

Motivation of Public Servants in Europe: A Proposal for a “Mixed Motives” Approach

Francesca Amendola

*University of Salerno, Department of Political Science and Communication
Via Giovanni Paolo II 132 – Fisciano (Salerno) – Italy
E-Mail: famendola@unisa.it;*

Marinella Boccia

*University of Salerno, Department of Economics and Statistics
Via Giovanni Paolo II 132 – Fisciano (Salerno) – Italy
E-Mail: mboccia@unisa.it;*

Roberta Troisi

*University of Salerno, Department of Political Science and Communication
Via Giovanni Paolo II 132 – Fisciano (Salerno) – Italy
E-Mail: rtroisi@unisa.it;*

Abstract

The paper analyses the attitude of public servants, to understand if it is based on an others- or self-oriented behavior. The conceptualization of the Public Service Motivation in the 1990s provided researchers with a new construct to understand the peculiar motivational leverages related to public sector employees. However, the concept has been analysed as based on altruistic elements rather than on self-serving ones. Using the European Social Survey for 2016, 2014 and 2012, it is empirically confirmed that the behavior of public servants within a European context is based on altruistic elements.

Keywords: Public Service Motivation; Organizational behaviour; Empirical Analysis

JEL Classifications: H83, M1, H19, C38

1. Introduction

Public administration studies have long been interested in understanding the peculiar motivational leverages related to the public sector employees. It is well-known how the conceptualization of the Public Service Motivation (PSM) in the 1990s provided researchers with a new construct defined as a “general motivation to serve the interests of a community” (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). Since its formulation, PSM research has increased and become much more multidisciplinary, introducing a new research topic in the public administration field, branching from the general motivational literature (Ritz et al., 2016). Furthermore, PSM stems from an idea that has been around for thousands of years, namely that of providing public service is based on a drive to do good for others and for society (Horton, 2008).

At the same time, the construct has addressed a perceived inadequacy in public administration studies with it being “behaviour like self-sacrifice, public interest, and altruism very hard to explain in terms of rational choice” (Steen, 2006; Vandenabeele et al., 2004). Thus, the starting point of the

scholars is that the motivation of public servants relies on others-oriented motives rather than on self-serving ones (Perry et al., 2010): along this line, the PSM construct has been analysed as a “specific manifestation of altruism that is expressed within the boundaries of public institutions” (Harari et al., 2016).

Despite the significant development of the construct, there are still some critical aspects regarding its definition. A stream of research highlights the incompleteness of the notion by pointing out that it could be based on “mixed motives” (Ritz, 2011; Ritz et al., 2016) rather than exclusively on altruistic elements. According to the authors, “a person working primarily for salary and benefits may aim for personal aggrandizement or may be fulfilling important family responsibilities” (Ritz et al., 2016) which suggests mixed motives (Brewer et al., 2000). However, these ideas are still relatively unexplored and mostly based on a theoretical contribution. The recommendations offered by Ritz et al. (2016) are welcomed, with the idea of incorporating in the research both the others- and self-oriented attitudes of individuals and carrying out a preliminary attempt of empirically testing these ideas.

As a step toward filling the void in current literature, this paper goes beyond the PSM construct and focuses on the general attitude of public servants.

It, therefore, gives two contributions to current literature.

Firstly, a contribution is made to the debate by empirically substantiating whether the attitude of public servants is supported by both selfish and unselfish motives. Most of the analysis, in taking into account primarily the altruistic aspect of the motivation of public servants, tend to underestimate the complexity of the construct. On the contrary, this paper welcomes the proposal of the part of the research (Ritz, 2011; Coursey and Pandey, 2007) that considers the motivation of public servants as based both of others- and self-oriented motives, in a “mixed motives” content. Thus, the main objective is to further explore the suggestions of the research that the self-oriented elements within the attitude of public servants are a counterbalance of the others-oriented ones, following the idea that human nature is generally based on both elements (Mueller, 1986).

Secondly, this study carries out an empirical analysis of the European scenario, moving the focus from the USA which has been the most explored country (DeHart-Davis et al., 2007; Perry, 1997; Perry and Hondeghem, 2008; Ward, 2014). In current PSM literature, there are different studies dedicated to the European scenario, but most of them focus on a specific European country or area (Camilleri, 2006; Vandenabeele, 2010; Witteloostuijn et al., 2017).

The European Social Survey (ESS) database is used, with it being an academically driven cross-national survey established in 2001 that measures the attitudes and beliefs of different populations in Europe. The Human Value Scale has been focused on since it has been used both for the measurement of human values (Davidov et al., 2008; Schwartz et al., 2012; Verkasalo et al., 2009) as well as for the measurement of a variant of the PSM (Howard and Georgellis, 2018).

