

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF PUBLIC SERVICES MOTIVATION

EXPLORING THE LITERATURE

Hector Edwards

ABSTRACT

The concept Public Service Motivation (PSM) which was posited by Perry and Wise (1990) has been gaining the attention of researchers over the last three decades. Perry (1996) also provided a construct to measure the various dimensions in PSM, which are widely used to varying degrees by researchers to study PSM over the years. A critical review of the literature indicated that various tests were done using more advanced analytical tools over time, as well as a wide cross section of individuals in the empirical studies to test the measurement scale. The various tests all supported the PSM model, though some of the studies were done in different countries. However, there is a consensus that further testing is required to enhance the scale, not only in terms of dimensions, but also in terms of the number of items that are desirable for various studies, if a specific scale cannot be developed. PSM does not replace other types of motivation, but assist public administrators in understanding the behavior of public employees.

Key Words: Public Service, Motivation Measurement

INTRODUCTION

The desire of various stakeholders for a better service by public servants in the USA during the 1960s and 1970s (Rainey *et al.*, 1976; Frederickson and Hart, 1985; Perry and Wise, 1990; Delfgaauw and Dur, 2008) was similar in other countries including Guyana, where an economic downturn was making it difficult to sustain the level of funding by Government. This desire was great since during the same period, private sector entities were perceived as being more effective (Perry and Porter, 1982). It was posited by some academics that the public sector should adopt the methods used by the private sector to improve its performance (Crewson, 1997). Various techniques such as pay-for-performance (Ingraham, 1993; Houston, 2000) were suggested and adopted as a way forward for the public sector. However, there were mixed views in relation to the applicability of these techniques (Ingraham, 1993; Houston, 2000; Camilleri, 2006, 2007), as some were of the opinion that the mission (Crewson, 1997) and objectives of the two sectors are fundamentally different (Golembiewski, 1996; Wright, 2001), and as such would not achieve the same results. It was then recognized that the difference in reward motivations must be considered when addressing the performance of Public servants.

Motivation which relates to the direction, level and persistence of effort (Wright, 2001; Steers *et al.*, 2004) is a very important issue when addressing the attitude and behavior of public sector employees. Some researchers have also posited there is a difference in motive between public and private sector employees (Houston, 2000), and unless these motives are understood and the appropriate action taken, performance would be affected (Crewson, 1997). The motives seen as important to public service employees were later defined as public service motivation. This was defined by Perry and Wise (1990) as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (p.386). This concept though it originated in the USA has been adopted by other scholars to describe the attitude of public servants in other countries (Taylor, 2007: Australia; Kim, 2005, 2008: South Korea; Castaing, 2006: France; Vandenaabeele, 2007, 2008a, 2008b: Belgium; Camilleri, 2006, 2007: Malta).

The present paper seeks to critically review the development of a public service motivation (PSM) concept that was posited by Perry and Wise (1990), and a subsequent construct to measure (PSM) by Perry (1996). The construct's validation and acceptance by various researchers over the decades have been in developed economies. The review of previous studies on Public service employees' motives and Public Service Motivation is undertaken to provide a better understanding of the concept so that future studies can be done in a less developed or developing economy.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PSM – A CRITICAL REVIEW

The need for enhanced performance in the Public Service has influenced researchers to study the factors that contribute to employees' behavior. In addition to an individual's ability, experience, and resources available, motivation is also considered an important variable that is related to performance in the workplace. Determining the motives that will influence the behavior of Public Servants is therefore critical in the study of employees' motivation in the Public Service.

Work Motivation

Work motivation is seen as the force that directs an individual's behavior (Perry and Porter, 1982; Wright, 2001; Steers et al., 2004), as well as the persistence and intensity of their actions (Wright, 2001; Steers et al., 2004), so as to satisfy specific needs. Motivation theories can be grouped into two broad categories, content and process (Carmilleri, 2007), with content addressing the needs aspect, while process the persistence and direction of effort. Motives emanating as a result of psychological deficiencies or needs are related to content theories of motivation (Carmilleri, 2007). These needs can be classified as intrinsic - those controlled and generated by the individual internally, and extrinsic - those controlled or provided by others (Crewson, 1997; Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999; Houston, 2000; Bright, 2009). Some academics are of the opinion that public employees are

motivated more by intrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997; Buelens and Van den Broeck, 2007), while others have indicated that public sector employees have a greater desire for some extrinsic rewards (Maidani,1991), depending on the level of employment within their organizations (Gabris and Simo,1995; Bright, 2005). Others are of the opinion that the difference is more specific to certain rewards (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007).

While Crewson (1997) indicated that employees from the two sectors have different motivation and expectations, Wright (2007) found that the work motivation of public sector employees was similar to private sector employees. However, it should be noted that though the motivation may be similar, the motives for such motivation may differ. Some researchers have posited that these differences seem to coincide with the sector, as it was found that public sector employees placed a higher value on public service, but lower value on monetary reward than private sector employees (Wright, 2001). Others are of the opinion that there is no significant difference between the needs of private sector as against public sector workers (Gabris and Simo, 1995). Some of the academics that are of the opinion that there is a difference in motive between public and private sector employees, are also of the opinion that identification of the difference is important if performance is to be maximised (Wright, 2001) in the public sector. Positive behaviour should only be expected if there is congruence between incentives and individuals' motives. Further, providing rewards (viz. extrinsic), that are not consistent with a given motive may reduce the expected effect of future related rewards (viz. intrinsic), on performance (Crewson, 1997). Rewards that are intrinsic in nature are important to public service employees, since it is felt that these rewards compensate for low levels of extrinsic rewards (Wright, 2007).

