

ASSESSING THE VARIATIONS IN REWARD PREFERENCE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN TERMS OF POSITION, PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION, AND PUBLIC SECTOR MOTIVATION

P. EDWARD FRENCH
MELISSA C. EMERSON
Mississippi State University

ABSTRACT: *The reward preference of public sector employees has often been evaluated in terms of public service motivation (PSM). The present research, utilizing survey data from 927 municipal employees in Mississippi, reevaluates the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to employees in local government in the light of changes in workforce composition, economic conditions, performance, and accountability that have challenged traditional public management approaches and techniques. PSM and employee position are found to be significantly related to the level of importance currently assigned to reward factors and to extrinsic and intrinsic reward variables in choosing to work for a local government. Minority status is also an important determinant of both PSM and the reward preferences of employees in this data set.*

KEYWORDS: *extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, local government, motivation*

Significant changes and challenges in the public sector workplace have emerged over the past few decades as governments at all levels respond to the increased emphasis on performance and results-oriented government services. The numerous reform initiatives that have taken place have substantially moved public sector management in an opportunistic direction for both scholars and practitioners. These initiatives have influenced many core management functions of government and highlight the need for public organizations to develop effective human capital strategies that enhance government performance and accountability. Public sector employees are assets to be valued and investments to be strategically managed, because the most important function of these individuals is to provide public service. With public management applying business concepts, private sector practices, and technological innovations to enhance performance accountability

and fiscal responsibility, the nature of the public employee's relationship with government is continually being redefined. Thus, it is relevant for the field to explore why someone seeks government employment and what type of working environments and incentive programs are essential for enhancing both individual and organizational performance.

A substantial body of scholarly research in public administration has explored why an individual chooses to work in the public sector. Much of this research is grounded in the theory that public sector motivation differs substantially from private sector motivation. In most studies, the public sector includes employees of the federal, state, and local governments, public corporations, and other entities providing extended public services, including education and health care. While this sector may attract individuals who are interested in the job security, career tenure, and retirement benefits often associated with government employment, there are also individuals who exhibit behaviors and actions that are not prompted solely by extrinsic motives and self-interest. Scholars have substantiated that these employees are more altruistic than their private sector counterparts (Crewson, 1997; Rainey, 1982). Perry and Wise define this public service motivation (PSM) as "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations" (1990, p. 368). Studies have also confirmed that intrinsic motivational factors are correlated to an individual's decision to seek employment in the public sector (Lewis & Frank, 2002; Pandey and Stazyk, 2008; Tschirhart, Reed, Freeman, & Anker, 2008). Often, nonfinancial incentives may lead to better performance from certain individuals because they have pursued public service employment to fulfill personal goals and intrinsic needs. Job satisfaction can be an outgrowth of achievement, verbal recognition, challenging work, and advancement (Miner, 2005).

The present research revisits the relationship between PSM and the preference of public employees for extrinsic and intrinsic rewards as economic conditions, workforce demographics, increased competition from the private sector, and technological innovations have changed the public sector work environment substantially over the past several years. The focus is not on public versus private sector, but rather on evaluating the differences that may exist between employee groups working within the same public sector entity. Very little research has explored the varying levels of public service motivation among public employees at the local government level, including both antecedents and correlates to reward preference (e.g., Bright, 2009; Jurkiewicz & Massey, 1997; Kim, 2005). The utilization of financial and human resources has always been closely scrutinized in the public sector, and administrators and employees are often tasked with doing more with less. As a result, mayors, managers, and councils need to understand the types of incentives that motivate employees. Thus, the study of PSM and its relationship to intrinsic and extrinsic reward preference is of fundamental importance to the

management of employees and the design and implementation of reward and motivation systems that fulfill their individual needs.

Public Service Motivation

Self-determination theory substantiates that individuals exhibit different levels of motivation and respond to motivations of different types that often vary with organizational context and task characteristics (Frey, 1997; Koehler & Rainey, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic factors such as pay and other material rewards are linked to the outcome of a task or activity, while intrinsic factors are associated closely with the inherent satisfaction that derives from undertaking a task. The public sector workplace differs from the private sector in many ways, including the availability of resources, public scrutiny of budgetary decisions, and greater limitations on the provision of extrinsic rewards. As a result, public managers may encounter obstacles in the recruitment and retention of employees. However, early research links the attractiveness of public sector employment to rational, norm-based, and affective motives (Buchanan, 1975; Downs, 1967; Frederickson & Hart, 1985; Kelman, 1987; Perry & Wise, 1990). Employees in the public sector are often motivated by a desire to promote the public interest, improve society, and bring about change (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000; Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2006; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Rainey, 1982; Wittmer, 1991). The PSM construct was conceptualized by Perry to include four dimensions that are grounded in these rational, norm-based, and affective motives: attraction to policy-making, commitment to the public interest and civic duty, compassion, and self-sacrifice (Perry, 1996). An increased level of PSM is associated with the desire to serve the public interest and an orientation toward social equity (Perry & Wise, 1990) and the impact of one's preference for employment in the public sector (Bright, 2001; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008). Vandenabeele (2008) also found that the utility of PSM as a predictor of public employer preference was positively related to the degree of "publicness" of the government organization. However, studies have found there are other factors associated with employment in the public sector that are extrinsic in nature and may appeal to certain individuals, including job security and tenure, career perspective, pension systems, and work-family balance (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Houston, 2000; Karl and Sutton, 1998; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Vandenabeele, Hondeghem, & Steen, 2004). In light of this, public *sector* motivation may be distinguished from public *service* motivation (Hondeghem, 1990; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). Concurrent with these studies, we expect that an individual's level of public service motivation will correlate to the level of importance the individual places on certain factors in the decision to seek local government employment.

