.11)	0.05 (0.11)	0.17 † (0.10)	0.19 † (0.10)	-0.16 (0.18)	-0.12 (0.18)
Cut points 1	7	7	1	1	7	7	1	1
Log Pseudolikelihood	-6,602.66	-6,589.19	-2,514.99	-2,473.04	-6,275.73	-6,247.04	-1,296.029	-1,267.77
Wald test (prob > χ^2)	172.07***	198.89***	193.76***	265.82***	312.65***	376.38***	58.50***	111.15***
Pseudo R2	0.013	0.015	0.040	0.056	0.025	0.030	0.023	0.044
Observations	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792	3,792

Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, † p<0.1

I find that the more illegitimate is the disapproval, the weaker is its positive effect on job dissatisfaction, although as discussed previously, the dummy for illegitimate disapproval does not come up significant. The legitimacy of disapproval even reverses the relationship when solely looking at the elements reflecting job satisfaction. When using the ordinal dependent variable of job satisfaction, the threshold is between legitimate disapproval ('clearly justified') and moderately legitimate disapproval ('exaggerated but sometimes justified'). When using the global dichotomous variable of job satisfaction, the threshold is between moderately legitimate disapproval ('exaggerated but sometimes justified') and illegitimate disapproval ('clearly unjustified'). As previously mentioned, the results are also consistent across models: the negative binomial models and OLS regressions used as robustness checks (Menard, 2001) exhibit similar results to the ordered logit models.ⁱⁱ

Discussion

The link between employees' perception of disapproval and lower job satisfaction is quite intuitive. When using job dissatisfaction as the dependent variable, I indeed observe that these employees are more dissatisfied. Employees' level of dissatisfaction is however a function of how legitimate this disapproval is, from their point of view. In other terms, the results show that if employees feel that their organization is being unfairly attacked, they are less affected by disapproval. There are two main explanations for this result. A first interpretation is that employees disdain the negative external perspectives in order to preserve their self-worth. A second explanation is related to the effect of the disapproval on workers. When an individual perceives a threat to his or her social approval, due to an external judgment of the organization he or she is affiliated to, the credit given to this external criticism has a moderating effect. If the disapproval is perceived as legitimate, the threat is stronger, and the employees have good reasons to distance themselves from their organization to preserve their self-worth. This distance will adversely affect the satisfaction derived from the various elements of the job context. I found a similar gradual effect when looking at job dissatisfaction. Interestingly, I however find that disapproval of the organization has overall a positive effect on job satisfaction. This is explained by the strong positive effect of illegitimate disapproval on job satisfaction. Beyond buffering mechanisms, the results suggest that the perception of the external judgment can invert the effects of disapproval. Insiders not only disdain outsiders' perspectives, they also 'bunker' themselves in order to preserve their

self-esteem. Opposing the rest of the world as a member of an organization makes employees believe that they possess the only truth, and because individuals are driven by self-esteem, being in the right as in-group members reinforces their pride and thus their job satisfaction. In other terms, the perception of corporate image is less important than the alignment, or the fit between the employee and the organization. The results of this study suggest the emergence of social identity mechanisms when employees have to face together an unfair criticism. Employees undergo a greater social cohesion when facing this external threat, and as a consequence, experience greater job satisfaction. Future research could look more closely at the materialization of this bonding process as a consequence of an external attack. In addition, the differences in the results when looking at job dissatisfaction as the dependent variable suggests that the sources of dissatisfaction are less likely to be cancelled out, while sources of satisfaction can be more easily affected by elements that are peripheral to the work context. As I discuss more extensively below, this study contributes to the literature on negative social evaluation and its consequences at the micro-level.

Limitations, constraints and methodological suggestions for future research

One of the constraints that I experienced in this study was the use of an already collected dataset: gathering primary data would have enabled us to refine the items and to test more specific mechanisms. In particular, I had to compute the dependent variables on the basis of single-item dichotomous measures of the dimensions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In addition, the main independent variables were built on a single item. The primary objective of the government dataset I used was unrelated with the research question I was trying to tackle in this study. Designing and conducting the survey would have enabled us to have a much more fine-grained measure of disapproval. In particular, my interpretation of the result suggests that the source of disapproval affects the magnitude of the effect: if disapproval comes from a source considered as highly reliable or appreciated by the employees, it is likely to be legitimate. Audiences definitely matter and taking into account their diversity would be interesting extension to this study. On the other hand, only an immense research budget would have allowed us to hire interviewers to collect the data for a balanced dataset of the same size.