These extrinsic rewards are examined below:

Job Security

An extrinsic reward that has been widely debated in terms of its importance to both public service and private sector employees is Job security. Houston (2000) found job security to be valued more by public sector employees, which was contrary to Rainey (1982), who found no difference between the

two sectors (Lewis and Frank, 2002). However, the higher value placed on job security by some public service employees may be responsible for their employment in the sector, so as to enjoy greater security (Baldwin, 1987). Public employees are protected through the grievance procedures which are time consuming and complex (Baldwin, 1987). The difficulty to punish public service employees provide them with greater protection from dismissal (Lewis and Frank, 2002). The job security received by public servants resulting in more stable careers compensates for the lower income in comparison to private sector pay (Lewis and Frank, 2002), since the lower the risk, the lower will be the expected return. This is consistent with Bellante and Link (1981) who “found that the public sector attracts more ‘risk averse’ employees than the private sector” (Baldwin, 1987; 185). This further reinforces the preference of some public service employees as it relates to rewards, and also noted by Perry and Wise (1990), that public servants with high PSM are likely to pursue the public interest out of self-interest (Bright, 2009), but in a much wider context in terms of their safety. Though job security is not the only factor that influences the selection of jobs by individuals, which will be addressed later in this paper, it is an important variable that can also assist in understanding the attitude of some public service employees. Their attitude can impact the level of their public service motivation, and ultimately their performance.

Monetary Reward

Another extrinsic reward that has also been discussed in terms of its importance in the public service is monetary reward. Wright (2007) posited that public sector employees place a lower value on financial rewards than their counterparts in the private sector. Some academics however found the difference in relation to some variables was not substantial (Baldwin 1987), or as was earlier stated, no significant difference existed (Gabris and Simo, 1995). However, the various studies have lacked consistency in findings, as it relates to the difference in the desire for monetary rewards between employees from the two sectors (Wright, 2001). Crewson (1997) found no significant difference between the sectors in terms of their preference for monetary reward, while Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) found that public service employees were significantly less motivated by monetary reward. They also found that older employees are less motivated by

monetary reward in terms of salary. Houston (2000) found that private employees placed more importance on higher pay than their public sector counterpart, which was similar to Lawler (1971 cited in Rainey *et al.*, 1976:241). On the other hand Maidani (1991), while looking at hygiene and motivator factors among public and private sector workers, found that public employees valued salaries significantly more than private employees. However, though they may value salaries more, it does not imply that they are motivated by monetary reward. They may have given greater value due to lower extrinsic rewards in the public sector (Wright, 2007). The needs or preferences of the employees are important as they can assist in providing appropriate incentives to the various sectors. The use of incentives that are not consistent with their needs can be counter-productive to the future behavior of employees (Crewson, 1997). Some researchers have argued that the use of monetary reward is more effective in the private sector than the public sector, due to greater importance being placed on such reward by private sector employees (Houston, 2000). Employees in the public sector were not only less motivated by monetary reward, but placed greater value on intrinsic rewards (Houston, 2000).

The greater value placed on intrinsic rewards including to serve the public interest by public sector employees (Wright, 2007) has played a significant role in determining the type of incentives to be provided, so that effectiveness can be improved in these organizations. Due to the difference between the sectors identified in earlier studies, further studies of the motives of public servants have become a necessity for both academics and human resource practitioners. The motive to serve the public interest is a normative one that has formed a part of the concept “public service motivation” (PSM). The realization that public service employees have different desires and motives also reinforces the need for a better understanding of the factors that will influence their behavior, which can ultimately enhance decision making in this sector.

PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION (PSM)

Theoretical Groundings of PSM

Public Servants play an integral role in the realization of governments' goals, and the execution of the various functions. Some researchers in their quest to determine whether public service employees were motivated by different motives had undertaken various studies over the years (Rainey *et al.*, 1976, Perry and Porter 1982, Balwin 1987, Perry and Rainey 1988, Maidoni 1991, Gabris and Simo 1995, Crewson 1997), with a more recent contribution to this area being that of Buelens and Van Den Broeck (2007). While it has been accepted by some that there is a difference in reward motivations, Rainey *et al.* (1976), Crewson (1997), Houston, (2000), Balwin (1987) and Gabris and Simo (1995) were less satisfied that differences did exist, as they either saw little evidence, or it was not substantial enough. However, the importance as to whether they have different motives cannot be over emphasized, since if there is a difference, the incentives would have to be dissimilar from those that are traditionally associated with work motivation in the private sector. The theoretical grounding of work motivation is still applicable to public service employees, though their motives may vary to some degree from private sector employees. As Camilleri (2007) posited, public service motivation has its domain within content theories.

Though most of the emphasis has been on content theories, Perry (2000) recognized the need to include social and institutional variables to the motivation equation so as to strengthen the theory of motivation. A process theory of PSM was presented, which is based on reciprocal causal relationships taking into consideration environmental influences, cognitive and other personal factors and behavior (Perry, 2000; Camilleri, 2006). The dimensions identified were socio-historical context, motivational context, individual characteristics, and behavior (Perry, 2000). The influence of parents and mentors on the development of sound public service attitudes and values (Pattakos, 2004) are seen as essential building blocks for the motivation model. The impact of these social groups- has also influenced individuals in their selection of work sector (Lewis and Frank, 2002; Pattakos, 2004). However, not much had been done by researchers in this

area besides Moynihan and Pandey (2007) partial testing of the proposed theory, using two of Perry's four dimensions of PSM – attraction to policy making (APM) and, commitment to public interest (CPI).