Following the Self-and other-interest Inventory (SOII) (Gerbasi and Prentice, 2013), two indicators have been identified within the ESS that capture both the others- and the self-oriented behaviours of individuals (Prysmakova, 2013): the importance of helping others and the importance of pursuing personal wealth. The aim is to understand which between self-interest and other-interest serves as a guide for behaviour.

The results of the analysis confirm the general idea of the researchers that the motivation of public servants is mostly based on an “altruistic” attitude (Perry et al., 2010; Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). Nevertheless, this analysis only offers some interesting insights for the study of the construct that could be applied to the measurement of the PSM itself or be used on a different sample. Future research could take into account the mixed motives approach to study in greater detail the PSM analysis, while also reinforcing the altruistic-like attitude of public sector employees.

The paper is organized as follows: Sections 2 and 3 are dedicated to a review of the literature and developing the research idea with a specific focus on the criticisms raised by part of the PSM research. Section 4 focuses on the empirical analysis, describing the data, the methodology applied and

discussing the results. Finally, Section 5 presents some conclusions and proposals for the future of the research.

2. Motivation in the Public Sector: Public Service Motivation as a Leading Theory

Historically, motivation, both in the private and public sectors, has been associated with merit pay or types of rewards (Perry, 1986; Rainey, 1982), mainly focusing on material incentives. An alternative perspective was introduced in the 1990s with the early conceptualization of the Public Service Motivation (PSM), “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry and Wise, 1990). The construct rapidly branched from the leading public administration field and the general topic of motivation, developing its own theoretical model.

In its early formulation in the 1990s, PSM was operationalized on three different dimensions: affective, norm-based and rational. The affective and norm-based dimensions were both based on the idea that an individual’s behaviour is driven by the necessity of satisfying emotional needs grounded in various social contexts (Perry and Wise, 1990). In this case, the individual feels some sort of compulsion to protect and serve society, developing a sort of social patriotism. The third dimension was a rational one. In this case, in performing “altruistic” acts, the individual is actually satisfying a personal need, so the will of helping others is sometimes grounded in individual utility maximization. Basically, when an individual participates in the formulation of policy, it could be due to the fact that it gives a sense of self-importance and satisfies a personal need.

This “3-dimensions approach” was further developed by Perry in 1996. Specifically, he operationalised the construct on four sub-dimensions: Commitment to the public interest (CPI), Compassion (COM), Self-sacrifice (SSF) and Attraction to policymaking (APM), to seize all the motives at the basis of this new type of motivation. While the first three dimensions seem to imply altruistic elements, the APM appears to be entirely based on self-interest. It brings together the self-interested elements of an individual’s PSM, shedding light on the fact that pursuing the public interest can also be based on personal satisfaction.

Over the years, despite the extraordinary development of the construct (Ritz et al., 2016), different criticisms were raised concerning the role of the APM dimension and rational motives defined ambiguous “in their relation with PSM” (Kim and Vandeneabee, 2010). Moreover, most of the international researchers refer to the rational dimension of PSM not as Attraction to policy-making but rather as “Politics and Policy” (Vandeneabee and Van der Walle, 2008), taking out the word attraction and restricting the APM extension. Therefore, the APM sub-dimension has been defined as still in a formation stage (Ritz, 2011), with it being still relatively unexplored as the dimension that mostly brings together the rational elements of PSM.

The criticisms have a common origin in the trend of the researchers to proceed from the assumption that “there are forms of motivation that are defined more by altruistic than self-serving motives” (Ritz, 2011). The PSM has been used as a “counterweight to the self-interest motivation of rational choice theories” (Ritz, 2011) and defined as a special type of altruism (Perry et al., 2010) or a general altruistic motivation (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). This initial approach to the construct theoretically oriented scholars to a one-way interpretation and prevented the PSM to consistently predict individuals’ job choices (Bright, 2011), especially concerning the sector of employment. Researchers mainly focused on the others-oriented elements, overlooking the self-oriented, rational-based ones (Ritz, 2011).

A small amount of studies analyzed the altruistic attitude as a way to satisfy personal needs (Cialdini and Kenrick, 1976; Cialdini, 1991; Cialdini et al., 1997), including in the discussion also different types of motives. Some others demonstrated that, even if an individual has a high level of PSM, higher monetary earnings are still preferred (Alonso and Lewis, 2001; Christensen and Wright,

2009; Vandenaabeele, 2008) showing that personal achievement is still an aspect that should be considered.

