

Public Service Motivation and Individual Job Performance

Adrian Ritz, Wouter Vandenabeele, and Dominik Vogel

14.1 Introduction

At the center of government, in public administration, the individual and their contribution to service for society are at the heart of the “public performance engine.” At this micro-level of the organization, it is important to understand employees’ motivation and the fit of an employee and their job as these factors contribute to service performance as well as to employee outcomes such as satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, or organizational commitment (Sayed et al. 2015).

There are several practical reasons for the relevance of motivation and specifically public service motivation (PSM) in public service performance. First, with an average of around 20 percent of total employment in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, public employment plays a substantial role in the economies around the globe. It is inconceivable that an unmotivated and unqualified public workforce would substantially contribute to effective government functions, such as firefighting, policing, air traffic control, the judicial system, or tax administration. Second, international reforms of public human resource management (HRM) show a move from career-based HR systems toward position-based HR systems, with the decentralization of certain HR practices (e.g. performance-related pay and flexible working time) and increasing performance monitoring (Brewer and Kellough 2016; Van der Meer et al. 2015). Thus, the expectations within the psychological contract between public employer and employee are shifting away from offering job security for individuals’ loyalty toward offering employability for individuals’ motivation and performance (see also Chapter 15). Third, the majority of government organizations reflect typical service organizations that are HR-intensive. The HR costs can easily climb to more than 50 percent of the total expenses of a public organization. Thus, knowing how to incentivize and manage individuals’ motivation to increase employee performance is highly relevant for public managers. Fourth, increased individual job performance through PSM may provide benefits for the organization as a whole (Brewer 2008).

Also, the effectiveness of extrinsic incentives in a public sector context is highly contested (Miller and Whitford 2007; Perry et al. 2009). Finally, demographic change increases labor market competition and makes it more and more difficult for public organizations to retain high-performing individuals through monetary rewards alone. Therefore, public employers need to develop HR strategies that facilitate the careful recruitment, promotion, and retention of high-performing individuals not driven primarily by extrinsic motives. It is assumed that PSM is a major element in the motivational structure of such individuals (Perry and Wise 1990).

Therefore, this chapter discusses the role of public employees' motivation and its relationship to individual performance. Individual performance is related to organizational performance, but the strength of this relationship is unclear because many other variables arguably have an impact (Brewer 2010). More specifically, we look into the relationship between individual motivation and performance by focusing on PSM, drawing on a stream of research developed over the last three decades stressing the service orientation of public employees' identity. We discuss the relevance of the topic and explain the most important questions that need to be addressed. Section 14.4 provides an overview of the existing empirical evidence concerning the relationship between PSM and individual performance. Section 14.5 offers reflections on meta-science as a specific set of methodological strategies for future research on the relationship between PSM and job performance. Finally, Section 14.6 summarizes the findings of the literature review and proposes some future research avenues.

14.2 Open Questions on the PSM–Job Performance Link

In their seminal article, Perry and Wise (1990) claimed that PSM is positively related to individual performance. A synthesis over the past thirty years of PSM research showed that the majority of empirical studies report a positive relationship between those two variables (Ritz and Petrovsky 2014; Ritz et al. 2016). Thus, most research assumes that PSM is highly relevant to the performance of individuals. Nevertheless, there remain many open questions on the PSM–performance link. First, and of particular interest, is the clarification of *direct and indirect links* between PSM and individual performance. Against the backdrop of institutional theory, the fit between employee and environment can act as a mediator or moderator (Bright 2007; Vandenabeele 2007; Van Loon 2015). However, when looking at this relationship from the theory of motivation, a direct link between PSM and individuals' performance can also be assumed (Grant 2008). Thus, the PSM–performance link is *context-dependent* (Vandenabeele et al. 2018; Van Loon et al. 2013). In certain contexts (e.g. task environment characterized by public values and organizations with public ownership and mission), the relationship might be stronger than in other contexts (e.g. private sector work without public purpose).

Second, we need to know more about the *types of individual performance* outcomes to which PSM relates. The heterogeneity across studies regarding the conceptualizations of performance is immense. Individual performance is measured for the most part in terms of some sort of job performance (e.g. supervisor ratings of individuals' job performance, self-assessed performance, subjective willingness to exert effort, number of publications, or number of certain tasks fulfilled). However, to date, it has not been possible to accumulate knowledge that would facilitate a better understanding of which dimensions or types of individual performance (e.g. in-role and extra-role performance and performance directed toward individuals or society) are linked primarily to PSM and which are not (Vandenabeele et al. 2018). That said, we need at least to differentiate between *subjective and objective measures* of individual performance (Brewer 2006; Ritz and Petrovsky 2014). Against the backdrop of the first question, we also need to differentiate between *contextualized and decontextualized measures* of performance.

Third, do we actually know *how strong the effect of PSM* on performance is? It is relevant for future research to know more about the relevance of PSM in explaining individual performance. This allows further investigation of how much variance of individual performance is explained by PSM when compared to other types of motivation and correlates, such as self-determined motivation, commitment, prosocial motivation, and job satisfaction (Breugh et al. 2017; Ritz et al. 2020; Schott et al. 2019).

In the following sections, we will answer these questions by theoretically reflecting upon the PSM–performance relationship and by analyzing thirty-eight empirical studies which deal with this relationship.

14.3 Theoretical Reflections on the Link between PSM and Individual Performance

From a theoretical perspective, the relationship between PSM and individual performance follows two major theoretical approaches: (1) motivation theories; and (2) institutional theory and person–environment fit theory (see Chapters 4 and 12). Both offer well-grounded propositions on the underlying processes.

Most motivation theories show that different incentives have a distinct impact on employee motivation and performance. Whereas intrinsic motivation is based on rewards such as the activity itself, the source of extrinsic motivation is external rewards (e.g. money or threats) (Cameron and Pierce 2002). From the perspective of self-determination theory, extrinsic motivation can be increased in work situations by offering external rewards, resulting in more positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (Deci and Ryan 1985). PSM can be understood as a eudaemonic form of certain outcome-directed and future-directed employee motives based on identified goals that act upon external rewards and result in increased autonomous work motivation to perform (Ritz 2009) and as intrinsic motivation to a lesser extent (Vandenabeele and Breugh forthcoming). However, this does not mean that only

PSM can activate individuals' performance. Extrinsic, enjoyment-based intrinsic, and prosocial intrinsic motivations complement one another where the behavioral motivation of individuals in a particular situation is concerned (Andersen et al. 2018; Neumann and Ritz 2015).

The institutional context and the objective, as well as the perceived fit between characteristics, such as demands, abilities, needs, supplies, values, and goals of an individual and the work environment, influence the PSM and performance relationship by defining structures and rules through norm and value-shaping communication and expectations that interact with individuals' attitudes and job performance (Perry 2000; Perry and Vandenberghe 2008; Van Loon 2015; see also Chapter 4). The fit can exist at various levels (e.g. environment, organization, and job) and results from recruitment and selection, as well as from socialization and adaptation over time (Kjeldsen and Jacobsen 2013). Thus, theory suggests that the higher the fit between an individual's PSM and the institutional environment, the higher the individual performance resulting from that motivation.