Motives and Dimensions in PSM

Due to the acceptance that there was a difference in reward motivations, as was earlier stated, Perry and Wise (1990) defined Public Service Motivation (PSM) as “an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organization” (p.368). More recently other researchers have built on Perry's definition (Brewer and Selden, 1998, Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999, and Vandenabeele et al., 2006). Public service motivation is not restricted to employees working in public institutions, but also some individuals in other sectors also exhibit similar motives (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999; Brewer *et al.*, 2000). As Moynihan and Pandey (2007) posited, private sector employees also exhibit PSM to varying degrees.

In looking at the motives of public servants, three types were highlighted by Perry and Wise (1990). The motives referred to by Perry and Wise (1990) were rational, norm-based and affective. This was not in keeping with rational choice theories that were associated with contemporary public administration thinking. Rational and public choice theories used to explain the behavior of public servants were seen as limited (Hondenghem and Vandenabeele, 2005; Vandenabeele *et al.*, 2006), since certain actions - compassion for other persons and self-sacrifice, by public employees were inconsistent with the general explanation offered by these theories. Fredrickson and Hart (1995) made reference to public servants displaying idealist traits as against careerist, with the resultant behavior being attributed to ‘patriotism of benevolence’. The behavior of such employees is based on an individual's feelings or emotions, which is associated with the affective motive. Another set of behaviors not explained by rational choice theories are pro-social or altruism (Perry, 2000), which include making a difference in society and social equity.

Altruism has been discussed by researchers in PSM as the motive of individuals to serve the public interest. Perry and Hondenghem (2008)

discussed the context of altruism in public service motivation, however Perry (1997) noted that the dimensions compassion (COM) and self-sacrifice (SS) which are central to PSM were aligned with altruism. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) indicated that through parental socialization individuals learn altruistic behaviour, which contributes to overall PSM. However, as Perry and Hondeghem (2008) indicated, rational self-interest may play a greater role in understanding public service motivation. Its role therefore should not be understated, even though it does not address all of the issues related to public service motivation. PSM therefore is a mix of the various motives (Brewer *et al.*, 2000) varying in levels and also in combination from person to person, which may also vary based on the prevailing circumstances within the society. These motives can be influenced from within the organization through its culture (Taylor, 2007), which is developed through ‘social processes that shape individuals’ normative beliefs and emotional understanding’ (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; 41), as well as outside the organization (Taylor, 2007), due to socio-historical factors before employment within the public service (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007).

Perry (1996) also provided a construct to measure the various dimensions in PSM, which serve as an attraction to public policy making (APM) – a rational motive, commitment to public interest (CPI) and civic duty – normative motives, compassion (COM) – an affective motive, and self-sacrifice (SS). These dimensions are widely used to varying degrees by researchers for the study of various aspects of PSM over the years (Alonso and Lewis, 2001; Kim, 2005 and 2008; DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, and Pandey, 2006; Vandenabeele *et al.*, 2006; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Coursey and Pandey, 2007; Bright, 2007, 2008 and 2009; and Taylor 2007). Perry’s dimensions were based on the work of earlier academics. Though it is felt that some aspects of behavior are learnt from various institutions (Perry, 2000; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007), others have been associated with individual utility maximization (Perry, 1996), and as such rational choice. The third of the motives are related to individuals’ emotional response to help others (Perry, 1996). A careful look at these motives highlights what is expected of public servants by the various stakeholders, including politicians. Though three of the dimensions are related to specific motives, Perry (1996) felt that the fourth dimension - self-sacrifice was

essential to PSM, since reference was frequently made of it in public administration literature (Perry, 1996). He persisted with self-sacrifice even after he found that it had a high correlation with commitment to the public interest. However, the four-dimensional model that included self-sacrifice had a better goodness-of-fit index (GFI) than the three-dimensional model based on differential chi square test (Perry, 1996; Coursey and Pandey, 2007).

Factors That Impact Public Sector Motivation

Perry (1997) posited that some factors such as parental socialization, political ideology, professional identification, individual demographics and religious socialization can influence the level of an individual's PSM. This was substantiated by his findings which indicated that there were positive relationships between PSM dimensions attraction to policy making and compassion, and the variables education level and age, while a negative relationship existed between commitment to public interest and income level (Perry, 1997). Other researchers also contributed to the understanding of the relationship between antecedents and PSM. Bright (2005) found a significant positive relationship between PSM and the variables education level, management level and gender (female), with management level being the strongest predictor of PSM. The finding in terms of women and high PSM was also supported by Naff and Crum (1999) and Camilleri (2006, 2007) who found women had higher PSM than men. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) also found higher educational level to be positively related to PSM, while tenure was negatively associated with PSM. Naff and Crum (1999) however found that age and tenure had not accounted for any significant difference in PSM scores in the organization, which differed from Moynihan and Pandey's (2007) finding where there was a negative relationship between tenure and PSM.