On the contrary, most of the literature collected highlights the altruistic nature of the motivation of public servants. A consistent number of studies showed that public managers give more importance to intrinsic rewards (helping others) rather than to extrinsic ones (benefits, pay raises etc.) (Brewer and Selden, 1998; Crewson, 1997; Georgellis et al., 2011; Kim, 2006; Rainey, 1997; Ritz and Waldner, 2011). Moreover, since PSM-motivated individuals normally “value making a difference in other people’s lives” (Grant, 2008), there is a small amount of studies that sees the construct as a specific type of prosocial behaviour (Christensen et al., 2013; Jensen and Andersen, 2015; Perry and Hondeghem, 2008;), driven by the will of helping others.

Additionally, it seems that a complementary notion of the motivation of public servants has been developed in the wake of Public Service Motivation literature. The difference is mainly methodological. Some studies use Perry’s questionnaire as a measurement scale for PSM (Coursey and Pandey, 2007; DeHart-Davis et al., 2007; Kim, 2009; Kim et al., 2013; Perry, 1996; Vandenaabeele, 2008;), others seem to define a broader construct of the motivation of public servants by relying on the PSM theory (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000, 2006; Pandey and Stazyk, 2008) and by using secondary data. In spite of this double-path, it seems that the altruistic-like approach remains a critical aspect.

This paper aims to make a first step towards exploring the attitude of public servants, taking into account the criticisms regarding the self-serving motives of individuals. This work is a preliminary attempt to empirically test the idea of a public servant’s behaviour based both on others- and self-oriented motives (Brewer et al., 2000; Ritz et al., 2016; Weske and Schott, 2016).

Keeping in mind that workers might be driven by different motives (Weske and Schott, 2016) that include both the will to help others as well as pursue personal wealth, an attempt has been made to empirically understand if those motives are mutually exclusive or if they simultaneously affect individual behaviours.

3. Research Idea and Methodological Approach

It is proposed to embrace the two-level approach of human behaviour literature. Mueller (1986) reveals that humans have two natures, a selfish one and a cooperative-altruistic one and that people make decisions in some contexts using alternatively those two approaches (Hu et al., 2003). The first type of nature implies that most of the acts performed for others are driven by the will to achieve a positive outcome with no regard for oneself. On the contrary, the second one focuses on the idea that those acts are based on “expectation of benefits to the self and/or the avoidance of aversive consequences to the self” (Barnett et al., 2000).

Following this line, the attitude of public servants is studied in a broad motivational framework based on two types of motives: others-oriented and self-oriented. The first one relies on the attention given to the wellbeing of others or society, while the second one is mainly linked to the satisfaction of personal needs. In this case, the choice of performing a public service act is based on a specific will that can be addressed to the wellbeing of others, to the satisfaction of a personal need or both. Following the criticisms and the theory of human nature mentioned above, it is hypothesised that the attitude of public servants could fall on the border between the self-oriented and the others-oriented motives, in terms of “who will benefit the most from the motivation to perform such behaviours” (Vandenaabeele et al., 2018). Since individuals’ choices often rely on different motives simultaneously, it is proposed to analyse the bases of motivation, taking into account all the different types of motives that could subtend the construct.

To preliminary investigate the motives at the basis of the behaviour of public servants, a probit analysis was carried out using data from the European Social Survey (ESS). Specifically, it focuses on the Human Value Scale from the ESS database which has already been used both for the measurement

of values and behaviours of individuals (Davidov et al., 2008; Schwartz et al., 2012; Verkasalo et al., 2009) and for the definition of a variant of the PSM (Howard and Georgellis, 2018).

This work is not based on the measurement of the PSM construct, but it is dedicated broadly to the attitudes and behaviours of public employees of the European countries. It goes beyond the PSM construct in order to understand if the behaviour of public servants in general is more oriented towards altruistic or self-serving elements.

Following the Self- and other- interest Inventory (SOII) (Gerbası and Prentice, 2013), two items were selected in order to measure the others- and self-oriented attitude of public servants: the importance given to pursuing personal wealth and the importance given to helping others.

The Self-and other-interest Inventory measures “the motivation to act in one’s own interest and the motivation to act in another’s interest” at the level of self-beliefs (Gerbası and Prentice, 2013). The Inventory provides interesting and useful insights for the study of motivation and behaviour of individuals, in this case public servants. The main idea is that both self-interest and other-interest dimensions exert an influence on individual behaviour. The aim is to understand which between self-interest and other-interest serves as a guide for behaviour.