Hypothesis 1: Individuals employed at the local government level who exhibit higher levels of public service motivation will place greater importance on intrinsic factors in choosing to work for their local government.

Additional research studies have correlated PSM to sociodemographic characteristics, including gender, age, education, management level, and tenure (Bright, 2001, 2005; Camilleri, 2007; Dehart-Davis, Marlowe, & Pandey, 2006; Naff & Crum, 1999; Pandey & Stazyk, 2008; Perry, 1997; Vandenabeele, 2011). Scholars have demonstrated that individuals who are female, older, highly educated, in managerial positions, and employed longer in an organization often exhibit higher levels of public service motivation. Local governments employ a variety of individuals in numerous positions requiring varying levels of education, skills, dedication, and expertise. Many of these positions are similar to blue-collar occupations in the private sector that require less education and encompass more physical tasks, while others, being administrative in nature, require specific training and specialized education for certain areas of expertise relevant to the public sector. In addition, police and fire personnel often encounter work conditions that may put their own or others' lives at risk. Understanding the motivation behind the dedication to occupations that are not always appropriately compensated is essential to the management of these employees; however, previous research has rarely explored the different levels of PSM that are distributed within a public organization from top to bottom (Bright, 2005). There are local government positions that offer opportunities to promote the public interest, improve society, and bring about public change; and there are others that are relevant to the maintenance of infrastructure and the delivery of routine services. Positions in administration, community development, planning, and public safety often provide opportunities to have an impact on policy-making, promote the public interest, and offer compassion and self-sacrifice. We hypothesize that individuals with higher levels of PSM will be employed in administrative positions and other positions that are engaged in promoting the public interest and societal benefits.

Hypothesis 2: An individual's level of public service motivation is positively correlated with the individual's position in the local government.

PSM and Reward Preference

Perry's (1996) PSM construct has significantly broadened the field's understanding of why individuals pursue careers in public service. Over the past two decades, correlations between PSM and employee reward preferences/incentives (Bright, 2001, 2005; Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000; Perry & Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982;

Wright, 2004) and performance-related pay systems (Georgellis, Iossa, & Tabvuma, 2010; Houston, 2009; Moynihan, 2008; Perry, Engers, & Jun, 2009; Stazyk, 2013) have been explored in the field's quest to empirically define these relationships. Specific research into the importance of intrinsic vs. extrinsic rewards among public sector employees has most often compared and contrasted the public and private sectors. While the present study focuses on municipal employees only, much of this research is relevant to the formation of the hypotheses that seek to understand the reward preferences of individuals employed in various positions at the local government level, many of which entail tasks resembling those in the private sector. Early studies found that public employees placed a higher value on performing work that is useful to society or helps other individuals (Rainey, 1982; Wittmer, 1991). Also, intrinsic motivational factors incorporating work ethic, the public interest, and service to society were reasoned to be valued higher among public employees (Perry & Wise, 1990). Crewson (1997) researched the differences between private- and public-sector employees concerning reward preferences and found that employees in the public sector placed a significantly higher value on work that provides a feeling of accomplishment and is helpful to society. Houston (2000) confirmed that public employees are more likely to place a higher level of importance on intrinsic reward factors, and he also reasoned that higher levels of PSM are characteristic of the individuals working in this sector. And in a comparison of the job values of public and private sector employees, Karl and Sutton (1998) concurred that individuals in private sector positions place the highest importance on good wages, while individuals in public sector positions place the highest importance on interesting work. Consistent with these studies, the following hypotheses are tested in this study:

Hypothesis 3a: Individuals employed at the local government level who exhibit higher levels of public service motivation will place greater importance on intrinsic reward factors.

Hypothesis 3b: Individuals employed at the local government level who exhibit lower levels of public service motivation will place greater importance on extrinsic reward factors.

Gabris and Simo (1995), however, concluded that there were very few differences between public, nonprofit, and private sector employees regarding perceived needs that motivate and are satisfied by their particular sector of employment. The participants in this study exhibited similar ratings of individual needs for job security, income/salary, responsibility, and making a difference. The importance of job security to public sector employees was also reported by Jurkiewicz, Massey, and Brown (1998) and by Houston (2000), even though the respondents in these two studies also placed great emphasis on intrinsic reward factors. Gabris and

Simo surmised that as employees reach their career potential, only those in the highest echelons would “remain imbued with public motivation need,” and the lower-level employees would become more concerned with monetary incentives, job security, and other extrinsic factors (1995, p. 40).

Few studies have focused on the differences in reward preferences exhibited by individuals solely employed in the public sector. Jurkiewicz and Massey (1997) found numerous similarities between supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel in the ranking of 15 extrinsic and intrinsic work-related motivational factors. Bright (2005), however, reasoned that management level was a strong predictor of higher levels of PSM and positively related to employee preference for nonmonetary incentives. He also determined in a study of local government employees that PSM was significantly correlated to the intrinsic nonmonetary preferences of these employees, including personal recognition, task meaningfulness, and professional growth, but he acknowledged that both intrinsic and extrinsic reward systems can be important in public organizations. Contingent on the findings from this study, it is here premised that variations between employee positions within the local government will also influence the level of importance each employee currently places on intrinsic and extrinsic reward factors. This relationship is evaluated in terms of whether the individual is employed in a managerial or nonmanagerial position as explored in these previous studies. In addition, we investigate whether variations occur between individuals employed in public safety, administrative, and service/maintenance positions that have not been evaluated in other studies. In line with our previous reasoning that individuals employed in positions that promote the public interest and societal change will exhibit higher levels of PSM, we also anticipate that these individuals will place greater importance on the opportunities they have to perform work that provides a feeling of accomplishment or helps other individuals. Thus the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4a: Individuals employed in management and public safety positions will place greater importance on intrinsic reward factors.