In addition to the levels of PSM, the variations in dimensional levels can also be influenced by antecedents including parental socialization and religious socialization. Perry (1997) investigating four demographic variables – gender, age, level of education, and income, found that men were more likely to have PSM in the dimensions of Public interest and self-sacrifice, which was similar to the findings of Camilleri (2007), while

income was negatively related to the dimension public interest, implying that as wealth increases PSM would decline. Though Naff and Crum (1999) found that age and tenure had not accounted for any difference at the macro level of PSM, Camilleri (2007) at the micro level of PSM dimensions found a high positive correlation between age and organizational tenure, and the PSM dimensions public interest, compassion and self-sacrifice. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) also found that women were more attracted to policy making, which was similar to the finding by DeHart-Davis *et al.* (2006), but dissimilar to Perry (1997). Women also had a higher need for compassion (Camilleri, 2007; DeHart-Davis *et al.*, 2006). Another demographic variable that influenced attraction to policy making was education, which was positively related to this dimension, but negatively related to compassion (DeHart-David *et al.*, 2006). Income had no significant relationship with PSM dimensions (DeHart-David *et al.*, 2006; Taylor, 2007), as well as the demographic variable race (DeHart-David *et al.*, 2006). The findings of various studies indicate that antecedents have relationships with levels and dimensions of PSM and also provide a better understanding of the factors that are likely to contribute to high PSM of employees.

TESTING OF PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION (PSM)

Perry's (1996) original test of a measurement scale for PSM was a six dimensional construct, which was revised to four dimensions, with commitment to public interest, social justice, and civic duty being collapsed into a single dimension commitment to public interest-civic duty. Initially Perry (1996) eliminated items that were low in variances and weakly correlated to the overall scale. After this failed to provide an acceptable model fit, he eliminated variables that had loaded on multiple dimensions. This was followed by combining of dimensions that had a high correlation between them, since they lacked discriminant validity (Perry, 1996). Coursey and Pandey (2007) tested Perry's (1996) measurement scale using a three dimensional construct – excluding self-sacrifice, as well as a reduced number of items, as the original scale was considered too long for practical

application. The test was also seen as important since an independent validation of Perry's (1996) scale had not been undertaken, and the use of more advanced procedures and techniques for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were available (Coursey and Pandey, 2007). Perry's measurement scale (Perry, 1996) was also tested by Kim (2008) due to low loading of attraction to policy making in other studies Carmilleri (2006) and Kim (in press), while Vandenabeele (2008a) wanted to determine its ability to measure the PSM concept in the European context.

The selection of items by Coursey and Pandey (2007) was based on reliability and validity results from Perry (1996) and 'subjective assessment of the face validity, distinctiveness, and clarity of the items' (Coursey and Pandey, 2007; 550). While Perry (1996) included self-sacrifice, though there was relatively no difference in fit between the three and four dimensional models – however a comparison based on chi square indicated the four dimensional model is superior to the three dimensional (Perry, 1996), self-sacrifice was eliminated by Coursey and Pandey (2007) to provide a shortened version as recommended by some academics (Perry, 1996; Coursey and Pandey, 2007).

Though a shortened version was recommended by some academics to facilitate validity testing, and testing of hypothesis relations (Coursey and Pandey, 2007), Kim (2008) used the four dimensional scale, but with 14 items instead of Perry's (1996) 24 items scale. Based on earlier studies by Lee (2005) - APM dimension performed poorly, Carmilleri (2006) and Kim (in press) - APM had low factor loading, and Coursey and Pandey (2007) - need for more development for APM, the need for a strengthening of APM dimension became the main focus of Kim (2008). In addressing the weakness of this dimension, Kim (2008) changed the wording of the items in this dimension, which he felt represented politics rather than public policy. By so doing the items better represented the rational base of PSM, thereby providing valid measures and a more appropriate assessment of APM (Kim, 2008). Another study that could have contributed to a similar conclusion as Kim (2008) but not considered at the time, was Perry's (1997) findings that professional identification is negatively related to attraction to policy making, while using the wording of the original items of the dimension that represented politics. The second order factor model was also

used by Kim (in press) to address measurement errors and the relationship between the construct and the dimensions (Kim, 2008). Previous tests by Perry (1996) and Coursey and Pandey (2007) operationalized the construct by summing the scores on the dimensions (Kim, 2008). The revised scale was reduced to 12 items after testing the PSM model that initially consisted of 14 items (Kim, 2008).

Vandenabeele (2008a) tested the measurement scale to determine its usability in environments outside the United States. The first phase in the process was the widening of the concept - public service motivation, which was defined 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' (Vandenabeele, 2007; 549). This definition facilitated the inclusion of three additional dimensions, equality, bureaucratic values, and customer orientation, with customer orientation eventually being removed and the other two being collapsed into one dimension called democratic governance. Though this dimension showed low composite reliability it was however retained, due to its theoretical value as it relates to continental Europe (Vandenabeele, 2008a).

A more thorough assessment of the studies indicated that while Perry (1996) used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in his initial 35 items scale, Coursey and Pandey (2007) and Kim (2008) used it to analyze their shortened versions. Factor loading for Perry's (1996) PSM scale ranged from .39 to .78 indicating how well they measure the latent dimensions. In relation to Coursey and Pandey's (2007) study, all the items except PSM 24 (loaded .27 maximum likelihood (ML) and .26 diagonally weighted least square (DWLS) and PSM 34 (loaded .40 ML and .39 DWLS) loaded well. In Perry's (1996) study the R^2 which measures the reliability ranged from .15 to .61 indicating varied reliability, while in Coursey and Pandey (2007) the R^2 values were similar or better than Perry's (1996) except for PSM 4, PSM 24, based on DWLS results. In terms of model fit a (GFI) of .88 and adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) of .86 was indicative of a good four dimensional model in Perry's (1996) study. Using more stringent and advanced measures Coursey and Pandey (2007) had an estimated root mean square error for approximation (RMSEA) value below .10, which indicated

that there was a good absolute fit. In comparison to Perry's results using similar measures the model fit values using (GFI) and (AGFI) were mostly above .90, indicating a good fit (Coursey and Pandey, 2007).