As for the first indicator, the definition of self-interest proposed by Gerbası and Prentice (2013) is used: a “pursuit of gains in socially valued domains, including material goods, social status, recognition, academic or occupational achievement, and happiness” which is considered to be only based on personal needs. The self-oriented attitude is basically the inclination to give more importance to personal gain or personal success rather than to the wellbeing of others or society. On the contrary, the others-interest is defined as “the pursuit of gains for others in socially valued domains, including material goods, social status, recognition, academic or occupational achievement, and happiness” (Gerbası and Prentice, 2013). Regarding the first indicator considered, the others-interest pursues the same final objective (gaining domains, goods, social trust etc.) but with a different subtended motive: others. Therefore, the others-oriented dimension is defined as the propensity of individuals to give more importance to the wellbeing of others rather than to personal gain. The Self- and other-interest inventory analyses those two individual attitudes as two sides of a coin which is what is proposed in relation to the motives that move public servants.

4. Analysis and Results

This analysis is based on data from the European Social Survey (ESS), a cross-national survey established in 2001. Every two years, face-to-face interviews are conducted with newly selected, cross-sectional samples all across Europe. It measures the attitudes and beliefs of different populations in Europe and is dedicated to various issues, such as social changes and politics. The survey comprises persons from 15 years old and over regardless of their nationality, citizenship, language or legal status (Prysmakova, 2013). The ESS survey is divided into two parts, a core section and a rotating one that can focus on different issues at each round. The core module questionnaire contains items measuring a range of topics of interest for the social sciences and a vast amount of socio-structural variables. The analysis is based on the ESS Round8, Round7 and Round6 respectively referred to 2016, 2014 and 2012.

The core module is divided into six different sections dedicated to i) media, internet, and social trust; ii) politics, political interest and immigration; iii) subjective well-being, social exclusion and religion; iv) socio-demographic profile; v) human values scale; vi) test questions. The rotating parts are dedicated differently to various issues such as climate change and energy or welfare. The focus of this study is mainly on the Human Values scale module dedicated to the perception of human behaviours and people in general.

Reflecting a long strand of PSM literature and given the above discussion, the analysis considers as a dependent variable the employment in the public sector (EPS in what follows) in 2016, 2014 and 2012-separately¹. The EPS is defined as a dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the employee works in the public sector; zero otherwise (the private one)².

The following equation defines the parameters of interest:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Rich_{it} + \alpha_2 Help_{it} + \alpha_3 Controls_{it} + \mu_C + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Where Y_{it} are the dependent variables (EPS) indexed to i , *Individual* at time t . *Rich* and *Help* to indicate respectively *i*) Important to be rich, have money and expensive things, and *ii*) Important to help people and care for the well-being of others. These variables are measured as dummy variables that take a value of 1 if they give importance to be rich and to help, zero otherwise.

Following the empirical and theoretical literature, a set of control variables is also included in the analysis, related to socio-economic characteristics (Alonso and Lewis, 2001; Houston 2000, 2006).

Moreover, a set of children, and family characteristics respectively is also included. The children characteristics include the presence or not of children at home expressed with a dummy variable; the family characteristics contain the value of net income, the marital status – expressed with a dummy variable indicating whether the family is married or in a civil union, separated, divorced, widowed.

A Probit model was separately estimated for the years of interest (2016, 2014, 2012) allowing for Country Fixed effects represented by μ_C . Finally, ε_{it} stands for the idiosyncratic error distributed as $\varepsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

The results (Table 1) are in line with the research, confirming the general idea of a public servants' motivation mainly driven by “altruistic” aspects.

Table 1: Public Sector - Probit Results

VARIABLES	(1)	(1)	(1)
	EPS2016	EPS2014	EPS2012
Help	0.136*** (0.0374)	0.173*** (0.0405)	0.106*** (0.0346)
Rich	-0.115*** (0.0293)	-0.115*** (0.0270)	-0.137*** (0.0237)
Children at Home	0.0104 (0.0292)	0.0376 (0.0313)	0.00546 (0.0255)
Less than Lower Secondary	-0.150 (0.286)	-0.0802 (0.218)	-0.236 (0.201)
Lower Secondary	0.129 (0.282)	0.112 (0.217)	-0.0473 (0.202)
Lower tier upper Secondary	0.0748 (0.285)	0.181 (0.216)	-0.0397 (0.204)
Upper tier upper Secondary	0.201 (0.281)	0.237 (0.216)	0.0277 (0.199)
Advanced Vocational	0.341 (0.277)	0.436** (0.214)	0.179 (0.202)
Lower Tertiary Education,	0.643** (0.278)	0.700*** (0.224)	0.444** (0.200)
Higher Tertiary Education	0.752*** (0.281)	0.821*** (0.220)	0.543*** (0.201)
Male	-0.409*** (0.0260)	-0.387*** (0.0295)	-0.358*** (0.0260)
Legally married	-0.0360	-0.0634	0.0987*

¹ The analysis is performed on cross-section data. The questionnaire based on non-uniques identified and on not unique Countries does not allow us to give a Panel Structure to the data.