Both lines of theory need to be considered when developing a general framework within which to analyze the relationship between PSM and individual performance. Many different variables come into play, and context seems to be important. We begin our reflection with the following function:

$$\text{Individual performance} = f(\text{individual characteristics, environmental characteristics})$$

This function is a substantial improvement compared to earlier formulations such as that of Maier (1958), who included motivation and individual ability but ignored context. Nevertheless, in our function, PSM serves as only one of the individual characteristics, next to general personality (Barrick and Mount 1991), other forms of motivation, and more importantly, cognitive and other skills (Antonakis 2004; Wright et al. 1995). Similarly, "environmental characteristics" is also a catchphrase for multiple characteristics, which may include resources provided by the environment (Rainey and Steinbauer 1999) but also characteristics at various institutional levels such as job, co-worker, or leadership attributes (Kristof-Brown et al. 2005).

However, the advantage of analyzing performance by means of a function with a set of broad variables is that variables can be controlled for or kept constant (*ceteris paribus*). This enables direct effects to be distinguished from indirect effects, where the former refers to effects stemming from individual characteristics and the latter to environmental conditions or interaction effects between the individual and a given environment.

With regard to PSM, the *direct effects* influencing performance for the most part derive from the regulation of motivation, as conceived in self-determination theory (SDT). As opposed to earlier motivational theories, such as motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg 1966), the typology of motivations developed in SDT states that motivation can be on a continuum rather than a dichotomy (such as intrinsic vs. extrinsic types of motivation). Despite the observation that there are dichotomies—such as the

distinction between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, or more importantly in SDT, the distinction between controlled or autonomous motivation—motivation is situated on a continuum depending on the degree present (Deci and Ryan 2004). The continuum ranges from amotivation (not being motivated to self-regulate one's behavior), through external regulation (obtaining a reward or avoiding a punishment), introjection (for reasons of guilt or honor), identification (regulation because it is an important element of one's identity), and integration (multiple identities which are aligned) to intrinsic motivation (doing something because you enjoy it). The stronger a motivation is internalized, the more it belongs to the core of oneself, with intrinsic motivation being the prime example of fully internalized motivation. This, in turn, influences outcomes in terms of strength and duration of the effects, for example, in terms of performance (Gagné and Deci 2005). Given that PSM is mostly a type of autonomous motivation—identified and to a lesser extent intrinsic (Vandenabeele and Breugh forthcoming)—the outcomes are expected to be relatively long-lasting and stronger. However, in instances in which PSM is regulated along controlled lines—e.g. in terms of social desirability (Kim and Kim 2016)—the effect is expected to be less persistent and weaker.

Given our function stated earlier, these effects will largely depend on the environment, which will mitigate or strengthen the outcome of PSM on performance as the direct effects will be observed in a pure form only when all other factors are controlled for. Therefore, it is important to address the impact of the environment on this relationship. With regard to the *indirect effects* of PSM on performance, it is mainly institutional theory and person–environment fit theory that inform theoretical reflection on the relationship between PSM and performance.

With institutions being a “formal or informal, structural, societal or political phenomenon that transcends the individual level, that is based on more or less common values, has a certain degree of stability and influences behavior” (Peters 2000, 18), institutional theory comprises a broad array of possible guises, either at micro, meso, or macro levels of structured interactions. Micro-level institutions have a limited number of members who have substantial direct interaction to create an institutional identity, whereas meso- and macro-level institutions have less direct interaction (Vandenabeele et al. 2014). What they have in common is that they have a certain logic of appropriateness of behavior that makes sense within the boundaries of a given institution, making this behavior more likely to occur in that particular setting. According to Perry and Vandenabeele (2008), in an institutional approach to PSM, identity is an important variable. What researchers measure as PSM (Giauque et al. 2011; Kim et al. 2013; Perry 1996; Vandenabeele 2008) is mostly a set of self-descriptive statements which refer to an individual digestion of societal and public values. These provide a partial answer to the question, “Who am I?,” making them very similar to what actually constitutes an identity—a generalized institutional identity that is based on public service values. In an institutional environment that emphasizes and rewards the values upon which this identity is grounded, these values and the associated identity will be the driving force behind performance.

This insight meshes well with findings based on person–environment fit theory (Kristof-Brown et al. 2005), which states that fit between the individual and their environment fosters motivation in this environment. The observation that there are various levels at which fit occurs only strengthens its ties with institutional theory, since a job, a set of structural relationships within a team or with a supervisor, or an organization as a whole—which represent the most commonly found types of person–environment fit—all represent different types of institutions. In particular, the (supplementary) fit based on the congruence of goals or values matches with the institutional perspective. The complementary fit perspective, in which an environment supplies what is needed by the individual or when an individual provides abilities demanded by the environment, matches less with this perspective (individual abilities do not refer to values). Only insofar as an identity provides what is needed by an organization (e.g. that it provides a pool of anticipatory members who already have a matching identity, and the institution does not, therefore, need to provide institutional training, such as a school hiring teachers) is a needs–supplies perspective useful for explaining the relationship between PSM and individual performance.

Analyzing the relationship described above from an institutional perspective means that what performance is also depends on the institutional context. Although there are general conceptions of what performance entails, be it role-based performance (in-role vs. extra-role performance), the value-component of performance is never far away. As mentioned earlier, Van Loon (2016) demonstrated that various types of performance are differently related to PSM depending on the type of organization. After all, the logic of appropriateness determines what is appropriate as performance and what is not. Teachers helping children with personal and non-education-related issues may or may not be considered as performance depending on what is institutionally appropriate. To the extent that performance is focused on providing public service and to the extent that this is apparent from how performance is conceptualized, the link between PSM and performance will be stronger.

For the purposes of this chapter, we will translate our performance function to make it case-specific in terms of PSM. Therefore,

$$\text{Individual performance} = f(\text{individual characteristics, environmental characteristics})$$

would become

$$\text{Individual public service performance} = f(\text{PSM, institutional characteristics})$$

In this function, the nature of the institution provides the context in which the process is enacted. Performance is contextualized to what is appropriate for a (specific) institution based on public service values. Similarly, PSM is a contextualized individual characteristic in two ways. First, it refers to the identity that is based on general values of public service. Next to this, it may possibly be an idiosyncratic operationalization of a general identity (Van Loon et al. 2013), distinguishing, for

example, between the PSM of teachers versus policemen versus nurses or civil servants. All of these categories of public employees provide public service, but they have their own conception of what this actually entails. Depending on the degree of internalization of this PSM or the degree to which it is an autonomous part of their self-conception, there will or will not be a link with performance. Apart from the direct effect, the interaction with the institution, and the key values of the institution, the effect will be enhanced or decreased.

14.4 Empirical Evidence

In the next step, we review the empirical research on the relationship between PSM and individual performance to assess what is already known about the direct or indirect nature of the effect, the type of performance that is affected by PSM, and how strong the effect is. In doing so, we extend previous reviews by Ritz et al. (2016) as well as Ritz and Petrovsky (2014) and present an encompassing and systematic review of all relevant studies investigating the relationship, published from 1990 to 2017. We included thirty-eight studies on the effect of PSM on individual performance. The reviewed studies are listed in Table A14.1 (see online Appendix¹). Table A14.1 also details what kind of performance the studies used, how they measured it, if a direct and/or indirect effect of PSM on performance was identified, and how pronounced the effect is.