Kim (2008) used two samples, the first for scale validation and the second to cross validate the factor structure from the first sample. In addition to the two samples Kim (2008) also used second order factor model as was earlier stated, thereby requiring the testing of both the first and second order models. Alterations in the first model of the first sample had to be made after the initial test revealed poor fit with comparative fit index (CFI) and incremental fit index (IFI) being too low - .894 and .895 respectively, and RMSEA being too high - .082. The two items that cross-loaded to other factors were removed, which resulted in an enhanced model fit with both CFI and IFI having values above the acceptable .9 - .955 for each, while the RMSEA value was now .059. The loading for the items ranged from .540 to .807, which was also better than Perry's (1996) study. The second order model fit was also satisfactory with CFI and IFI of .925 and .926 respectively, and RMSEA of .075, while factor loading of the dimensions APM, CPI, COM and SS were .683, .855, .725, and .640 respectively. The t coefficient of .68 also indicated the extent to which the second order model explains the variance among the first order factors in the first sample (Kim, 2008). The other study that used two samples for validation and cross validation, but rather than separate samples a split data set was used by Vandenberg (2008a). Though second order factor model was not used as Kim (2008), additional dimensions were used. Except for RMSEA with a value that was acceptable, since it was below .06, the other fit indices – GFI, normed fit index (NFI) and CFI all indicated poor model fit. After deleting items with low loading – below .40, and cross loading on factors, a model with five dimensions was tested. A second model that collapsed self-sacrifice and commitment to the public interest was also developed by Vandenberg (2008a). Both models demonstrated good fit with the five dimensional model having a value of .053 for RMSEA, GFI of .983, CFI of .963 and NFI of .957, while the four dimensional model had RMSEA of .056, GFI of .980, CFI of .959 and NFI of .952. Both models also demonstrated significant factor loading (Vandenberg, 2008a).

In cross validating the model from the first sample in Kim (2008), the items were tested with the second sample. The first order model in relation to the second sample had a good fit with CFI and IFI values of .954 and .955 respectively and RMSEA of .060. The factor loading ranged from .452 to .856 (Kim, 2008). The second order also had a good model fit with CFI value of .952 and IFI value of .953. The t coefficient was also better than the validation model with a value of .96, which almost explained all of the variances among the first order factors. The factor loading for the dimensions was also significant. However, except for SS the other dimensions had not done as well as the first order model (APM - .630, CPI - .819, COM - .545 and SS - .646). In Vandenaabee's (2008a) study both 'loose' and 'partial' cross-validation were applied to the second sample, where it was found that the models had good fit, with both based on the goodness of fit indices for the five and four dimensional models. There was also no measurement variance between the models in the two samples thus indicating the models were cross validated (Vandenaabee, 2008a).

The various tests conducted by Perry (1996), Coursey and Pandey (2007), Kim (2008) and Vandenaabee (2008a) all supported the measurement scale used to measure PSM using confirmatory factor analysis. However of significance was the approaches of Kim (2008) where two separate samples were used and Vandenaabee (2008a) using two samples from an initial sample, with the intention of cross validating the model fit, as distinct from Perry (1996) and Coursey and Pandey (2007) earlier studies where a single sample was used to test the PSM measurement scale. The general consensus from the studies is that further testing is required to enhance the scale, not only in terms of dimensions, but also in terms of the number of items that are desirable for various studies, if a specific scale cannot be realized. The data type used by the various researchers varied in terms of collection, thereby impacting on the outcome of the studies. While Perry (1996) used a small heterogeneous sample which was not randomly selected, Coursey and Pandey (2007), Kim (2008), and Vandenaabee (2008a) all used homogeneous samples that were above 500 respondents, thus providing more statistical power to their studies. Coursey and Pandey (2007) and Vandenaabee (2008a) samples were census based, however the samples of Kim (2008) and Vandenaabee (2008a) were above 1,000, thereby restricting the types of goodness of fit test that are available, since chi square

test is sensitive to sample size (Coursey and Pandey, 2007). However, the normed chi square measure (X^2/df) which makes adjustment for the degree of freedom, can be used to assess model fit (Kim, 2008), in addition to goodness of fit index (GFI) as used by Perry (1996) and Vandenberg (2008a), adjusted goodness of fit (AGFI) as used by (Perry, 1996), and more advanced tests such as comparative fit index (CFI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) - the best measure of absolute fit (Coursey and Pandey, 2007), as used by Kim (2008), Coursey and Pandey (2007) and Vandenberg (2008a), incremental fit index (IFI) as used by Kim (2008) and Coursey and Pandey (2007), and normed fit index (NFI) used by Vandenberg (2008a) are tests that have been used in testing the PSM model. The various tests all supported the PSM model, though some of the studies were done in different countries.