² See Appendix for additional details.

	(0.0619)	(0.0624)	(0.0563)
In a legally registered civil union	0.0404	-0.112	-0.0423
	(0.0976)	(0.148)	(0.140)
Legally separated	0.0837	-0.0121	0.0440
	(0.115)	(0.113)	(0.0923)
Legally divorced/civil union dissolved	-0.0423	-0.0377	-0.0474
	(0.0360)	(0.0362)	(0.0314)
Widowed/civil partner died	0.0868*	0.0368	0.122***
	(0.0496)	(0.0506)	(0.0398)
Age	0.0143***	0.0142***	0.0164***
	(0.00113)	(0.00104)	(0.00114)
HH Net Income	-0.0132**	-0.00195	-0.0103**
	(0.00529)	(0.00494)	(0.00522)
Constant	-1.537***	-1.659***	-0.921***
	(0.286)	(0.235)	(0.238)
Observations	15,804	14,102	18,542
Method	FE	FE	FE
Controls	YES	YES	YES

Notes: The Dependent Variable is The PSM in 2016, 2014, 2012. The most relevant independent variables are Rich (Important to be rich,) and Help (Important to help other people). The other independent variables include: presence or not of children at home, the level of education and the gender of the respondent; the value of net income, the marital status (married, civil union, separated, divorced, and widowed). The estimation allows also for Country fixed effects. Robust standard errors ARE in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Specifically, the importance to help other people positively affects the probability to work in the public sector, differently from the importance to be rich that negatively impacts. Regarding the presence of Children at home, no evidence is found for all the periods of interest. The results on the role of Education, Gender, Age, and Income, are consistent with current literature. The educational level of the respondent impacts mainly at a higher level, in line with literature (Perry, 1997; Perry et al., 2008; Vandenaabeele, 2010), indicating that the more an individual is educated, the more he/she is likely to work in the public sector. These results can probably be explained from a professionalization perspective. A higher level of education could also increase the job expectations and can “lead individuals to recognize the value that public service has to society” (Bright, 2005), pushing them to work in the public sector. Along the same line, the probability to work in the public sector seems to increase if the age increases. Also, in this case, the result is in line with previous studies. A high level of individual PSM has been linked to the idea that older people have reached a higher stage of “moral development” (Perry, 1997; Vandenaabeele, 2010) so they have a higher level of trust in the public sector and probably are also more inclined to rely on public institutions compared to younger people. Similarly, the probability to work in the public sector increases if the employees are women, with the coefficient related to the gender of the respondent (Male) decreasing for all the years at a significant level. In this case, the general evidence in current literature about the role of gender in the individual level of PSM is mixed, with it probably being due to the complexity of the concept. Moreover, there is still very little evidence about the European scenario whereas further studies show that “being female have negative effects on public service motivation” (Vandenaabeele, 2010) even if the research was geographically confined. On the contrary, according to Ricucci (2018), gender is an important predictor of PSM and women are more likely to help people and care for the wellbeing of others. This is true when following the idea of a PSM as a “general altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation or humankind” (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999), setting aside the PSM understood as a “mixed” construct. Further research could explore the role of gender in the PSM as a mixed concept.

No interesting evidence is reported regarding the marital status, except for widowed, for which the coefficient is positive and significant in two of the three periods of interest.

Following the above results, also the Net Income shows a negative sign, both in 2016 and in 2012. On the contrary, in other studies, the income variable has been mainly linked to the public interest or civic duty (Perry, 1997) or volunteering experience (Perry et al., 2008) and was generally positively associated to those dimensions.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the rational, self-oriented motives are not the primary content of the attitude of public servants, in line with most of the results of current literature.

Conclusions and Further Research

This work is a preliminary attempt to explore some of the criticisms raised by PSM scholars.

It had a twofold objective: open the debate about the “double nature” of a complex concept like the PSM and further the research dedicated to the European scenario on a whole.