14.4.1 Direct or Indirect Effect

In their 2016 review, Ritz et al. assessed twenty-six studies researching the relationship between PSM and individual performance. They concluded that only fifteen of the studies reviewed found a positive direct relationship, whereas eleven studies found mixed or no associations (Ritz et al. 2016). If we look at the overview in Table A14.1 (see online Appendix), we can draw a more positive conclusion. Of the thirty-eight reviewed studies, twenty-three find supporting evidence for a direct effect, nine find mixed effects, four studies did not find a significant effect, and no study reports a significant negative relationship. In the studies that find mixed evidence, either only a subset of the PSM dimensions is positively related to individual performance (Cheng 2015; Palma et al. 2017; Vandenabeele 2009) or PSM affects only some performance indicators (Alonso and Lewis 2001; Van Loon 2016). We nevertheless conclude that the empirical foundation for a direct effect of PSM on individual performance is convincing.

Furthermore, we are interested in establishing whether there are additional indirect effects or if direct effects even vanish if indirect effects are analyzed. Unfortunately,

¹ The online appendix is available at <http://www.oup.co.uk/companion/managingforpublicservice>.

a significant portion of the studies did not test for additional indirect effects. Nevertheless, eighteen studies did so, providing us with some insights on possible moderators and mediators.

First, we do not find evidence that a direct effect of PSM on individual performance disappears if studies test for mediating or moderating effects. The studies also testing indirect effects do not report more insignificant direct effects than the studies that test only for direct effects.

The most frequently tested indirect effect of PSM on individual performance is a moderating effect of transformational leadership. Four studies investigated whether a transformational leadership style of the supervisor strengthens the effect of PSM on individual performance. However, the results are inconclusive. Park and Rainey (2008) confirm that the effect of PSM on performance increases when employees have a transformational leader. Bellé (2014) confirms this in a field experiment. Caillier (2014), however, does not find a significant moderation effect in his study that is based on a convenience sample. In an even more contradictory finding, Bottomley et al. (2016) indicate that PSM reduces the positive effect of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Another common assumption in favor of an indirect effect of PSM on individual performance is the fit an employee perceives between themselves and their organization (person–organization fit, P–O fit) or their job (person–job fit, P–J fit). It is assumed that PSM has a stronger effect if employees see a fit with their organization and job (moderating effect), that a high level of PSM leads to a better fit with the organization and job, and that a better fit increases individual performance (mediation effect). As with transformational leadership, the empirical evidence is mixed. The two studies (Koumenta 2015; Leisink and Steijn 2009) considering P–O fit as a moderator of the PSM–performance relationship find evidence in favor of the effect. Meanwhile, the mediation analyses in four additional studies reveal mixed evidence. While Gould-Williams et al. (2015) find support for a partial mediation of P–O fit on OCB, Bright (2007), Jin et al. (2018), and Van Loon et al. (2017) find no evidence for a mediation effect of P–O fit on individual performance, extra-role performance, or OCB. However, Van Loon et al. (2017) find a mediating effect of P–J fit on extra-role performance. Two additional articles survey a related indirect effect. They assume that PSM increases organizational commitment, which, in turn, increases individual performance. Again, the evidence for such an indirect effect is mixed. Vandenberghe (2009) finds such an effect, but Jin et al. (2018) cannot confirm it.

In addition to these four indirect effects (transformational leadership, P–O fit, P–J fit, and organizational commitment), we found eight studies investigating additional indirect effects. However, each effect is investigated only once. The results are displayed in Table A14.1.

In summary, we conclude that while the evidence for a direct effect of PSM on individual performance is convincing, we do not see any clear evidence of indirect effects. None of the potential moderators or mediators were found to have an effect in multiple studies without being questioned by other studies.

14.4.2 Type of Performance

Most of the studies reviewed do not further specify what kind of performance they are interested in and leave it to the participants or their supervisors to define performance. There are, however, some exceptions. Park and Rainey (2007; 2008), for example, used the US Merit Principles Survey, which asks participants for a self-assessment of their productivity and quality of work. Quality was also a focus of the study by Levitats and Vigoda-Gadot (2017), who assessed performance using the SERVQUAL instrument. Van Loon (2016) explicitly tested whether PSM affects different types of performance differently. Assessing four types of performance (output, service outcome, responsiveness, and democratic outcome), she found that PSM positively affects all four performance types for “people-changing” organizations but only service outcome and democratic outcome in the case of “people-processing” organizations. This indicates that the effects of PSM depend on the type of performance analyzed and the institutional context. Furthermore, two experimental studies used specific aspects of performance to assess the direct effect of PSM on performance. In a laboratory experiment, Resh et al. (2018) used persistence as their performance measure of interest. They found that participants with high self-sacrifices are more persistent at a voluntarily repeated reaction time task than others. Pedersen (2015) found that PSM increases students’ willingness to spend time on an additional survey and used this time expenditure willingness as a measure of performance.

In four additional studies, the authors focus more specifically on certain types of performance by distinguishing between in-role and extra-role performance. It can be assumed that in-role behavior is what most of the other studies measure when they ask participants about their overall performance. As Van Loon et al. (2017) point out, in-role performance refers to the activities that are required for a specific task. In-role performance is high when an employee meets the standards that are associated with their role (Williams and Anderson 1991). As previously pointed out by Katz (1964), for an organization to be successful, it is not sufficient if its members do only what is required in their specific role. To be successful, employees have to take on responsibility beyond their role, for example, by helping their colleagues or engaging in other activities that are beneficial to the organization. This is what is called extra-role behavior or extra-role performance. Overall, three of the four studies confirm a positive direct effect of PSM on extra-role performance (Caillier 2015; 2016; Van Loon et al. 2017), while one does not find any such effect (Wright et al. 2017).

Eight additional studies examined a construct that is strongly related to extra-role performance: organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Like extra-role behavior, OCB captures behavior that is beneficial to the organization but not directly rewarded (Organ 2016). A substantial majority of seven studies found that PSM increases employees’ OCB. Cun (2012) details this finding by analyzing the dimensions of PSM separately. Doing so, he finds support only for a positive effect of

attraction to public policy-making and commitment to public interest, while the combined dimension of compassion and self-sacrifice is not related to OCB.

Overall, it is challenging to state whether PSM affects different types of performance in different ways. However, compared to specific performance measures, we see much more variance in the results when the studies do not further specify the kind of performance in which they are interested. While we found eleven studies with non-specific performance measures in favor of a direct effect on individual performance, there are also five studies with mixed results and five that did not find any direct effect. In contrast, the results of effects on extra-role performance and OCB are much clearer, with ten studies supporting a direct effect and only one with mixed results and one without any effect.