Hypothesis 4b: Individuals employed in nonmanagement and non-public safety positions will place greater importance on extrinsic reward factors.

Crewson (1997) concluded that public sector employees have a unique ethic that makes them value intrinsic over extrinsic rewards and cautioned against using private-sector incentive structures in public sector settings. Additional studies have shown that monetary rewards can affect intrinsic motivation negatively (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Houston, 2006; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Subsequent research evaluating public employees has shown that performance-related pay systems focusing on extrinsic rewards often fail to enhance employee motivation and performance (Houston, 2009; Kellough & Lu, 1993; Kellough &

Nigro, 2009; Perry et al., 2009; Sanders, 2004; Weibel, Rost, & Osterloh, 2009) and may crowd out or even diminish intrinsic motivation in the public sector (Georgellis et al., 2010; Houston, 2009; Moynihan, 2008; Weibel et al., 2009). However, in a recent study of the relationship between variable pay systems, public service motivation, and job satisfaction at the local government level, Stazyk found no evidence that public service motivation was crowded out by performance-related pay systems and cautions against treating the two as “inherently conflicting or seemingly dichotomous concepts” (2013, p. 265).

As evidenced by the literature, the relationships between level of PSM, intrinsic/extrinsic reward preference, and employee performance and compensation are truly complex, often problematical, and certainly worthy of continued study (Perry et al., 2010). The present research is designed to assess the relationship between PSM and intrinsic/extrinsic reward preference at the local government level from a perspective that evaluates possible antecedents and correlates of intrasectoral variation. A case study of 927 local government employees from 10 municipalities in the state of Mississippi provides the opportunity to evaluate the importance to these individuals of extrinsic factors, including job security, high income, and chance for promotion, and intrinsic factors, such as work that is important and a job that is useful to society. The study also examines individual level of PSM and the relationship between PSM and preference for intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Data from this survey allow for comparisons between departments, management/nonmanagement, public safety/non-public safety, and other demographic categories that are well represented at this level of government operations. In addition, all 24 measures of Perry’s PSM scale are included to further weigh the efficacy of this multidimensional measure. The findings revealed very little variation in the mean levels of PSM exhibited by the various demographic groups, but differences were seen across the sample population, and significant contrasts were evident in the relative importance of several intrinsic and extrinsic reward preference variables to individuals in the study.

Methods

A random sample was chosen from 3,698 municipal employees from 10 cities across the state of Mississippi that were selected by the authors based on their demographic locations, economic conditions, and population distribution.¹ The research survey was administered to 1,159 public employees over a seven-month period in 2012.² Employees in all city departments were given the opportunity to complete the survey anonymously during paid working hours. The authors were on site at different municipal locations to oversee administration of the survey instrument and answer any questions from the city’s employees. The mayors, managers, and senior management teams had given approval for the project and encouraged

all municipal employees to participate. All told, 927 surveys were completed, for a 79% response rate. Respondents represented all municipal departments, including public safety, administration, public works, and parks and recreation.

The survey was designed to collect information concerning employee motivations, incentive preferences, and personal demographics. Respondents were also asked to indicate the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic reward factors to them both at present and as factors in choosing to work for their local government employer. A five-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (very important).³ An additional survey question asked employees to rank five specific intrinsic and extrinsic items in numerical order of importance in order to directly measure their relative values. These five motivation rewards were work that is important, chances for promotion, no danger of termination, short working hours, and high income.

Variables

Data from this survey allowed the authors the opportunity to explore reward preferences in terms of employee demographics and level of public service motivation at the local government level. Six dependent variables were used to test the hypotheses in this study. Extrinsic and intrinsic reward preference variables were derived from an average score for each set of extrinsic and intrinsic reward factors explored in previous studies (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000). The five extrinsic reward factors were chance of getting a promotion, amount of job security, chance for receiving a performance award, status/prestige, and high income/salary. The four intrinsic reward factors were the chance to accomplish something worthwhile, a job that allows you to help other people, a job that is useful to society, and getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job. The choice to work (CTW) extrinsic and CTW intrinsic variables were also derived from the average score for each set of extrinsic and intrinsic reward preferences on a separate question that asked respondents to indicate the level of importance of those items in choosing to work for their local government employer. This question included 11 extrinsic items and six intrinsic items. Utilizing data from this same question, we created the CTW public sector index, which represents the average level of importance for five extrinsic items previously cited in the literature that may be associated with certain individuals' attraction to public sector employment, namely prestigious employer, fast promotion, nonmonetary fringe benefits, equal opportunity for men and women, and job security (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Houston, 2000; Karl & Sutton, 1998; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008; Vandenabeele et al., 2004). We also created a CTW public service index representing the average level of importance of five intrinsic items associated with an individual's motives to serve the public good. Items in this index were personal development, responsibility,

social orientation, challenging work, and personal interest (Hondeghe, 1990; Perry & Hondeghe, 2008; Perry & Wise, 1990). Cronbach's alphas for these indexes ranged from 0.72 to 0.87, all of which were above the 0.70 level for accepted reliability suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).