Unlike other studies, Brewer et al. (2000) tested Public Service Motivation using Perry's (1996) forty original questions and Q-methodology, which requires an evaluation of each item to the others, while other studies evaluated each item independently (Brewer *et al.*, 2000). Emerging out of the study were four concepts that described individuals with varying combinations of the four dimensions. The groups were classified as Samaritans, humanitarians, patriots and communitarians. They also concluded that 'PSM is more complex than depicted' in other studies, and that no group of motives 'emerged as dominant' (Brewer *et al.*, 2000: 261). In addition to directly testing the measurement scale, other researchers had also tested the scale while examining the relationships between PSM and antecedents as well as attitudes and behavior of public service employees (Alonso and Lewis, 2001; DeHart-David *et al.* 2006; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Vandenberg, 2008b, 2009). Due to the propositions by Perry and Wise (1990), as well as other theoretical expectations based on historical and behavioral studies (DeHart-Davis *et al.* 2006), the relevance of PSM has been studied since the scale was developed by Perry (1996). The outcomes of the testing of the measurement scale and the propositions were influenced to some extent by the research designs, which included data collection and data analysis using available techniques and applications at the time of the various studies. The approaches have contributed to some of the inconsistencies in findings of some of the studies. Despite those inconsistencies in some of the studies, the similarities of some of the results

using different sampling frames and approaches have provided support for scale generalizability as it relates to PSM (Coursey and Pandey, 2007:552).

Data Type

The type of data used after Perry's (1996) initial study varied to some extent depending on where and when the studies had taken place. Also of significance is the influence of the categories of public service employees and the basis of data collection on the outcome of the studies. Many of the empirical studies and more so some originating in the US had respondents at the management level from the various organizations (DeHart-Davis, 2006; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Coursey and Pandey, 2007), other studies used both management and non-management levels (Perry, 1997; Naff and Crum, 1999; Brewer *et al.*, 2000; Bright, 2005, 2007, 2008), while Vandenabeele (2008b) used non-public servants (masters students). Some of the recent studies in other countries also had respondents from both management and non-management levels within the public service (Kim, 2005; Camilleri, 2006, 2007; Taylor, 2007; Vandenabeele, 2008a, 2009). The type of public service agency in relation to the tier of public service also varied as some studies utilized employees at federal or national/central agencies (Brewer and Selden, 2000; Alonso and Lewis, 2001; Coursey and Pandey, 2007; Camilleri, 2007), while some at the state or regional/provincial agencies (DeHart-Davis, 2006; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Coursey and Pandey, 2007; Vandenabeele, 2008a, 2009), and others at the local agency level (Bright, 2009). Some studies were more heterogeneous with all Levels being studied (Kim, 2005). The studies of PSM utilizing various respondents provided further evidence of the existence of the motive in the public service, though some of the relationships in some of the studies were inconsistent as was earlier stated.

The researchers in their studies of PSM also used various methods of data collection, which could have varying effects on response bias (Bright, 2009), as well as response rate, with Internet technology being used to administer questionnaires via e-mail (Vandenabeele, 2009; Bright, 2009) among other methods, while Vandenabeele (2008a) and Taylor (2007) used a web-based survey. These modes however are likely to result in a lower response rate than paper-and-pencil survey (Sax *et.al*, 2003). Self-

administered Questionnaires (Perry, 1997; Camilleri, 2006, 2007; Kim, 2005, 2008; Brewer *et al.*, 2000) or by mail (Bright, 2005, 2007, 2008), which were over extended periods of time were the more preferred mode in many of the studies. Others relied on secondary data (Naff and Crum, 1999; Alonso and Lewis, 2001; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Coursey and Pandey, 2007). While most of the studies used a five-point-likert scale, Bright (2007, 2008, and 2009) used a seven-point scale. Though the seven-point scale is expected to increase validity (Preston and Colman, 2000), the five point scale provided better comparability with earlier studies that used a similar scale. The scope of the studies as well as the resources available would have however influenced the methods used by the various researchers. The use of various approaches and the subsequent similarity in findings of many of the studies also provided support for scale generalizability (Coursey and Pandey, 2007).

THE APPLICABILITY OF PSM TO OTHER ECONOMIES/COUNTRIES

Since its development in the US, the concept public service motivation has gained acceptance, analyzed as well as it was tested by academics in various countries, with some referring to PSM by different names (Camilleri, 2007). The existence of PSM has emanated from various backgrounds, but with a common thread a desire to serve the public interest. Its usage and popularity has been growing not only in the more developed economies, but also in some developing economies. Though culture contributes to the behavior of public service employees, there is commonality as it relates to public values of the Western world (Vandenabeele, 2008a). The public values found in part of continental Europe have been influenced by French administration (Vandenabeele, 2008a). To determine its applicability outside the United States both normative and empirical studies have been undertaken by academics. The significance of these studies in relation to the development of Perry's PSM concept has been the comparison of his concept with

various European variants, such as customer orientation, equality, and bureaucratic governance.

Academics have looked at the factors and context in which public servants operate in various European countries in addition to other emerging economies. Alterations to a few items in the measurement scale were required in some of the studies due to cultural interpretation and meanings of terms Taylor (2007), Kim (2008) and Vandenabeele (2008). Though the PSM model has been adopted with a few modifications to the scale in some emerging economies, it was felt that a wider definition was required for European economies as was earlier stated, due to their historical background. PSM concept was analyzed in relation to some European countries such as France, Netherland, Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Malta by various academics (Hondegheem and Vandenabeele, 2005; Castaings, 2006; Vandenabeele *et al.*, 2006). The findings of the various studies revealed similarities between the US public servants and some European public servants. Perry (1996) posited that PSM is an antecedent of organizational commitment, which is also seen as applicable to the French civil service (Castaing, 2006).