Finally, another limitation of the data is the suspicion regarding a potential selection bias. Selection biases regarding the way workers match themselves with their employer could affect the results. Some workers may have decided to join a firm because they know their well

being won't be affected by a negative perception of the organization they work for. If an individual does not care about the external perception of the organization he or she works for, it is unlikely to affect his or her decision to join this organization in the first place. The absence of better employment options might also trigger a decision to stay in a disapproved firm and generate a form of commitment that buffers or discounts disapproval. The second point is partly taken care of by controlling for tenure. Designing the survey could have helped us improve the way I control for those two sources of selection bias by adding items related to the turnover intention and the conditions in which the individuals joined the organization. This would have required a second wave of survey, to limit the presence of common method bias between those controlling variables and the variables of interest, considering they deal with related matters. In addition, measuring disapproval in a richer way would also be of some help. However, the large sample size and the fact that despite slight over-representations, the sampling plan adequately reflects the French population, limit the likelihood of selection biases. The conditions that would create such selection biases are probably too marginal among professionally active individuals in France to significantly affect the results.

Contribution and research agenda

The existing literature on the relationship between corporate image and employee level outcomes has mostly focused on a unidimensional construct as the independent variable. Building on the research that has linked positive organizational image with beneficial consequences at the employee level (Riordan, et al. 1997; Cable and Turban, 2003; Herrbach, et al. 2007; Hausknecht, et al. 2008; Holtbrügge, et al. 2010; Helm, 2012; Dögl and Holtbrügge, 2013;), the study confirms that a negative image can inversely have an adverse effect on job satisfaction. However, the focus on the outcomes of a negative perception of the organization enables us to enrich this perspective with less intuitive conclusions. It is not the nature of the outsider views that matters, but more the perception of these views by employees. The concern is thus whether outsider judgments are legitimate, valid or simply relevant from the employees' perspective. This takes Helm's focus on "perceived" external reputation (Helm, 2012) one step further: I suggest that to analyze the internal effect of an organizational level and perceptual construct, measuring the internal appreciation of this external perception is required. The results may hold for other dependent variables of interest for human resource managers: turnover intention and attractiveness as an employer are also a

matter of perspective. While organizational prestige and image are related to employee retention (Herrbach, Mignonac and Gatignon, 2007; Hausknecht, et al. 2008) and attractiveness for applicants (Turban and Greening, 1997; Cable and Turban, 2003; Holtbrügge, et al. 2010), I argue that the source of this external assessment and its importance and relevance from the employee's point of view determines the magnitude of the effect. As initially pointed out by Coupland and Brown (2004), taking in account a diversity of opinions including insiders' perception of outsiders' points of view, is crucial when looking at organizational identity.

I also showed the necessity of treating positive and negative organizational image, as different constructs. Future research may find that the magnitude of the effect of a positive judgment of the organization depends on the employees' perception of this judgment. However, this perception would not invert the relationship (i.e. when the organization is positively seen by outsiders, but that these outsiders are not credited by employees, the judgment will not have adverse employee level consequences). This argument is already preeminent in macro-organizational research (see Vergne, 2012; Devers et al., 2009; Hudson, 2008), but it needs to be further taken into account when looking at the micro-organizational outcomes. This research suggests that these positive and negative dimensions do not necessarily have opposite effects. They can have a similar impact under certain conditions, depending on employees' perception.

The next step would be to test the mediating and moderating effects on smaller samples. Similar to previous studies (Helm, 2012; Riordan et al., 1997), the theoretical framework suggests that organizational identification – the degree to which the organization is integrated into one's self-concept (Dutton et al., 1994) – mediates the relationship between organizational image (in both its negative and positive dimensions) and job satisfaction. The more an individual's self-esteem is enhanced by his or her affiliation, the stronger is the identification itself (Dutton et al., 1994; Fuller et al. 2006). Previous research suggested that individuals tend to identify more with organizations that are held in high regard (Mael and Ashforth, 1992). The results raise some concerns regarding these findings. The results suggest that organizations that are *not* held in high regard can actually achieve stronger organizational identification, on the condition that insiders challenge outsiders' perception.