Four independent variables—management/nonmanagement, public safety/nonpublic safety, position (public safety/administration/service-maintenance), and PSM—were correlated to the intrinsic and extrinsic reward preferences of respondents. Two demographic factors were assessed by binary variables—management and public safety. The 11 department response designations were grouped into an additional variable with three categories depending upon the administrative/professional orientation, public safety classification, and service/maintenance provision. Responses from administrative, community development, human resources/personnel, planning and development, and “other” departments were categorized as administrative. Responses from police and fire were subgrouped into the public safety category. Survey responses from individuals employed in parks and recreation, public works, electrical, and airport departments were categorized as service/maintenance. Gender, race, age, education, tenure, and salary were utilized as control variables.⁴ The public service motivation measure was derived using Perry's 24-item PSM scale. Respondents indicated their level of agreement to questions measuring the original four subscales—attraction to policy-making, commitment to public interest, self-sacrifice, and compassion—using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The study utilized an aggregate measure of public service motivation derived from the average score on the set of 24 items (Brewer & Selden, 2000; Kim, 2005; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Naff & Crum, 1999; Vandenabeele, 2011). The 24-item PSM scale achieved a very good measure of internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82. Reliability estimates for the four subscales ranged from 0.65 to 0.76.⁵

Descriptives and Regression Models

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive data for many of the categorical variables. The majority of respondents in this study were male (73%), and the highest percentage were between the ages of 35 and 44 (32%). Minorities and females were also represented, as almost 32% of those in the study were nonwhite, and approximately 27% were female. Most of the respondents (50.3%) had a high school education, and the largest percentage (36%) had worked for their municipality five years or less. Slightly more than half (54%) of the group were fire and police personnel; and a majority of respondents (66%) were employed in nonmanagement positions. Most employees in the study earned less than \$40,000 per year.

As can be seen in Table 2, survey responses from the group demonstrated that local government employees tend to place greater emphasis overall on intrinsic

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Categorical Variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Gender			Education		
Male	679	73.3	Less than high school	32	3.5
Female	247	26.7	High school/GED	464	50.3
			2 years college	238	25.8
			4 years college	151	16.4
			Master's degree	32	3.5
			Law degree	3	0.3
			Doctorate degree	3	0.3
Race					
White	632	68.4	Public safety	502	54.2
Nonwhite	292	31.6	Non-public safety	425	45.8
Age					
≤ 24	48	5.2	Management	319	34.4
25–34	206	22.2	Nonmanagement	608	65.6
35–44	292	31.5			
45–54	29	26.9			
55–64	118	12.7			
≥ 65	13	1.4			
Tenure			Administrative (Adm)	195	21.0
0–5 years	329	35.5	Public safety (PS)	502	54.2
6–10 years	227	24.5	Service/maintenance (S/M)	230	24.8
11–15 years	124	13.4			
16–20 years	128	13.8			
> 20 years	118	12.7			
Salary	<i>N</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Salary Adm</i>	<i>Salary PS</i>	<i>Salary S/M</i>
\$0–19,999	66	7.2	8.3%	1.8%	18.0%
\$20,000–39,999	529	57.8	55.7%	55.0%	65.4%
\$40,000–59,999	262	28.6	25.5%	37.7%	11.4%
\$60,000–69,999	31	3.4	5.7%	3.2%	1.8%
\$70,000–99,999	23	2.5	3.1%	2.0%	3.1%
> \$100,000	5	0.5	1.6%	0.2%	0.4%

reward factors than on extrinsic reward factors when asked about the importance of several items related to their work. The mean for the combined intrinsic reward factors variable, including the chance to accomplish something worthwhile, a job that allows you to help other people, a job that is useful to society, and a feeling of accomplishment, was 4.44. The mean for the combined extrinsic reward variable in the study, including chance of getting a promotion, amount of job security, chance for receiving a performance reward, status/prestige, and high income/salary, was 3.79. When survey responses to the nine intrinsic and extrinsic variables were ranked individually based on mean level of importance, the data revealed that job security (4.62), an extrinsic factor, was most important to survey respondents, with

Table 2. Importance of Intrinsic/Extrinsic Factors (in %)

	Unimportant	Of little importance	Moderately important	Important	Very important	Average
Amount of job security you have	1.0	1.1	3.9	23.0	71.1	4.62
Getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job	0.8	0.5	5.9	30.1	62.7	4.53
Chances you have to accomplish something worthwhile	0.6	0.8	6.5	34.8	57.3	4.47
Job that allows you to help other people	0.5	1.4	9.1	36.2	52.8	4.39
Job that is useful to society	1.1	1.1	9.6	36.8	51.4	4.36
High income/salary	1.8	3.8	19.8	37.1	37.4	4.05
Your chances of getting a promotion	2.7	7.2	15.3	33.0	41.7	4.04
Your chances for receiving a performance award	10.4	19.0	26.2	23.4	21.0	3.26
Status/prestige	14.6	24.6	26.1	18.9	15.8	2.97

Table 3. Numerical Order Ranking of Level of Importance (in %)

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Avg.</i>
Work that is important	41.0	15.8	17.1	15.9	10.0	2.38
High income	25.3	25.5	23.8	14.6	10.7	2.60
No danger of being fired	23.1	25.4	21.0	20.0	10.5	2.69
Chances for promotion	4.2	23.1	27.7	31.0	14.1	3.28
Short working hours	7.0	9.8	9.5	18.3	55.4	4.05

getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job (4.53) as next important. The majority of employees (71%) considered job security to be very important in their employment, and 23% considered this factor important or moderately important; 63% of respondents considered getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job as very important, and an additional 30% considered this factor important or moderately important.

Respondents were also asked to rank five job characteristics in numerical order of importance from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important). Table 3 shows that work that is important exhibited the highest mean rank at 2.38, followed by high income at 2.60. No chance of being fired (2.69) was considered third in numerical order of importance, with chances of promotion (3.28) and free time (4.05) fourth and fifth, respectively. Importance of the combined extrinsic and intrinsic reward variables and rank of these five job characteristics was initially evaluated utilizing *t*-tests to determine whether responses varied significantly according to the nature of the employee's position within the municipality. There were no significant differences between the responses of management and nonmanagement employees in this study regarding the importance of the combined extrinsic and intrinsic reward variables. Significant differences were demonstrated by the data in comparing the responses of public safety and non-public safety personnel. Non-public safety employees considered the combined extrinsic reward variable significantly more important than public safety employees; however, there was no difference in level of importance assigned to the combined intrinsic reward variable by the two groups. Non-public safety employees also ranked high income as most important, as compared to public safety employees, who ranked work that is important as number one.