14.4.3 Measurement of Performance

The most common way to measure performance is to directly ask employees about their self-perception. Overall, twenty-eight of the thirty-eight studies summarized in Table A14.1 (see online Appendix) choose this approach. There are, however, two groups of studies that differ from this “standard approach.” The first uses performance data from an external source. In this context, it is quite remarkable that both Schwarz et al. (2016) and Wright et al. (2017) are the only researchers conducting studies that ask supervisors to assess the performance of their subordinates and combine this performance measure with employees’ own assessment of their PSM.² They conclude that PSM has a positive direct effect on performance as indicated by supervisor ratings.

Various Danish researchers have made another attempt to make performance measures more valid using external data. They use the register data of performance measures and combine them with employees’ self-assessed PSM. Andersen and Serritzlew (2012) operationalize the performance of physiotherapists as the proportion of time they spent on difficult cases or types of treatment, but find only one of three tested direct effects of commitment to public interest on this performance measure to be significant. Andersen et al. (2014; 2015) and Lynggaard et al. (2018) focus on school teachers and draw on students’ exam marks as a measure of teacher performance. Two studies (Andersen et al. 2014; 2015) find a positive direct effect of PSM on performance. Lynggaard et al. (2018), however, do not confirm such an effect. Instead, they argue that the effect of commitment to public interest on performance is contingent on teachers’ work autonomy and user capacity.

With the increasing popularity of experimental designs in public administration (Grimmelikhuijsen et al. 2017), a stream of research has developed on performance effects of PSM that uses such an approach. We found five such studies. The first one

² The difficulties associated with the collection of such clustered data might explain its infrequent use (Vogel 2018).

to use experiments to assess the effect of PSM on individual performance was Bellé (2013; 2014). In his field experiments with nurses in Italian public hospitals, he observed participants' involvement in a developmental aid project in which they voluntarily assembled surgical kits for shipment to a former war zone. One study (Bellé 2013) used persistence, output, productivity, and vigilance concerning the assembly of surgical kits, and the other (Bellé 2014) only the output in the form of the number of assembled kits. The experiments confirm a positive effect of PSM on objective performance (Bellé 2013). Furthermore, PSM strengthens the positive effect of transformational leadership on performance (Bellé 2014). Resh et al. (2018) take a different approach. In a laboratory experiment, they used persistence as their performance measure of interest. They find that participants with high levels of self-sacrifice are more persistent at a voluntarily repeated reaction time task than others.

Finally, two articles can be added to our review of experimental approaches to the PSM–performance effect. Both use hypothetical scenarios. Bellé and Cantarelli (2015) asked Italian government employees about their current work effort, randomly assigned them to a vignette describing a task and a bonus the government pays for that task, and subsequently surveyed the participants on the effort they would invest into this task. The experimental manipulation was carried out by altering the amount of the bonus promised in the hypothetical scenario. Unfortunately, the study does not report the direct effect of PSM on work effort. However, it shows that the effect of the size of the bonus is not dependent on participants' PSM. Pedersen (2015) also designed a hypothetical scenario to test the performance effects of PSM. He asked students to fill in a survey assessing PSM, among other things. At the end of the survey, participants were asked how much time they would be willing to spend on another survey that would be conducted in the future. The reason they might be asked to participate again was varied between groups. Some got a PSM-related reason, some an extrinsic motivation-related reason, and some did not get a reason. Pedersen shows that those with a PSM reasoning are willing to spend significantly more time on an additional survey than others. He also shows that this effect is even stronger if participants have a high PSM.

14.4.4 Size of the Effect

So far, we have only discussed whether there is any effect of PSM on individual performance. We concluded that the evidence is generally in favor of such an effect. Additionally, we wanted to assess how much PSM contributes to individuals' performance. Therefore, we reviewed the literature with regard to the reported effect sizes and summarized the results in Table A14.1 (see online Appendix). As the reviewed studies use a variety of different statistical methods, we collected standardized effect sizes or calculated them from the reported statistics if no standardized effects were reported. Afterwards, we used common categorizations of effect sizes to give a verbal expression of the size of the effects. The categories are no effect, small

effect, medium effect, and large effect. A small effect is equal to a correlation of Pearson's $r = 0.1-0.3$, a medium effect to $r = 0.3-0.5$, and a large effect to 0.5 and higher (Cohen 1988). The details of these categories are reported in Table A14.1.

Of the reviewed studies, six report effect sizes that have to be categorized as no effect. Five studies find a mix of no and small effects, fifteen studies find small effects, and one a mix of small and medium effects. Six studies find medium effects, and two additional studies find large effects. Considering that many studies test more than one effect, we can further differentiate. Of the seventy-one tested effects, twenty-three have to be categorized as no effect. Thirty-four additional effects can be categorized as small effects. Thirteen effects are of medium size, and three are large.

Overall, the direct effects of PSM on individual performance have to be considered as relatively small. This is, however, not particularly surprising as performance is a highly complex construct, and it cannot be assumed that a single factor will explain a large amount of the variance between employees.

14.4.5 Summary of Empirical Evidence

So what do we learn from the literature on the effect of PSM on individual performance? Keep in mind our theoretical function, which is:

$$\text{individual institutional public service performance} = f(\text{PSM, institutional environmental characteristics})$$

If we simply count all the reviewed studies that support a positive effect of PSM, we can conclude that twenty-five studies are in favor of a direct or indirect effect, and six studies partially support it. Whereas thirty-six studies analyze a direct relationship, twenty-two studies confirm the positive link between PSM and individual performance. Only six studies do not find any direct effect.

Eighteen studies investigate the indirect link and include contextual effects. As PSM is a kind of generalized institutional identity that is based on public service values, an environment that emphasizes and rewards these values will interact with individuals' motives and drive performance. In our overview of empirical studies, a few moderators and mediators seem to be relevant: transformational leadership, person-organization fit, person-job fit, mission valence, public service orientation of the organization, type of organization (people-processing vs people-changing), work autonomy, emotional intelligence, and user capacity. Most of these concepts represent value-loaded phenomena and add some supportive evidence that the logic of appropriateness of behaviors guided by institutional values at the macro-level (e.g. mission valence), meso-level (e.g. organizational orientation), and micro-level (e.g. supervisor) drive individual performance. However, either these moderators have been tested only once or the evidence for their effect is inconclusive (transformational leadership, person-organization fit).

Against the backdrop of our second question about the type of performance measures, we ought not simply to treat all studies as equal evidence for the PSM–performance relationship but also take their rigor and design into account. The majority of empirical work on this subject is based on public employees’ self-assessment of their performance. Although researchers have tried to improve the validity of such measures by asking about specific elements of performance, supervisor ratings, or performance compared to team members, subjective performance is problematic. Extensive psychological research shows that people are limited in their ability to assess their behavior correctly and often overestimate positive aspects, such as performance. Andersen et al. (2015) demonstrate that public employees overestimate their performance and that the effects of explanatory variables are much stronger when they come from the same data source (i.e. self-assessment). This is also the case for PSM. Therefore, we have to assume that studies using operationalizations of performance other than self-assessment provide a more accurate test of the PSM–performance relationship. We found nine such studies published over the last six years. They either use register data, such as students’ exam marks, supervisor assessments, or objective measures in an experimental context (e.g. number of assembled surgical kits and persistence in reaction time task). Five of those studies find support for a positive direct effect of PSM on performance, while three do not confirm such an effect.³ The body of evidence, therefore, seems to be slightly in favor of a PSM–performance effect. However, five to three is not a very convincing outcome.