As mentioned in the discussion above, some of the criticisms regarding PSM definition focused on the excessive “altruistic” approach used by most of the scholars (Brewer and Selden, 1998; Crewson, 1997; Georgellis et al., 2011; Kim, 2006; Rainey, 1997; Ritz and Waldner, 2011). The general trend of the researchers in this branch has been to focus on altruistic motives that underpin the behaviour of public sector workers, overlooking eventually the self-serving elements that underpin man in general. Nevertheless, since the formulation of the construct, its self-interest dimension was brought out (Perry and Wise, 1990) but lately has almost totally been neglected.

In order to further empirically test the criticisms, a probit analysis was carried out using the European Social Survey database. It focused on two variables that capture both the types of motives, following the Self- and other- interest Inventory (SOII) (Gerbasi and Prentice, 2013): the importance of helping others and the importance given to personal wealth.

The results showed that working in the public sector in Europe is still more associated with others-oriented motives rather than to self-serving ones, confirming the general trend of the research. The importance given to help other people positively affects the probability to work in a public sector, differently by the importance to be rich that negatively impacts.

Notwithstanding the initial results, the study offers interesting insights for the future of the research.

Firstly, it suggests that the idea of a PSM as a “mixed construct” could possibly take the scholars on a false path, rather than incentivize them to take a step forward in the operationalization of the PSM. The study has some limitations. It does not directly measure the PSM construct but only explores the general attitude of public servants in the European scenario. Nevertheless, the “mixed motives” approach could give interesting insights or different results if used for the measurement of the PSM itself. Using the “mixed motives” approach to look at the motivational behaviour of public servants, it could still help scholars to identify more precisely what type of motives subtend the motivation of public servants. Moreover, if the research succeeds in identifying more precisely the motives within the PSM, it will also be possible to better understand what type of motivational leverages should be used in the public sector.

Secondly, it sheds light on the need for PSM research to take a step forward with regard to its definition. According to Christensen et al. (2017) “management practices have received limited direct empirical investigation”, showing an excessive focus of the scholars on the measurement and definition of the construct. It is time for PSM research to move from the analysis of the PSM as an emergent construct (Perry and Wise, 1990) to its study as an “applied tool of management” (Christensen et al., 2017).

Further research could:

1. Test the “mixed motives” framework in the measurement of the PSM itself, using the traditional instrument of the questionnaire in order to double-check the PSM nature;

2. Give more attention to the reference framework. Most of the studies are dedicated to a geographical area as a whole, without specific attention to the administrative or institutional context which are two key elements in the public sector organization and practices;
3. Give more importance to the operationalization of the PSM.

As already mentioned above, this is one of the critical aspects regarding the PSM research. Given the difficulties faced by scholars (Christensen et al., 2017), it is possible to claim that the operationalization of the PSM construct should probably pass through the analysis of the elements that influence the behaviour of most individuals such as religion, family and professional socialization (Perry et al., 2010). The importance of this type of influences on individual motivation also highlights the central role of the motives that shape the individual level of PSM. Given the latest developments of PSM research, further studies dedicated to the identification of the motives that underpin the construct are still necessary for a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the PSM construct.

References

- [1] Alonso, P. and Lewis, G.B. (2001) 'Public Service Motivation and Job Performance: Evidence from the Federal Sector', *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 363-380.
- [2] Barnett, M.A., Vitaglione, G.D., Bartel, J.S. and Sanborn, F.W. (2000) 'Perceptions of self-oriented and other-oriented "everyday" helpers', *Current Psychology*, Vol.19 No. 2, pp. 87-109.
- [3] Brewer, G.A. and Selden, S.C. (1998) 'Whistle Blowers in the Federal Civil Service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 413-439.
- [4] Brewer, G.A., Selden, S. C. and Facer II, R. L. (2000) 'Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 254-264.
- [5] Bright, L. (2005) 'Public Employees with High Levels of Public Service Motivation', *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 138-54.
- [6] Bright, L. (2011) 'Does Public Service Motivation Affect the Occupation Choices of Public Employees?', *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 11-24.
- [7] Camilleri, E. (2006) 'Towards developing an organizational commitment – public service motivation model for the Maltese public service employees', *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 63-84.
- [8] Camilleri, E. (2007) 'Antecedents affecting public service motivation', *Personnel Review*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 356-77.
- [9] Christensen, R. and Wright, B. (2009) 'The effects of public service motivation on job choice decisions: Exploring the contributions of person-organization fit and person-job fit', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 723-743.
- [10] Christensen, R. K., Whiting, S. W., Im, T., Rho, E., Stritch, J. M., and Park, J. (2013) 'Public service motivation, task, and non-task behaviour: A performance appraisal experiment with Korean MPA and MBA students', *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 28-52.
- [11] Christensen, R. K., Paarlberg L.E. and Perry, J. (2017) 'Public Service Motivation Research: Lessons for Practice', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 77 No. 4, pp. 529-542.
- [12] Cialdini R.B. and Kenrick D.T. (1976) 'Altruism as hedonism: a social development perspective on the relationship of negative mood state and helping', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 34 No.5, pp. 907-914.