Classification of the non-public safety responses into administrative and service/maintenance categories in addition to the public safety employees allowed us to examine these findings more closely. As seen in Table 4, respondents in positions/departments associated with the maintenance/delivery of services to citizens considered extrinsic reward factors significantly more important than respondents in administrative and public safety positions/departments. These individuals ranked

Table 4. Importance of Factors in Choosing to Work for Local Government Employer (in %)

	Unimportant	Of little importance	Moderately important	Important	Very important	Average
Relationship with supervisor/manager	3.9	4.8	14.0	42.0	35.3	4.00
Personal development	0.5	2.4	11.1	47.9	38.1	4.21
Responsibility	0.7	0.8	6.7	40.4	51.5	4.41
Social orientation (your impact on society)	1.2	4.8	20.3	45.6	28.2	3.95
Challenging work	1.3	1.4	16.5	50.9	29.9	4.07
Personal interest	1.3	3.9	18.2	46.3	30.3	4.00
Customer orientation (your impact on customer satisfaction)	1.6	3.4	13.7	42.0	39.3	4.14
Prestigious employer	8.7	20.0	28.1	28.8	14.4	3.20
Fast promotion	7.9	20.6	36.0	24.3	11.1	3.10
Fringe benefits (monetary bonuses)	4.2	10.4	31.3	32.4	21.7	3.57
A successful employer	2.7	3.0	16.2	42.1	36.0	4.06
Wages/salary	1.2	2.3	15.0	40.6	41.0	4.18
Lack of stress	4.1	13.6	24.3	27.4	30.5	3.67
Fringe benefits (nonmonetary pension, vacation, healthcare, etc.)	1.3	2.6	16.1	36.8	43.2	4.18
Easy promotion	10.9	26.2	32.9	20.7	9.3	2.91
Equal opportunity for men and women	5.0	5.8	16.7	28.9	43.6	4.00
Job security	0.8	1.0	6.5	23.9	67.8	4.57

high income as most important, while administrative and public safety personnel ranked work that is important as their most important job characteristic.

Participants in the study were also asked to indicate the level of importance of 17 items in choosing to work for their local government employer. Interestingly, three of the top five were extrinsic factors. Once again, job security exhibited the highest mean level at 4.57, with responsibility averaging a mean level of importance of 4.41. Personal development (4.21), wages/salary (4.18), and fringe benefits (4.18) rounded out the top five in terms of importance in this set of employees choosing to work for their municipality. Also, 16 of 17 items were considered at least moderately important by respondents in the survey based on the mean response for each item. Nonmanagement employees considered job security and lack of stress as significantly more important factors in choosing to work for their local government employer; while employees in management positions considered challenging work as significantly more important in their initial employment decisions. Several differences emerged between non-public safety and public safety employees, as the respondents in nonsafety positions noted that seven of 11 extrinsic reward factors were significantly more important in choosing to work for their local government employer—the two types of fringe benefits, wages, a successful employer, lack of stress, easy promotion, and equal opportunity for men and women. These findings were further clarified when the differences between public safety, administrative, and service/maintenance personnel were evaluated. Service/maintenance employees valued wages/salary significantly more important and personal development and responsibility significantly less important factors in choosing to work for the local municipality than both administrative and public safety employees. These individuals also considered fringe benefits, including bonuses, as a significantly more important reason in their initial employment decision.

Zero-order correlations for the study variables appear in Table 5. The bivariate correlations show that extrinsic reward preference is related to several personal attribute antecedents that are utilized as control variables, including tenure, age, minority status, and salary level. In accord with previous research findings, the data demonstrate that employees who are white, older, employed longer, and earn higher salaries tend to place less importance on the extrinsic reward factors. This reward preference is also significantly correlated to whether the employee is employed in a public safety, administrative position, or service/maintenance position. The results also show that PSM has a positive correlation with extrinsic reward preference, indicating that a higher employee PSM score is related to the level of importance placed upon the combined extrinsic reward variable. Three dimensions of PSM (attraction to policy-making, commitment to public interest, and compassion) are also positively correlated to the level of importance placed on extrinsic reward factors in this study. As this is contrary to the extensive literature showing a negative effect of PSM on preference for extrinsic rewards, this

Table 5. Zero-Order Correlations

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Extrinsic reward importance (0.735)																
2. Intrinsic reward importance	0.391**	(0.871)														
3. PS/NPS	-0.085**	0.048														
4. M/NM	-0.047	0.016	-0.063													
5. PS/ADM/PW	0.090**	-0.053	-0.062	-0.017												
6. PSM	0.082*	0.454**	-0.032	0.063	-0.080*	(0.824)										
7. APM	0.103**	0.160**	-0.180**	0.120**	-0.020	0.443**	(0.659)									
8. CPI	0.071*	0.385**	0.069*	0.064	-0.107**	0.766**	0.159**	(0.667)								
9. COM	0.107**	0.275**	-0.145**	0.141**	-0.076*	0.774**	0.293**	0.412**	(0.649)							
10. SSF	0.018	0.443**	0.125**	-0.010	-0.061	0.794**	0.094**	0.628**	0.366**	(0.761)						
11. Tenure	-0.134**	-0.037	0.053	0.372**	-0.007	-0.017	-0.095**	-0.030	0.017	-0.021						
12. Age	-0.090**	-0.036	-0.238**	0.286**	-0.041	0.100**	0.035	0.048	0.196**	-0.005	0.482**					
13. Gender	0.038	0.027	-0.274**	-0.082*	-0.303**	0.092**	0.168**	-0.005	0.181**	-0.034	-0.014	0.126**				
14. WNW	-0.205**	-0.103**	-0.156**	0.024	-0.049	-0.211**	-0.260**	-0.109**	-0.246**	-0.052	0.029	-0.008	-0.117**			
15. Education	-0.059	0.024	-0.048	0.107**	-0.212**	0.102**	0.071*	0.082*	0.114**	0.055	-0.040	-0.001	0.127**	0.035		
16. Salary	-0.174**	0.028	0.151**	0.117**	-0.160**	0.010	-0.075*	0.079*	-0.026	0.048	0.294**	0.165**	-0.163**	0.241**	0.289**	