Interestingly, of the studies using an objective measure of performance, especially those that use a limited assessment of PSM are the ones that do not confirm a positive effect of PSM on individual performance. Two of them (Andersen and Serritzlew 2012; Lynggaard et al. 2018) study only commitment to public interest and one (Wright et al. 2017) a combination of commitment to public interest and compassion. This brings us to the question of whether it is PSM in its full combination of four dimensions that has a positive effect on performance or whether specific dimensions drive this effect (see also Brewer 2010). The body of evidence we currently have does not allow for any conclusion on this question. We reviewed seventeen studies that used all four PSM dimensions. Twelve neglected attraction to public policy-making. Two studies used only two dimensions and five only a single dimension (mainly commitment to public interest). Only three studies tested the effects of the PSM dimensions separately. Even with the limited number of three studies separately analyzing the effect of the PSM dimension, all three come to different conclusions. Cheng (2015) found a positive effect of attraction to public policy-making and compassion. Cun (2012) only confirms the effect of attraction to public policy-making but finds an additional effect of commitment to public interest. Finally, Palma et al. (2017) report a positive effect of commitment to public interest and self-sacrifice. Hence, further research is required on the effects of the

³ One study, (Bellé 2014), does not report the direct effect of PSM on performance.

respective PSM dimensions. This could also be carried out by reanalyzing the data of studies that have already been published.

However, it should be noted that the variety of PSM measures used to test whether PSM affects individual performance is quite staggering. We found twenty-five different measures of PSM in a set of thirty-seven studies. Only six item sets were used more than once. In four of those six cases, this can be observed because the same authors published multiple studies or multiple studies were based on the same dataset. Without an extensive assessment of the validity of all these different measures of PSM, it is difficult to conclude whether measurement issues play a role in the mixed evidence on the PSM–performance relationship. We assume that the variety of PSM measures reflects the length and therefore limitation of the two validated PSM measures (Kim et al. 2013; Perry 1996). As such, we strongly recommend the development of a comprehensive and validated measurement scale for PSM (Vandenabeele and Penning de Vries 2016).

To summarize, one can conclude that there is ample evidence for some positive relationship between PSM and performance. However, this is by no means a perfect relationship.

14.5 Methodological Strategies to Improve Future Research

Despite the substantial attention in terms of time, energy, and other resources that have been devoted to the study of the relationship between PSM and individual performance, the scientific evidence is not entirely convincing. Although our literature review shows that the majority of empirical findings point to a positive relationship, the relationship between the two core concepts has not been compellingly or undeniably demonstrated. To assess the causal value of our function, a number of strategies should be pursued. Below, we will elaborate on a few of the methodological approaches we think may contribute to better development of the causal analysis. Evidently, this is first and foremost oriented toward the field of PSM and performance. However, the strategies outlined below may also serve to facilitate improved causal analysis in other fields.

First, an important strategy is to fully appreciate the formulation as a performance function. Earlier, we stated that one advantage of this function is that parts of it can be investigated under the *ceteris paribus* assumption. However, this means that when carrying out this kind of research, one needs to live up to this assumption by actually controlling for all other things. Given that the majority of studies, in particular the earlier studies, rely on cross-sectional data, one should control for all other possible factors in order to assess an effect. This fictional requirement stamps all these studies with the label “plausible at best.” To test for causality, the gold standard is the experimental design. This has recently also been advocated by scholars identifying “behavioral public administration” (Grimmelikhuijsen et al. 2017) as a strategy to further the field of public administration as a science. In such well-conducted

experiments, everything apart from the treatment would be controlled for so that differences in outcomes can be attributed only to the treatment. Transposing this to our domain, this would require PSM to be manipulated randomly in order to keep other influences constant.

Despite some studies claiming to have manipulated PSM (Bellé 2013 and Christensen and Wright 2018 would be the prime examples of such a study) or to have reminded employees of their associated impact (Vogel and Willems 2020), one can readily question experiments' ability to actually manipulate PSM, given its multiple assumed antecedents (Perry 1997; Vandenabeele 2011) and its relative observed stability over time (Vogel and Kroll 2016). Moreover, not all settings lend themselves to experimental designs, ethically or for other reasons. In such cases, all other (observational) techniques that do not address the issue of endogeneity—due to common method bias or other causes—are useless for testing causality (Antonakis et al. 2010). Therefore, a valid non-experimental alternative would be a two-stage-least-squares (2SLS) approach, in which instrumental variables are identified to correct for the endogeneity. Such an instrumental variable is not correlated to the dependent variable in the model but to the independent one.

When using the instrumental variable approach of 2SLS, these instrumental variables are used to provide a proxy estimate of the independent variable that is not affected by endogeneity (as it is uncorrelated to the dependent variable). Any correlation between this proxy estimate and the dependent variables is, therefore, a “true” correlation. Combining this with the well-argued time order in which cause clearly precedes effect (e.g. by means of longitudinal data) changes the label on such studies from “plausible at best” to “likely causal.”

However, one should also be aware of the phrase “well-conducted experiment” and extend it to “well-conducted research.” Epidemiological work by Ioannidis (2005) states that in all likelihood, half of the studies conducted, if not more, are false due to the way in which science operates (the problem is that we do not know which half is false). This has been illustrated by the “replication project” (Open Science Collaboration 2015) in which only 37 percent of ninety-nine studies conducted were replicated. An experiment is therefore not a guarantee for true knowledge. To account for this, we need meta-science strategies to counter this effect. The most common strategy would be meta-analysis, in which the results of multiple studies are combined to assess an actual relationship, mitigating possible outliers (Ringquist 2013). This would even facilitate the discovery of possible moderators that have not been included in the actual studies. The Achilles' heel of any such approach is, however, the number of studies available. Another strategy would be actual replication of studies by means of new data (Walker et al. 2018) collected in a different study, preferably multiple independent studies (the so-called Many Labs approach) (Klein et al. 2014). However, this would require a concerted effort by multiple teams to devote their scarce resources to a project that would create limited individual exposure. In such an effort, rewards for participating researchers should be well designed in order to fit within the general institution of science.

A final strategy to increase the validity of the findings concerns the more fine-grained analysis in which the direct effect is explained by mediating mechanisms. This would, for example, be a causal chain in which PSM influences perceived person–environment fit, in turn influencing performance. Furthermore, regarding what was said earlier about the use of non-experimental data to test for causal effects, mediation has its own problems that are not solved by applying experimental approaches (Bullock et al. 2010). Just as independent variables should be manipulated, so should mediators. More importantly, however, when developing models with multiple mediators (e.g. when replacing person–environment fit with person–organization and person–job fit), it should be argued how manipulations would affect only one of the mediators. Bullock et al. (2010) put forward a number of solutions; however, given that the subtitle of the article is “Don’t expect an easy answer,” this complicates the research substantially.