Perry (1996) also posited that commitment to the public interest was a norm-Based motive. This was built on Perry and Wise's (1990) classification of desire to serve the public interest as a norm-Based motive, since it was seen as a norm to be loyal to one's country and a nationalist. Though Hondegheem and Vandenabeele (2005) posited that 'public interest seem to be more of a duty to government' in France, which was based on the literature studied (Hondegheem and Vandenabeele, 2005; 11), Castaings (2006) posited that commitment to public interest relates more to desire -an affective motive, than duty to serve others – a normative motive, in the French civil service. This was due to the findings that PSM (commitment to the public interest) is a better predictor of affective organizational commitment than normative commitment (Castaings, 2006). However, though commitment to serve the public interest is common in both the US and French societies, the motive appears to be more from an individual's emotions in the French society than the US where it is an obligation or duty to serve.

The preferences or needs of the various employees are also important across the US and European countries studied. Similar to the US where Houston (2000) found that public employees were less motivated by monetary reward, it was posited that as it relates to French civil servants ‘little attention is devoted to monetary rewards’ (Hondeghem and Vandenameele, 2005; 17). This was also similar to findings in Belgium where public sector employees were less motivated by money than their counterparts in the private sector (Buelens and Van den Broeck 2007). In addition to Perry and Wise’s (1990) proposition regarding utilitarian rewards, it was also posited that individuals with high PSM are more likely to be attracted to the public sector (Perry, 1996). A study in Belgium found that individuals with high levels of PSM were more likely to prefer public service employment (Vandenameele, 2008b).

While most of the studies used Perry’s (1996) four dimensions or less, following the testing of PSM in a European context with additional dimensions (Vandenameele (2008a), Vandenameele (2009) used the additional dimension democratic governance in the study of PSM-performance relationship and mediating variables. The inclusion of this dimension may be important from a European context, but may not have the same relevance in other countries outside of Europe, due to the difference in historical and cultural values. Democratic governance which is a norm based dimension may not have the same level of importance in political systems that are radically different from Western Europe. As such, consideration should be given to the political system operating in a country when testing PSM. The system and political practice in the country can also influence changes to some of the items in the measurement scale in various dimensions as in the case of Kim (2008), if they are to have the desired ability to measure the dimensions.

CONCLUSION

There has been considerable development regarding the concept public service motivation over the years. The various academics utilized more advanced analytical tools over time, as well as a wide cross section of individuals in the empirical studies to test the scale and propositions. However, further studies in this area would contribute towards solidifying the concept. Various antecedents were investigated in studies including those that emanated from the organization's culture, the level of employees' contact with members of society as distinct from tenure. However, both categories of antecedents in terms of public organization and public service employment have not been investigated. The existence of a relationship between the level of employees' contact with members of society and PSM, or any of its dimensions, will help administrators and researchers understand the likely effects of citizen's issues on public service employees. Motives arising from within the organization through socialization may be either affective - due to concerns for them, or normative - due to learning that it is one's duty or responsibility. As such, future studies can be undertaken to determine whether a relationship exist between the respective variables.

The level of economic development or underdevelopment of a country, and the extent of PSM and the levels of the dimensions are issues that can be studied. While studies of PSM have been undertaken in more developed countries, similar studies should be done in less developed and underdeveloped countries, to determine the extent of PSM. Another viable area for study is the nature of government in terms of participation of citizens in the election of the legislative arm of government, which will ultimately influence the values and culture in the country and consequently PSM.

As it relates to the internationalisation of the concept, PSM can be seen as a 'valid concept in a European environment', even though alterations are needed to the measurement scale, since the core elements remain as initially set out (Vandenabeele, 2008b;1103). The findings to date also suggest that the concept public service motivation has universal relevance (Vandenabeele, 2008a), due to the testing of the measurement scale and

propositions on various types of individuals and countries. However, ‘PSM does not replace other types of motivation’ (Vandenabeele, 2008b; 1103), but assists public administrators in understanding the behaviour, and making predictions of public employees. A better understanding of the forces that influence public service employees can result in improvement in the human resource management in public organizations.

REFERENCES

- Alonso, Pablo and Gregory B. Lewis. (2001). Public Service Motivation and Job Performance: Evidence from the Federal Sector, *American Review of Public Administration*, 31, 4: 363-380.
- Baldwin, J. Norman. (1987). Public versus Private: Not That Different, Not That Consequential, *Public Personnel Management*, 16, 2: 181-193.
- Brewer, G. A., and S. C. Selden. (2000). Why Elephants Gallop: Assessing And Predicting Organizational Performance In federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10, 685-711.
- Brewer, Gene A., Sally C. Selden and Rex L. Facer. (2000). Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation, *Public Administration Review*, 60, 3: 254-264.
- Bright, Leonard. (2005). Public Employees with High Levels of Public Service Motivation: Who are They, Where are they and what do They Want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25, 2: 138-154.
- Bright, Leonard. (2007). Does Person-Organization Fit Mediate the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and the Job Performance of Public Employees? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27, 4: 361-379.
- Bright, Leonard. (2008). Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on the Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees? *American Review of Public Administration*, 38, 2: 149-166.
- Bright, Leonard. (2009). Why Do Public Employees Desire Intrinsic Nonmonetary Opportunities? *Public Personnel Management*, 38, 3: 15-37.
- Buelens, Marc, and Herman Van Den Broeck. (2007). An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations, *Public Administration Review*, 67, 1: 65-74.