Note: Cronbach's alphas are included in parentheses for variable with multi-item measures, $N = 927$. * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.001$.

relationship was reevaluated using tenure, age, education, sex, minority status, and salary as control variables. PSM was again positively correlated to the mean level of importance of the extrinsic reward variable, confirming that individuals in this study with higher levels of PSM still place a greater level of importance on extrinsic reward factors than individuals with lower levels of PSM. Preference for the combined intrinsic reward variable is only correlated to PSM, its four dimensions, and minority status. Data indicate that nonwhite respondents also place significantly greater importance on the combined intrinsic reward variable than white respondents, and individuals with higher levels of PSM consider the combined intrinsic reward variable of greater importance than do those with lower levels of PSM.⁶ There are no significant differences in the level of importance placed on the combined intrinsic reward variable due to an employee's management status or position within the local government.

Results from these correlations also demonstrate several significant relationships between employee position and management status and level of total PSM and many of its subdimensions. The mean PSM level of administrative employees is significantly higher than the mean PSM level of both public safety and service/maintenance employees. Also, significantly higher mean scores for attraction to policy-making and compassion were exhibited by non-public safety employees, whereas public safety employees demonstrated significantly higher mean levels for commitment to public interest and self-sacrifice. Both administrative and service/maintenance employees had significantly higher levels for attraction to policy-making and compassion than employees in public safety positions. However, there was no significant difference in mean level for attraction to policy-making and self-sacrifice when administrative and service/maintenance positions were compared. Administrative employees did have a significantly higher mean score for the compassion dimension than service/maintenance employees. In reevaluating the difference in mean levels of commitment to public interest, significant differences were found between public safety and service/maintenance employees and administrative and service/maintenance employees, but there was no significant difference in the data between the mean levels of commitment to the public interest of public safety and administrative employees. Last, public safety employees exhibited a significantly higher mean level for the self-sacrifice dimension than either administrative or service/maintenance employees.

Table 6 presents the findings from ordinary least squares regression for six models.⁷ One employee position variable and PSM are significant predictors of respondent preference for extrinsic rewards. Model 1, although statistically significant, explains only 1.8% of the variance in extrinsic reward preference. Model 2 for the intrinsic reward variable demonstrates that only PSM is a significant predictor for this variable. Individuals who exhibit higher levels of PSM place a greater level of importance on the intrinsic reward factors, as anticipated. This

Table 6. OLS Regression of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Reward Preferences

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	Extrinsic coefficient (SE)	Intrinsic coefficient (SE)	CTW extrinsic coefficient (SE)	CTW intrinsic coefficient (SE)	CTW public service coefficient (SE)	CTW public sector coefficient (SE)
Public safety/administration/ service maintenance	0.110** (0.037)	-0.006 (0.026)	0.096** (0.032)	-0.009 (0.026)	-0.007 (0.027)	0.114** (0.034)
Management/nonmanagement	-0.053 (0.057)	0.033 (0.037)	-0.076 (0.046)	-0.008 (0.037)	-0.015 (0.038)	-0.058 (0.048)
PSM	0.202** (0.059)	0.646** (0.042)	0.284** (0.053)	0.678** (0.043)	0.663** (0.043)	0.230** (0.055)
F statistic	6.524**	79.174**	12.369**	84.890**	78.487**	9.141**
Adjusted R ²	0.018	0.207	0.040	0.220	0.206	0.027

*0.05 level of significance; **0.01 level of significance.

model explains 20.7% of the variance in the intrinsic reward preference variable in this study. When the relationship between the importance of the extrinsic reward variables is again evaluated with the independent variables to determine importance in choosing to work for a local government employer, PSM and one variable for employee position are significant predictors. Model 3 explains only 4.0% of the variation seen in this dependent variable. The same independent variables are also regressed to the importance of intrinsic reward factors in choosing to work for the local government employer; and again PSM is the only significant predictor for intrinsic reward preference in this model. Higher levels of PSM have positive effects on the CTW intrinsic reward variable. Results for Model 6 show that PSM and one variable for position are significantly correlated to the importance of the items included in the CTW public sector index; while only PSM is significantly correlated to the variables in the CTW public service index in Model 5.

Discussion

In this study, it was anticipated that level of PSM would be correlated to the level of importance an individual placed on intrinsic motivational factors in choosing to work for the local government. This hypothesis was confirmed, but the data demonstrated that PSM was also positively correlated to the level of importance respondents placed on extrinsic motivational factors in choosing to work for the local government. Similar results were evidenced in the two models that were included to further distinguish between public service motivation and public sector motivation. While Model 6 explained only a very small amount of the variation seen in the CTW public sector variable, employee position and level of PSM were once again demonstrated to be significant factors in the amount of importance employees in the survey assigned to this index. Almost 21% of the variation seen in the CTW public service variable was explained in Model 5, which also demonstrated that PSM was significantly related to the level of importance placed on the five intrinsic reward factors comprising this index. These findings yield support to the conclusion that public sector employment is expected to attract individuals who are seeking opportunities to fulfill higher-level needs and altruistic motives (Camilleri, 2007; Wright & Davis, 2003). However, the study also substantiates that there are certainly individuals who seek employment in this sector for other reasons that may be self-interested or rational, including job security, fringe benefits, and the prestige historically associated with government employment.