14.6 Conclusion

The performance of public organizations is essential for the legitimacy of a state. However, as shown in Chapter 2 of this volume, public service performance is multifaceted and relates to various stakeholder perspectives on which public value has to be achieved and which public values should be prioritized. In this chapter, we focus on the motivation of individual employees as a contribution to individual public service performance, and therefore, we exclude many other factors contributing to the performance of public organizations, including non-directly performance-related variables, such as turnover and absenteeism. However, the equation we used for our literature review:

$$\text{individual public service performance} = f(\text{PSM, institutional characteristics})$$

reflects how the link between individuals’ motivation and individual performance is dependent on institutions. For instance, public values are one of the fundamental building blocks of public institutions, and thus, institutions matter in regard to the performance outcomes of public service-motivated individuals (see also Chapter 4). This is supported by the two theoretical lenses (motivation theory and institutional theory) we used to explain the underlying processes.

Our literature review reveals that the majority of empirical findings point to a positive relationship between public service motivation and individual performance. The evidence is based on research designs that analyze direct and indirect relationships using a variety of interacting variables, types of performance variables, and methodological strategies, such as surveys or experiments. However, the variety of study designs, data used, and performance types studied raise questions regarding the generalization of these findings. Nevertheless, the literature review sheds more light on one of the three fundamental claims about public service motivation raised by Perry and Wise in their seminal article in 1990.

First, we learn that the relationship is highly context-dependent. Person–organization fit, mission valence, and transformational leadership are relevant intervening variables. Value congruence between an organization, its supervisors, and the individual employee exemplifies how institutional characteristics filter down to organizational actors. Leadership behavior, which supports such a complementary fit between the organizational environment and the individual, further strengthens the performance outcomes of public service motivation. Future research needs to clarify whether complementary fit alone acts as a moderating variable or if public service motivation is also needed as a supply for the organization (supplementary fit).

In addition, research differentiating between various types of fit and different performance outcomes is scarce, and more knowledge is required in order better to understand the role played by context when it comes to explaining individual performance through public service motivation. For instance, more knowledge is needed about the influence of structural disaggregation, outsourcing, and agencification on the relationship between PSM and individual performance. This also includes the analysis of environmental fit measuring changes in institutional context over time, as well as institutional (publicness) differences between sectors, nations, policy fields, and organizations and the effects thereof on performance outcomes (see also Chapter 4). Empirical studies point to transformational leadership as a moderator; at the same time, we also find studies using public service motivation as a moderator of the leadership–performance link. Both perspectives can be theoretically explained. However, future research needs to further investigate what exactly context characterized by public service motivation means and what role it plays in an organizational environment. Furthermore, our knowledge is very limited concerning the specifications of non-public environments interacting with the public service motivation–performance relationship.

Second, when looking at the type of performance measures used in empirical research, our literature review leads us to conclude that institutional context matters. Differences were found in research analyzing the relationships between public service motivation and various performance measures in different contexts. Furthermore, we also find contradictory findings between studies investigating the same type of performance (e.g. extra-role behavior) in different contexts. However, with the exception of experimental studies and the study by Van Loon (2015), there is a lack of studies using contextualized measures of performance. Task performance in one policy field may differ from that in another when examining the concrete public values determining performance in a specific context. Thus, we encourage researchers to move away from using rather general HR survey measures to analyze performance effects of public service motivation. We suggest instead investing more time in the contextualization of performance variables.

Furthermore, while positive findings of experimental studies on the link between public service motivation and individual performance are very consistent, empirical studies using external sources of performance, such as supervisor ratings or registered data, show rather mixed results. Against the backdrop of supervisory ratings, which are a widespread element of public personnel policies linking performance

with contingent pay, the underlying processes and impacts of such performance appraisals and their pay effects in relation to public service motivation need to be analyzed in more depth. Against the backdrop of a high variety of performance measures, we also need to question the relevance of the public service motivation–individual performance link because relationships of PSM with other non-directly performance-related variables, such as turnover and absenteeism could be of greater relevance when individual performance does not scale up to organizational performance. Thus, future research should also look at performance outcomes from a broader and more comparative perspective.

Third, and finally, we were interested in the strength of the relationship between public service motivation and individual performance. So far, we can conclude that the strength of correlations and effects measured is rather small. Giving due consideration to the fact that most models are not fully specified and empirical studies largely neglect correlates of public service motivation as explanatory variables, we can definitely conclude that individuals' performance depends to a larger extent on other factors (e.g. other types of motivations, personality characteristics, and cognitive and other skills), some of which may be more important than PSM.

Except for experimental studies, our knowledge is very limited when it comes to the relevance of public service motivation in comparison to other motivational and attitudinal variables predicting or relating to individual performance. For instance, job satisfaction is an antecedent of individual performance and is closely related to PSM (Homberg et al. 2015). However, from a content perspective, the two constructs are distinct and have different implications for leading employees in practice. Therefore, it is of great interest to find out which types of correlates (e.g. micro-level variables, such as controlled and self-determined motivation, meso-level variables, such as organizational commitment, or macro-level variables, such as societal value orientation) are more or less in competition with public service motivation and specific types of individual performance (see e.g. Breugh et al. 2017).

Future research will need to unravel those relationships in order to better assess the role played by public service motivation. With an increase in experimental studies, it will be worth systematically comparing results from experimental studies to the results from the majority of non-experimental studies to gauge the distortion caused by model specification error in the latter set of studies.

References

- Aloe, A. 2014. "An Empirical Investigation of Partial Effect Sizes in Meta-Analysis of Correlational Data." *The Journal of General Psychology* 141 (1): pp. 47–64.
- Alonso, P., and G. B. Lewis. 2001. "Public Service Motivation and Job Performance: Evidence from the Federal Sector." *American Review of Public Administration* 31 (4): pp. 363–80.
- Andersen, L. B., E. Heinesen, and L. H. Pedersen. 2014. "How Does Public Service Motivation among Teachers Affect Student Performance in Schools?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24 (3): pp. 651–71.

- Andersen, L. B., E. Heinesen, and L. H. Pedersen. 2015. "Individual Performance: From Common Source Bias to Institutionalized Assessment." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 26 (1): 63–78.
- Andersen, L. B., L. H. Pedersen, and O. H. Petersen. 2018. "Motivational Foundations of Public Service Provision: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis." *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 1 (4): pp. 283–98.
- Andersen, L. B., and S. Serritzlew. 2012. "Does Public Service Motivation Affect the Behavior of Professionals?" *International Journal of Public Administration* 35 (1): pp. 19–29.
- Antonakis, J. 2004. "Why 'Emotional Intelligence' Does Not Predict Leadership Effectiveness." *Organizational Analysis* 12 (2): pp. 171–82.
- Antonakis, J., S. Bendahan, P. Jacquart, and R. Lalive. 2010. "On Making Causal Claims: A Review and Recommendations." *Leadership Quarterly* 21 (6): pp. 1086–120.
- Barrick, M. R., and M. K. Mount. 1991. "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology* 44 (1): pp. 1–26.
- Bellé, N. 2013. "Experimental Evidence on the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Performance." *Public Administration Review* 73 (1): pp. 143–53.
- Bellé, N. 2014. "Leading to Make a Difference: A Field Experiment on the Performance Effects of Transformational Leadership, Perceived Social Impact, and Public Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24 (1): pp. 109–36.
- Bellé, N., and P. Cantarelli. 2015. "Monetary Incentives, Motivation, and Job Effort in the Public Sector: An Experimental Study with Italian Government Executives." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 35 (2): pp. 99–123.
- Bottomley, P., A. M. S. Mostafa, J. S. Gould-Williams, and F. León-Cázares. 2016. "The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: The Contingent Role of Public Service Motivation." *British Journal of Management* 27 (2): pp. 390–405.
- Breaugh, J., A. Ritz, and K. Alfes. 2017. "Work Motivation and Public Service Motivation: Disentangling Varieties of Motivation and Job Satisfaction." *Public Management Review* 20 (10): pp. 1423–43.
- Brewer, G. A. 2006. "All Measures of Performance Are Subjective: More Evidence on US Federal Agencies." In *Public Service Performance: Perspectives on Measurement and Management*, edited by G. A. Boyne, K. J. Meier, L. J. O'Toole, and R. M. Walker, pp. 35–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, G. A. 2008. "Employee and Organizational Performance." In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem, pp. 136–56. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brewer, G. A. 2010. "Public Service Motivation and Performance." In *Public Management and Performance*, edited by R. M. Walker, G. A. Boyne, and G. A. Brewer, pp. 152–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, G. A., and E. J. Kellough. 2016. "Administrative Values and Public Personnel Management: Reflections on Civil Service Reform." *Public Personnel Management* 45 (2): pp. 171–89.