- [13] Cialdini, R. B., (1991) 'Altruism or egoism: That is (still) the question', *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 124-126.
- [14] Cialdini, R.B., Brown, S.L., Lewis, B.P., Luce, C., and Neuberg, S.L. (1997) 'Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 73 No. 3, pp. 481-494.
- [15] Coursey, D. H. and S. K. Pandey (2007) 'Content Domain, Measurement, and Validity of the Red Tape Concept: A Second-Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis', *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 342-361.
- [16] Crewson, P. E. (1997) 'Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 499-518.
- [17] Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., and Schwartz, S. H. (2008) 'Bringing values back in: The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp. 420-445
- [18] DeHart-Davis, L, Marlowe, J. and Pandey, S.K. (2007) 'Gender Dimensions of Public Service Motivation', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66 No. 6, pp. 873-887.
- [19] Georgellis Y., Iossa. E. and Tabvuma, V. (2011) 'Crowding Out Intrinsic Motivation in the Public Sector', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 473-493.
- [20] Gerbasi, M.E. and Prentice, D.A. (2013) 'The Self- and Other-Interest Inventory', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 105 No. 3, pp.495-514.
- [21] Grant, A, M. (2008) 'Employees without a Cause: The Motivational Effects of Prosocial Impact in Public Service', *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 48-66.
- [22] Harari, M.B., Herst, D.E.L., Parola, H.R. and Carmona, B.P. (2016) 'Organizational Correlates of Public Service Motivation: A Meta-analysis of Two Decades of Empirical Research', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 27 No.1, pp. 68-84.
- [23] Horton. S. (2008) 'History and persistence of an idea and an ideal.', in Perry, L.J. and Hondeghem, A. (Eds.), *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 17-32.
- [24] Houston, D.J. (2000) 'Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 713-727.
- [25] Houston, D. J. (2006) 'Walking the walk of public service motivation: Public employees and charitable gifts of time, blood, and money', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 67-86.
- [26] Howard, R.A. and Georgellis, Y. (2018) 'The Universal Challenge: A Conceptual Framework for Exploring the Multidimensional Antecedents of Public Service Motivation'. Paper presented at the XXII IRSPM Annual Conference. 11-17 April 2018. Edinburgh, Scotland.
- [27] Hu, Y.A. and Liu, D.Y. (2003) 'Altruism versus Egoism in Human Behavior of Mixed Motives', *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 677-705.
- [28] Jensen, U. T., and Andersen, L. B. (2015) 'Public service motivation, user orientation, and prescription behavior: Doing good for society or for the individual user?', *Public Administration*, Vol. 93 No. 3, pp. 753-768.
- [29] Kim, S. (2006) 'Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea', *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 27 No. 8, pp. 722-740.
- [30] Kim, S. (2009) 'Revising Perry's Measurement Scale of Public Service Motivation', *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 149-163.
- [31] Kim, S. and Vandenabeele. W. (2010) 'A Strategy for Building Public Service Motivation Research Internationally', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 70 No. 5, pp. 701-709.
- [32] Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Wright, B.E., Andersen, L.B., Cerase, F.P., Christensen, R.K., Desmarais, C., Koumenta, M., Leisink, P., Palidauskaite, B.L.J., Pedersen, L.H., Ritz, A., Perry, J.L., Taylor, J. and De Vivo, P. (2013) 'Investigating the Structure and Meaning of