REFERENCES

- Ardilly, P. (2003). Weighting method used in the French “Construction des Identités” survey. *Proceedings of Statistics Canada Symposium 2003: Challenges in Survey Taking for the Next Decade*.
- Ashforth, B. E. and Kreiner, G. E. (1999). “How can you do it?”: Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 413-434.
- Ashforth, B. E. and Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory of the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Benabou, R. and Tirole, J. (2010), ‘Individual and corporate social responsibility’. *Economica*, 77, 1-19.
- Brant, R. (1990). Assessing proportionality in the proportional odds model for ordinal logistic regression. *Biometrics*, 1171-1178.
- Bruck, C. S., Allen, T. D. and Spector, P. E. (2002). The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: a finer-grained analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 336–353.
- Cable, D. and Turban, D. B. (2003). The value of organizational reputation in the recruitment context: a brand-equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 2244–2266.
- Clemente, M., & Roulet, T. (2015). Public Opinion as a Source of Deinstitutionalization: A “Spiral of Silence” Approach. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Coupland, C. and Brown, A. D. (2004). Constructing organizational identities on the web: A case study of Royal Dutch/Shell, *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(8), 1325-1347.
- Deephouse, D. L., and Carter, S. M. (2005). An Examination of Differences Between Organizational Legitimacy and Organizational Reputation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 329-360.
- Deephouse, D. and Suchman, M. (2008). Legitimacy in Organizational Institutionalism. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 49-77. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Devers, C. E., Dewett, T., Mishina, Y. and Belsito, C. A. (2009). A general theory of organizational stigma’. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 154-171.
- Dögl, C., & Holtbrügge, D. (2014). Corporate environmental responsibility, employer reputation and employee commitment: an empirical study in developed and emerging economies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(12), 1739-1762.
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. and Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239–263.
- Elsbach, K. D. and Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members’ responses to organizational identity threats: encountering and countering the business week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 442–476.
- Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, 26(4), 596-607.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1990). *Group dynamics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

- Fu, V. K. (1999). Estimating generalized ordered logit models. *Stata Technical Bulletin*, 8(44).
- Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., Relyea, C., & Beu, D. (2006). Perceived external prestige and internal respect: New insights into the organizational identification process. *Human Relations*, 59(6), 815-846.
- Glynn, M. A., and Marquis, C. (2004). When good names go bad: organizational illegitimacy and the dot-com collapse. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 22, 147-170.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. and Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Hausknecht, J. P., Rodda, J. and Howard, M. J. (2009). Targeted employee retention: Performance-based and job-related differences in reported reasons for staying. *Human Resource Management*, 48(2), 269-288.
- Helm, S. (2012). A matter of reputation and pride: associations between perceived external reputation, pride in membership, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *British Journal of Management*.
- Herrbach, O., Mignonac, K., & Gatignon, A. L. (2004). Exploring the role of perceived external prestige in managers' turnover intentions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(8), 1390-1407.
- Histoire de vie. (2003), INSEE, Centre Maurice Halbwachs (CMH), France.
- Holtbrügge, D., Friedmann, C. and Puck, J. F. (2010), Recruitment and retention in foreign firms in India: a resource-based view. *Human Resource Management*, 49(3), pp. 439-455
- Hudson, B. A. (2008). Against all odds: a consideration of core-stigmatized organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 252-266.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. J., Schriesheim, C. A., and Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 14-32.
- Kjærgaard, A., Morsing, M. and Ravasi, D. (2011). Mediating identity: a study of media influence on organizational identity construction in a celebrity firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(3), 514-543.
- Klassen, R. M., and Anderson, C. J. (2009). How times change: secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(5), 745-759.
- Kreiner, G. E., Ashforth, B. E., and Sluss, D. M. (2006). Identity dynamics in occupational dirty work: integrating social identity and system justification perspective. *Organization Science*, 17(5), 619-636.
- Kuruppu, S., and Milne, M. J. (2010). Dolphin deaths, organizational legitimacy and potential employees' reactions to assured environmental disclosures. *Accounting Forum*, 34 (1), 1-19.