- Bright, L. 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): pp. 361–79.
- Bullock, J. G., D. P. Green, and S. E. Ha. 2010. "Yes, but What's the Mechanism? (Don't Expect an Easy Answer)." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 98 (4): pp. 550–8.
- Caillier, J. G. 2014. "Toward a Better Understanding of the Relationship between Transformational Leadership, Public Service Motivation, Mission Valence, and Employee Performance: A Preliminary Study." *Public Personnel Management* 43 (2): pp. 218–39.
- Caillier, J. G. 2015. "Towards a Better Understanding of Public Service Motivation and Mission Valence in Public Agencies." *Public Management Review* 17 (9): pp. 1217–36.
- Caillier, J. G. 2016. "Does Public Service Motivation Mediate the Relationship between Goal Clarity and Both Organizational Commitment and Extra-Role Behaviours?" *Public Management Review* 18 (2): pp. 300–18.
- Cameron, J., and D. W. Pierce. 2002. *Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation: Resolving the Controversy*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Cheng, K.-T. 2015. "Public Service Motivation and Job Performance in Public Utilities." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 28 (4/5): pp. 352–70.
- Christensen, R. K., and B. E. Wright. 2018. "Public Service Motivation and Ethical Behavior: Evidence from Three Experiments." *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration* 1 (1). <https://doi.org/10.30636/jbpa.11.18>.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cun, X. 2012. "Public Service Motivation and Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Empirical Study Based on the Sample of Employees in Guangzhou Public Sectors." *Chinese Management Studies* 6 (2): pp. 330–40.
- Deci, E. L., and R. M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., and R. M. Ryan. 2004. *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Gagné, M., and E. L. Deci. 2005. "Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26 (4): pp. 331–62.
- Giauque, D., A. Ritz, F. Varone, S. Anderfuhren-Biget, and C. Waldner. 2011. "Putting Public Service Motivation into Context: A Balance between Universalism and Particularism." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 77 (2): pp. 227–53.
- Gould-Williams, J. S., A. Mostafa, and P. Bottomley. 2015. "Public Service Motivation and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Person–Organization Fit." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25 (2): pp. 597–622.
- Grant, A. M. 2008. "Does Intrinsic Motivation Fuel the Prosocial Fire? Motivational Synergy in Predicting Persistence, Performance, and Productivity." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93 (1): pp. 48–58.

- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., S. Jilke, A. L. Olsen, and L. G. Tummers. 2017. "Behavioral Public Administration: Combining Insights from Public Administration and Psychology." *Public Administration Review* 77 (1): pp. 45–56.
- Herzberg, F. 1966. *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland, OH: World Pub. Co.
- Homberg, F., D. McCarthy, and V. Tabvuma. 2015. "A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Satisfaction." *Public Administration Review* 75 (5): pp. 711–22.
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. 2005. "Why Most Published Research Findings Are False." *PLOS Medicine* 2 (8): pp. e124.
- Jin, M. H., B. McDonald, and J. Park. 2018. "Does Public Service Motivation Matter in Public Higher Education? Testing the Theories of Person–Organization Fit and Organizational Commitment through a Serial Multiple Mediation Model." *American Review of Public Administration* 48 (1): pp. 82–97.
- Katz, D. 1964. "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior." *Behavioral Science* 9 (2): pp. 131–46.
- Kim, S. H., and S. Kim. 2016. "National Culture and Social Desirability Bias in Measuring Public Service Motivation." *Administration & Society* 48 (4): pp. 444–76.
- Kim, S., W. Vandenabeele, B. E. Wright, L. B. Andersen, F. P. Cerase, R. K. Christensen, C. Desmarais, M. Koumenta, P. Leisink, B. Liu, J. Palidauskaite, L. H. Pedersen, J. L. Perry, A. Ritz, J. Taylor, and P. de Vivo. 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* 23 (1): pp. 79–102.
- Kjeldsen, A. M., and C. B. Jacobsen. 2013. "Public Service Motivation and Employment Sector: Attraction or Socialization?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23 (4): pp. 899–926.
- Klein, R. A., K. A. Ratliff, M. Vianello, R. B. Adams, Jr, Š. Bahník, M. J. Bernstein, K. Bocian, M. J. Brandt, B. Brooks, . . . and B. A. Nosek. 2014. "Investigating Variation in Replicability: A 'Many Labs' Replication Project." *Social Psychology* 45 (3): pp. 142–52.
- Koumenta, M. 2015. "Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship." *Public Money & Management* 35 (5): pp. 341–8.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., R. D. Zimmerman, and E. C. Johnson. 2005. "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person–Job, Person–Organization, Person–Group, and Person–Supervisor Fit." *Personnel Psychology* 58 (2): pp. 281–342.
- Leisink, P., and B. Steijn. 2009. "Public Service Motivation and Job Performance of Public Sector Employees in the Netherlands." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 75 (1): pp. 35–52.
- Levitats, Z., and E. Vigoda-Gadot. 2017. "Yours Emotionally: How Emotional Intelligence Infuses Public Service Motivation and Affects the Job Outcomes of Public Personnel." *Public Administration* 95 (3): pp. 759–75.
- Lynggaard, M., M. J. Pedersen, and L. B. Andersen. 2018. "Exploring the Context Dependency of the PSM–Performance Relationship." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 38 (3): pp. 332–54.