- Camilleri, E. (2006). Towards Developing an Organizational Commitment – Public Service Motivation Model for Maltese Public Service Employees, *Public Policy and Administration*, 26, 1: 63-83.
- Camilleri, E., (2007). Antecedents Affecting Public Service Motivation, *Personnel Review*, 36, 3: 356-377.
- Castaing, S. (2006.) The Effects of Psychological Contract Fulfillment and Public Service Motivation on Organizational Commitment in the French Civil Service, *Public Policy and Administration*, 21, 1: 84-98.
- Coursey, David, and Sanjay Pandey. (2007). Public Service Motivation Measurement: Testing an Abridge Version of Perry's Proposed Measurement Scale, *Administration and Society*, 39, 5: 547-568.
- Crewson, Philip E. (1997). Public-Service Motivation Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7, 2: 499-519.
- DeHart-Davis, Leisha, Justin Marlowe, and Sanjay K. Pandey. (2006) Gender Dimensions of Public Service Motivation, *Public Administration Review*, 66, 6: 873-887.
- Delfgaauw, Josse, and Robert Dur. (2008). Incentives and Workers' Motivation in the Public Sector, *The Economic Journal*, 118, 525: 171-191.
- Frederickson, H. George, and David K. Hart. (1985). The Public Service and the Patriotism of Benevolence, *Public Administration Review*, 45, 5: 547-553.
- Gabris, Gerald T. and Gloria Simo. (1995). Public Sector Motivation as an Independent Variable Affecting Career Decisions, *Public Personnel Management*, 24, 1: 33-51.
- Golembiewski, Robert T., (1996). The Future of Public Administration: End of a Stay in the Sun? Or a New Day A-Dawning? *Public Administration Review*, 56, 2: 139-148.

- Hondeghem, A. and W. Vandenabeele. (2005). Values and motivation in public administration: Public service motivation in an international comparative perspective, *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, 115: 463-480.
- Houston, David J. (2000). Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10, 4: 713-727.
- Ingraham, Patricia W. (1993). Of Pigs in Pokes and Policy Diffusion: Another Look at Pay-For-Performance, *Public Administration Review*, 53, 4: 348-356.
- Kim, Sangmook. (2005). Individual-Level Factors and Organizational Performance in Government Organizations, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15, 2: 245-261.
- Kim, Sangmook. (2008). Revising Perry's Measurement Scale of Public Service Motivation, *The American Review of Public Administration*.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Sue A. Frank. (2002). Who Wants To Work For Government? *Public Administration Review*, 62, 4: 395-404.
- Maidani, Ebrahim A., (1991). Comparative Study of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction among Public and Private Sectors, *Public Personnel Management*, 20, 4: 441-448.
- Moynihan, D.P., and Pandey, S.K. (2007). The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation, *Public Administration Review*, 67:40-53.
- Naff, K.C. and Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does PSM makes a Difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19: 5-16.
- Pattakos, Alex N. (2004). The Search for Meaning in Government Service, *Public Administration Review*, 64, 1: 106-112.

- Perry, James L. (1996). Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6, 1: 5-22.
- Perry, James L. (1997). Antecedents of Public Service Motivation, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7, 2: 181-197.
- Perry, James L. (2000). Bringing Society In: Toward A Theory Of Public-Service Motivation, *Journal Of Public Administration Research And Theory*, 10, 2: 471-488.
- Perry, J. and A. Hondeghem. (2008). Building Theory and Empirical Evidence about Public Service Motivation, *International Public Management Journal*, 11, 1: 2-12.
- Perry, James L., and Lyman W. Porter. (1982). Factors Affecting the Context for Motivation in Public Organizations, *Academy Of Management Review*, 7, 11: 89-98.
- Perry, James L., and Hal G. Rainey. (1988). The Public-Private Distinction in Organization Theory: A Critique and Research Strategy, *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 2: 182-201.
- Perry, James L., and Lois Recascino Wise. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service, *Public Administration Review*, 50, 3: 367-373.
- Preston, C. C. and A.M. Colman. (2000). Optimal Number of Response Categories in Rating Scales: Reliability, Validity, Discriminating Power and Respondent Preferences, *Acta Psychologica*, 104: 1 – 15.
- Rainey, Hal G., Robert W. Backoff and Charles H. Levine. (1976). Comparing Public and Private Organizations, *Public Administration Review*, Mar/Apr: 233-244.
- Rainey, H. G., and P. Steinbauer. (1999). Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9, 1-32.

- Romzek, Barbra S. (1990). Employee Investment and Commitment: The Ties That Bind, *Public Administration Review*, 50, 3: 374-382.
- Sax, Linda J., Shannon K. Gilmartin and Alyssa N. Bryant. (2003). Assessing Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Web and Paper surveys, *Research in Higher Education*, 44, 4: 409 -432.
- Steers, Richard M., Richard T. Mowday, and Debra L. Shapiro. (2004). The Future of Work Motivation Theory, *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 3: 379-387.
- Taylor, Jeannette. (2007). The Impact of Public Service Motives on Work Outcomes in Australia: A Comparative Multi-Dimensional Analysis, *Public Administration*, 85, 4: 931-959.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter. (2007). Toward a Theory of Public Service Motivation: an Institutional approach, *Public Management Review*, 9, 4:545-556.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter. (2008). Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument, *International Public Management Journal*, 11, 1:143-167.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter. (2008). Government Calling: Public Service Motivation As An Element in Selecting Government as an Employer of Choice, *Public Administration*, 86,4:1089-1105.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter. (2009). The mediating effect of Job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance: more robust evidence of the PSM-performance relationship, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75, 1:11- 34.
- Vandenabeele, W., S. Scheepers and A. Hondeghem. (2006). Public Service Motivation in an International Comparative Perspective: The UK and Germany, *Public Policy and Administration*, 21, 1:13-31.

Wright, Bradley E., (2001). Public-Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11, 4: 559-586.

Wright, Bradley E., (2007). Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter? *Public Administration Review*, 67, 1: 54-64.