- Landier, H. (2005). *Divorce à la Française, Comment les Français Jugent les Entreprises*. Dunod, Paris.
- Lindell, M. K., and Whitney, D. J. (2001). 'Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1) 114-121.
- Long, J. S., and Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata*. College Station, Tex.: StataCorp LP.
- Mael, F., and 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.
- Malinowska-Tabaka, E. (1987). Complex measures of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction among professionals. *Social Indicators Research*, 19 (4), 451-473.
- Menard, S. (2001). *Applied logistic regression analysis (No. 106)*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
- 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(3), 477-493.
- Nagy, M. S. (2002). Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction. *Journal Of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(1), 77-86.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Overall job satisfaction: how good are single versus multiple-item measures?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(5), 388-403.
- Podsakoff, P. M. and Organ D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J-Y., Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-890.
- Preston, A. E. (1989). The nonprofit worker in a for-profit world. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 7(4), 438-463.
- Quarstein, V. A., McAfee, R. B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 45(8), 859-873.
- Rege, M. and Telle, K. (2004). The impact of social approval and framing on cooperation in public good situations. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(7-8), 1625-1644.
- Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D. and Bill J. B. (1997). Corporate image: employee reactions and implications for managing corporate social performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 401-412.
- Saari, L. M., and Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395-407.
- Roulet, T. J., & Touboul, S. (2014). The intentions with which the road is paved: Attitudes to liberalism as determinants of greenwashing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-16.

- Roulet, T. (2014). "What Good is Wall Street?" Institutional Contradiction and the Diffusion of the Stigma over the Finance Industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Roulet, T. (2015). Qu'il est bon d'être méchant! Paradoxe de l'illégitimité organisationnelle dans le contexte des banques d'investissement.
- Shamir, B. (1991). Meaning, self and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 12, 405-424.
- Scarpello, V., and Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: are all the parts there?. *Personnel psychology*, 36(3), 577-600.
- Shenkar, O. & Yuchtman-Yaar, E. (1997) Reputation, image, prestige, and goodwill: An interdisciplinary approach to organizational standing. *Human Relations*, 50, 1361–81.
- Spector, P. E. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., and Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. G., Smith, P. C. (2002). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The abridged Job Descriptive Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol 62(1), Feb 2002, 173-191
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole .
- Turban, D. and Greening, D. (1997). Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 658-672.
- Turban, D. B. (2001). Organizational attractiveness as an employer on college campuses: An examination of the applicant population. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 293-312.
- Vergne, J-P. (2012). 'Stigmatized categories and public disapproval of organizations: a mixed methods study of the global arms industry (1996-2007)'. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., and Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures?. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247.
- Wayne, J. H., and Casper, W. J. (2012). Why does firm reputation in human resource policies influence college students? The mechanisms underlying job pursuit intentions. *Human Resource Management*, 51(1), 121-142.
- Zelenski, J., Murphy, S. A. and Jenkins, D. A. (2008). The happy-productive worker thesis revisited. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(4), 521-537.
- Zhou, J., and George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management journal*, 44(4), 682-696.
- Zimmerman, M. and Zeitz, G. J. (2002). Beyond survival: achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 414-413.

ⁱ There are 4% of disabled people under 60 in France and 2.3% in the sample (because they are rarely professionally active), 11% of people are descendants of immigrant parents in France and 14.8 % in the sample, and finally 9% are immigrants in France and 18.3% in the sample.

ⁱⁱ Both the negative binomial and the OLS regression yields coefficients exhibiting the same signs and significance levels as the ordered logit models, except for the “Clearly justified criticism” dummy in the model looking at job satisfaction. This variable is more significant in the negative binomial and OLS models. Regarding the strength of the coefficients, they reveal a similar hierarchy: when looking at job satisfaction as the dependent variable, the more justified is the criticism, the less positive is the coefficient, and when looking at job dissatisfaction, the more justified is the criticism the more positive is the coefficient.