- Maier, N. R. F. 1958. *Psychology in Industry*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Miller, G. J., and A. B. Whitford. 2007. "The Principal's Moral Hazard: Constraints on the Use of Incentives in Hierarchy." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17 (2): pp. 213–33.
- Neumann, O., and A. Ritz. 2015. "Public Service Motivation and Rational Choice Modelling." *Public Money & Management* 35 (5): pp. 365–70.
- Open Science Collaboration. 2015. "Estimating the Reproducibility of Psychological Science." *Science* 349 (6251). DOI: 10.1126/science.aac4716.
- Organ, D. W. 2016. "A Restatement of the Satisfaction–Performance Hypothesis." *Journal of Management* 14 (4): pp. 547–57.
- Palma, R., A. Hinna, and G. Mangia. 2017. "Improvement of Individual Performance in the Public Sector." *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship* 5 (3): pp. 344–60.
- Park, S. M., and H. G. Rainey. 2007. "Antecedents, Mediators, and Consequences of Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment: Empirical Tests of Commitment Effects in Federal Agencies." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 27 (3): pp. 197–226.
- Park, S. M., and H. G. Rainey. 2008. "Leadership and Public Service Motivation in U.S. Federal Agencies." *International Public Management Journal* 11 (1): pp. 109–42.
- Pedersen, M. J. 2015. "Activating the Forces of Public Service Motivation: Evidence from a Low-Intensity Randomized Survey Experiment." *Public Administration Review* 75 (5): pp. 734–46.
- Perry, J. L. 1996. "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6 (1): pp. 5–22.
- Perry, J. L. 1997. "Antecedents of Public Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7 (2): pp. 181–97.
- Perry, J. L. 2000. "Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10 (2): pp. 471–88.
- Perry, J. L., T. A. Engbers, and S. Y. Jun. 2009. "Back to the Future? Performance-Related Pay, Empirical Research, and the Perils of Persistence." *Public Administration Review* 69 (1): pp. 39–51.
- Perry, J. L., and W. Vandenabeele. 2008. "Behavioral Dynamics: Institutions, Identities, and Self-Regulation." In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem, pp. 56–79. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., and L. R. Wise. 1990. "The Motivational Bases of Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 50 (3): pp. 367–73.
- Peters, G. B. 2000. *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism*. London: Continuum.
- 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): pp. 1–32.

- Resh, W. G., J. D. Marvel, and B. Wen. 2018. "The Persistence of Prosocial Work Effort as a Function of Mission Match." *Public Administration Review* 78 (1): pp. 116–25.
- Ringquist, E. 2013. *Meta-Analysis for Public Management and Policy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ritz, A. 2009. "Public Service Motivation and Organizational Performance in Swiss Federal Government." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 75 (1): pp. 53–78.
- Ritz, A., G. A. Brewer, and O. Neumann. 2016. "Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook." *Public Administration Review* 76 (3): pp. 414–26.
- Ritz, A., and N. Petrovsky. 2014. "Public Service Motivation and Performance: A Critical Perspective." *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship* 2 (1): pp. 57–79.
- Ritz, A., C. Schott, C. Nitzl, and K. Alfes. 2020. "Public Service Motivation and Prosocial Motivation: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Public Management Review*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1740305>.
- Sayed, M. A. M., G.-W. J. Seymour, and B. Paul. 2015. "High-Performance Human Resource Practices and Employee Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration Review* 75 (5): pp. 747–57.
- Schott, C., O. Neumann, M. Baertschi, and A. Ritz. 2019. "Public Service Motivation, Prosocial Motivation and Altruism: Towards Disentanglement and Conceptual Clarity." *International Journal of Public Administration* 42 (14): pp. 1200–11.
- Schwarz, G., A. Newman, B. Cooper, and N. Eva. 2016. "Servant Leadership and Follower Job Performance: The Mediating Effect of Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration* 94 (4): pp. 1025–41.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2007. "Toward a Public Administration Theory of Public Service Motivation." *Public Management Review* 9 (4): pp. 545–56.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2008. "Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument." *International Public Management Journal* 11 (1): pp. 143–67.
- Vandenabeele, W. 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): pp. 11–34.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2011. "Who Wants to Deliver Public Service? Do Institutional Antecedents of Public Service Motivation Provide an Answer?" *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 31 (1): pp. 87–107.
- Vandenabeele, W., and J. Breugh. Forthcoming. "Further Integration of Public Service Motivation Theory and Self-Determination Theory: Concepts and Correlates." *International Public Management Journal*.
- Vandenabeele, W., G. A. Brewer, and A. Ritz. 2014. "Past, Present, and Future of Public Service Motivation Research." *Public Administration* 92 (4): pp. 779–89.
- Vandenabeele, W., and J. Penning de Vries. 2016. "Validating a Global Measure of Public Service Motivation: Assessing Measurement Invariance." Paper presented at the 2016 Public Management Research Conference, Aarhus, Denmark, June 22–24, 2016.

- Vandenabeele, W., A. Ritz, and O. Neumann. 2018. "Public Service Motivation: State of the Art and Conceptual Cleanup." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, edited by E. Ongaro and S. Van Thiel, pp. 261–78. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van der Meer, F. M., T. P. S. Steen, and A. Wille. 2015. "Civil Service Systems in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis." In *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century*, edited by F. M. Van der Meer, J. C. N. Raadschelders, and T. A. Toonen, pp. 38–56. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Loon, N. M. 2015. "The Role of Public Service Motivation in Performance: Examining the Potentials and Pitfalls through an Institutional Approach." Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands.
- Van Loon, N. M. 2016. "Is Public Service Motivation Related to Overall and Dimensional Work-Unit Performance as Indicated by Supervisors?" *International Public Management Journal* 19 (1): pp. 78–110.
- Van Loon, N. M., P. Leisink, and W. Vandenabeele. 2013. "Talking the Talk of Public Service Motivation: How Public Organization Logics Matter for Employees' Expressions of PSM." *International Journal of Public Administration* 36 (14): pp. 1007–19.
- Van Loon, N. M., W. Vandenabeele, and P. Leisink. 2017. "Clarifying the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and In-Role and Extra-Role Behaviors: The Relative Contributions of Person–Job and Person–Organization Fit." *American Review of Public Administration* 47 (6): pp. 699–713.
- Vogel, D. 2018. "Matching Survey Responses with Anonymity in Environments with Privacy Concerns." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 31 (7): pp. 742–54.
- Vogel, D., and A. Kroll. 2016. "The Stability and Change of PSM-Related Values across Time: Testing Theoretical Expectations against Panel Data." *International Public Management Journal* 19 (1): pp. 53–77.
- Vogel, D., and J. Willems. 2020. "The Effects of Making Public Service Employees Aware of Their Prosocial and Societal Impact: A Microintervention." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 30 (3), pp. 485–503. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/muz044.
- Walker, R. M., G. A. Brewer, M. J. Lee, N. Petrovsky, and A. Van Witteloostuijn. 2018. "Best Practice Recommendations for Replicating Experiments in Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muy047>.
- Williams, L. J., and S. E. Anderson. 1991. "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors." *Journal of Management* 17 (3): pp. 601–17.
- Wright, B. E., S. Hassan, and R. K. Christensen. 2017. "Job Choice and Performance: Revisiting Core Assumptions about Public Service Motivation." *International Public Management Journal* 20 (1): pp. 108–31.
- Wright, P. M., K. M. Kacmar, G. C. McMahan, and K. Deleeuw. 1995. "P = f (MXA): Cognitive Ability as a Moderator of the Relationship between Personality and Job Performance." *Journal of Management* 21 (6): pp. 1129–39.