H2 anticipated that level of PSM would be positively correlated to an individual's position within the local government. Results from this study demonstrate that significant differences in PSM and its subscales are seen between positions, but several nuances emerge with the interpretations. Administrative employees exhibit significantly higher PSM levels; however, the mean scores for each of the four di-

mensions certainly come into play when further evaluating the relationship between PSM and an employee's position. While very few differences are seen between management and nonmanagement employees, significant differences between the dimension means for the three position groups, as evidenced and reviewed in the previous section, lend support to the argument that the relative importance of each subdimension might vary within an organization. However, it should be emphasized that the three groups of administrative, public safety, and service/maintenance exhibit much higher mean scores for self-sacrifice and commitment to public interest than compassion and attraction to policy-making, thus demonstrating that they find greater motivation from these two dimensions.

This study also confirmed that an employee's level of public service motivation is significantly related to reward preference. However, with this data set, employees exhibiting higher levels of PSM considered both intrinsic (confirming H3a) and extrinsic reward variables significantly more important than those exhibiting lower levels of PSM (rejecting H3b). In further exploration of this finding, we examined variations in employee levels of PSM due to the four demographic variables of age, tenure, minority status, and salary. The zero-order correlations had shown that the variations seen with age, tenure, and salary were expected and in the anticipated direction, as previously documented in the literature. However, the nonwhite respondents in this study exhibited significantly higher means levels of PSM than the white respondents. Since nonwhite individuals comprised almost 32% of the respondents in this study, we revisited the extrinsic and CTW extrinsic reward variables to determine whether there were significant differences between the mean levels of importance assigned by these two groups. Evaluation of the means utilizing *t*-tests demonstrated that nonwhite respondents placed greater importance on both these two variables. Interestingly, nonwhite respondents also placed significantly more importance on the intrinsic reward and CTW intrinsic reward variable. However, this did not change the expected direction for the relationship between PSM and intrinsic reward preference, since nonwhite respondents exhibited higher levels of PSM overall.

Analyses of the data revealed a significant relationship between employee department/position and reward preference in this study, but also demonstrated that a significant variation in reward preference did not exist between management- and nonmanagement-type employees. H4 anticipated that individuals in the study who were employed in management positions would place greater importance on intrinsic rewards than those employed in nonmanagement positions. However, management and nonmanagement employees did not vary significantly regarding the importance they placed on either intrinsic or extrinsic reward factors. We also anticipated that employees in public safety positions would place greater importance on intrinsic rewards than individuals employed in non-public safety positions. Our analysis of the survey results confirmed that there were

significant differences between these two groups regarding both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Results showed that non-public safety employees placed greater importance on extrinsic reward factors, while public safety employees placed greater importance on intrinsic reward factors.

Further evaluation of survey data regarding employee position with the municipality substantiated that this variable significantly influences an employee's preference for extrinsic rewards but not intrinsic rewards. Individuals who are employed in positions engaged in the maintenance and provision of services to residents placed greater importance on extrinsic reward factors than individuals in administrative or public safety positions. However, no significant differences were seen between these three groups in the level of importance employees place on the intrinsic reward factors.

Conclusion

Data from this study show that level of PSM and reward preference can vary within a public sector organization, and that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are important to specific employees. While public service motivation is certainly related to intrinsic and extrinsic factors, it is not an all-encompassing answer as to why individuals choose to work in the public sector and how they can be motivated. Public sector employment is expected to attract individuals who are seeking opportunities to fulfill higher-level needs and altruistic motives (Camilleri, 2007; Wright & Davis, 2003). However, there are individuals who seek employment in this sector for other reasons that may be self-interested or rational. Job security, wages/salary, and fringe benefits were considered very important to a number of respondents in this study. These results lend support to Gabris and Simo's (1995) conclusion that certain factors motivate employees regardless of their sector of employment. As there are many core functions of government that employ individuals in positions that are similar to blue-collar occupations in the private sector, it is vital for public organizations to analyze and implement reward structures that are effective with a variety of employees whose motives and needs are ever-changing. This research has shown that employees at the local government level value intrinsic rewards significantly more than extrinsic rewards. However, job security is of the utmost importance to them, and there are employees at this level who also place significant importance on extrinsic factors as a source of their motivation. Stazyk (2013) suggests that in some cases employees are motivated by the tandem of PSM and performance-related pay. The results of the study support this conclusion. Government officials who are able to design incentive structures around both intrinsic and reward systems have a greater opportunity to satisfy the personal motives of their employees throughout their careers and in times of increased financial scrutiny.

This research is not without limitations. Although the survey utilized different measures for PSM and several variables related to intrinsic motivation, the measures were conceptually difficult to separate and could offer an alternative explanation for the significant relationships seen in the models. While these constructs were based on previous studies of PSM and reward correlates, our results should be interpreted cautiously. Also, the study was designed to evaluate variations in employee PSM at the local government level. As very few studies have utilized Perry's full 24-item scale and provided mean levels of PSM for public sector respondents, we are unable to determine if the mean levels of PSM exhibited by these individuals are truly above the norm for public employees. This research focused on determining factors of intrasectoral variation but was limited to local government. Future evaluations of PSM in the public sector would benefit from a study evaluating intrasectoral variation among local, state, and federal employees. The nature of the public employee's relationship with government is continually being redefined. Thus future research exploring additional factors affecting intrinsic and extrinsic reward preference is needed to contribute to the field's understanding of the type of incentive programs that are essential for enhancing both individual and organizational performance.