- Public Service Motivation across Populations: Developing an International Instrument and Addressing Issues of Measurement Invariance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 79–102.
- [33] Mueller, D.C. (1986) 'Rational egoism versus adaptive egoism as fundamental postulate for a descriptive theory of human behavior', *Public Choice*, Vol. 51, No. 1, pp 3–23
- [34] Pandey, S. K. and E. C. Stazyk. (2008) 'Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation', in Perry, L.J. and Hondeghem, A. (Eds.), *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 101-117.
- [35] Perry, J. L. (1986) 'Merit pay in the public sector: The case for a failure of Theory', *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 57-69.
- [36] Perry J.L and Wise, L.R. (1990) 'The Motivational bases of Public service', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 367-373.
- [37] Perry, J.L. (1996) 'Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 5-22.
- [38] Perry, J.L. (1997) 'Antecedents of Public Service Motivation', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 181–97.
- [39] Perry, J. L. and Hondeghem, A. (2008) *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [40] Perry, J.L., Hondeghem, A., and Wise, L.R. (2010) 'Revisiting the Motivational Bases of Public Service: Twenty Years of Research and an Agenda for the Future', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 70 No. 5, pp. 681-690.
- [41] Perry, J.L. and Vandenberg, W. (2015) 'Public Service Motivation Research: Achievements, Challenges, and Future Directions', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 75 No. 5, pp. 692-699
- [42] Prysmakova, P. (2013) *Public Service Motivation in Europe: Testing Attitudes toward Work Motives*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Florida International University.
- [43] Rainey, H.G. (1982) 'Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic', *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 16 No.4, pp. 288–302.
- [44] Rainey, H.G. (1997) *Understanding and managing public organizations*, 4th ed, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- [45] Rainey H.G., Steinbauer, P. (1999) 'Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organization', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 1-32.
- [46] Ricucci, N.M. (2018) 'Antecedents of Public Service Motivation: The Role of Gender', *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 115-126.
- [47] Ritz, A. (2011) 'Attraction to public policy making: a qualitative inquiry into improvements in PSM measurement', *Public Administration*, Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 1128-1147.
- [48] Ritz, A. & Waldner, C. (2011) 'Competing for Future Leaders A Study of Attractiveness of Public Sector Organizations to Potential Job Applicants', *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 291-316.
- [49] Ritz, A., Brewer, G.A. and Neumann, O. (2016) 'Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 76 No. 6, pp. 414-426.
- [50] Ritz, A., Schott, C., Neumann, O. and Baertschi, M. (2019), 'Public service motivation, prosocial motivation altruism and prosocial behavior: Towards disentanglement and conceptual clarity', *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 42 No. 14, pp. 1200-1211.
- [51] Steen, T. (2006) 'Public Sector Motivation: Is There Something to Learn From the Study of Volunteerism?', *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 49-62.
- [52] Schwartz, S. H., Ciecuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O. and Konty, M. (2012)

- ‘Refining the theory of basic individual values’, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 103 No. 4, pp. 663-688.
- [53] Vandenberghe, W., Depré, R., Hondeghem, A., & Yan, S. (2004). The motivational patterns of civil servants. *Viesoji Politika Ir Administravimas*, Vol. 13, pp. 52–63.
- [54] Vandenberghe, W. and Van der Walle, S. (2008) ‘International Differences in Public Service Motivation: Comparing Regions across the World’, in Perry, L.J. and Hondeghem, A. (Eds.), *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, Oxford University Press, Oxford,, pp. 223–44.
- [55] Vandenberghe, W. (2008) ‘Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry’s Measurement Instrument’, *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 143–167
- [56] Vandenberghe, W (2010) ‘Who wants to deliver public service? Do institutional antecedents of public service motivation provide an answer?’, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 87 – 107.
- [57] Vandenberghe, W., Ritz, A. and Neumann, O. (2018) ‘Public Service Motivation; state of the art and conceptual cleanup, in Ongaro E. and Van Thiel S. (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*.
- [58] Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.E., Lipsanen, J. and Helkama, K. (2009) ‘European norms and equations for a two dimensional presentation of values as measured with Schwartz’s 21-item portrait values questionnaire’, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 780-792.
- [59] Ward, K. D. (2014) ‘Cultivating Public Service Motivation through AmeriCorps Service: A Longitudinal Study’, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 114–25.
- [60] Weske, U. and Schott, C. (2016) ‘What Motivates Different Groups of Public Employees Working for Dutch Municipalities? Combining Autonomous and Controlled Types of Motivation’, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 415-430.
- [61] Witteloostuijn, A., Esteve, M. and Boyne, G. (2017) ‘Public Sector Motivation ad fonts: Personality Traits as Antecedents of the Motivation to Serve the Public Interest’, *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory*, Vol. 27 No.1, pp. 20-35.

Appendix 1

Below the dataset information used to construct the most important variable of interest.

a) What type of organization work/worked -PUBLIC

Central or local government	Public
Other public sector (such as education)	Public
A state-owned enterprise	Public
A private firm	Private
Self-employed	Private

b) Important to be rich, have money and expensive things-IMPORTANT TO BE RICH

Very much like me	Important to be rich
Like me	Important to be rich
Somewhat like me	Important to be rich
A little like me	No Important to be rich
Not like me	No Important to be rich
Not like me at all	No Important to be rich

c) Important to help people and care for others well-being-IMPORTANT TO HELP

Very much like me	Important to help
Like me	Important to help
Somewhat like me	Important to help
A little like me	No Important to help
Not like me	No Important to help
Not like me at all	No Important to help