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to the John C. Stennis Institute of Government and Community Development at Mississippi State University for administrative and financial support of the initial research project.

Notes

1. The 10 cities selected in this study were Biloxi, Greenville, Gulfport, Hernando, McComb, Meridian, Natchez, Pascagoula, Starkville, and Tupelo. Populations ranged from 12,790 to 67,793, with the average population 31,069.

2. Authors desired a 95% confidence interval with a 3% margin of error for the population of interest.

3. In this study, steps were taken to reduce the threat of biased self-reports. The survey posed a number of questions designed to elicit information on incentives, motivation, job satisfaction, empathy, prosocial behaviors, organizational commitment, and respondent demographics. Also, individuals were requested to respond to the survey anonymously to mitigate the potential of social-desirability bias. We tested for common source bias using Harman's single-factor test. Factor analysis of the variables in all six models resulted in four factors, with the biggest factor explaining no more than 37% of the covariance of among the measures.

4. The gender of participants was determined by the following multiple-choice question: What is your gender? The response categories were male, coded as 0, and female, coded as 1. Respondents were also asked: What is your race; multiple-choice responses were Caucasian/white, African American/black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, and Other. White/Caucasian respondents were classified as white and coded as 1, while all other respondents were considered nonwhite and coded as 0. The age variable was determined from survey responses to the following question: What is your age range? There were six

possible responses: 24 or younger, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64, and 65 or older. These responses were coded from 1 (24 or younger) to 6 (65 or older). Education level was also measured categorically, and possible responses included less than high school (coded as 1), high school/GED (coded as 2), 2 years college (coded as 3), 4 years college (coded as 4), master's (coded as 5), law degree (coded as 6), and doctoral degree (coded as 7). Management/nonmanagement was a dichotomous variable derived from the survey question: Are you classified as a department head, manager, or supervisor? No was coded as 0; yes was coded as 1. The public safety/non-public safety variable was collected from the survey's request to indicate the participant's department. Responses from individuals in police and fire departments were noted as public safety (coded as 1), and all others were considered non-public safety (coded as 0). The tenure variable was derived from an open-ended survey question: How many years have you worked for this city? The salary variable was measured categorically, and possible responses were: \$0 to \$19,999 (coded as 1), \$20,000 to \$39,999 (coded as 2), \$40,000 to \$59,999 (coded as 3), \$60,000 to \$69,999 (coded as 4), \$70,000 to \$99,999 (coded as 5), and \$100,000 and above (coded as 6).

5. Cronbach's alphas for the four subscales in Perry's original research ranged from 0.69 to 0.74. As we utilized the same 24-item measures based on Perry and Wise's (1990) conceptualization and operationalization (Perry 1996) and in agreement with the anonymous reviewer, we felt that including those measures at or near the 0.70 level of reliability would provide additional substance to the study.

6. In addition to its original construct, the combined intrinsic variable was evaluated as two other indexes. One was derived from the mean level of importance for the chances you have to accomplish something worthwhile, a job that allows you to help other people, and getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job. The other was derived from the mean level of importance assigned to the chances you have to accomplish something worthwhile, a job that is useful to society, and getting a feeling of accomplishment from your job. Intrinsic reward importance was only correlated to PSM, the four dimensions, and minority status regardless of which construct was used in the evaluation.

7. Results from variance inflation factor (VIF) tests for these models revealed no indication of significant problems with multicollinearity.

References

- Brewer, G.A., & Selden, S.C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: Assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration and Theory, 10*(4), 685–711.
- Bright, L. (2001). Does public service motivation affect the occupation choices of public employees? *Public Personnel Management, 40*(1), 11–24.
- Bright, L. (2005). Public employees with high levels of public service motivation: Who are they, where are they and what do they want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 25*(2), 138–154.
- Bright, L. (2009). Why do public employees desire intrinsic nonmonetary opportunities? *Public Personnel Management, 38*(3), 15–37.
- Buchanan, B. (1975). Red-tape and the service ethic. *Administration and Society, 6*, 423–444.
- Buelens, M., & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review, 67*(1), 65–74.
- Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel Review, 36*(3), 356–377.
- Crewson, P.E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*(4), 499–518.

- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E.; Koestner, R.; & Ryan, R. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627–668.
- DeHart-Davis, L.; Marlowe, J.; & Pandey, S.K. (2006). Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 873–887.
- Downs, A. (1967). *Inside bureaucracy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Frederickson, H.G., & Hart, D.K. (1985). The public service and the patriotism of benevolence. *Public Administration Review*, 45(5), 547–553.
- Frey, B.S. (1997). A constitution for knaves crowds out civic virtues. *Economic Journal*, 107(July), 1043–1053.
- Gabris, G.T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management*, 24(1), 33–51.
- Georgellis, Y.; Iossa, E.; & Tabvuma, V. (2010). Crowding out intrinsic motivation in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21, 473–493.
- Hondeghem, A. (1990). *De loopbaan van de ambtenaar* [The career trajectory of the civil servant]. Leuven: VCOB.
- Houston, D.J. (2000). Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 713–727.
- 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*, 16, 67–86.
- Houston, D.J. (2009). Motivating knights or knaves? Moving beyond performance-related pay for the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 43–57.
- Jurkiewicz, C.J., & Massey, T.K., Jr. (1997). What motivates municipal employees: A comparison study of supervisory vs. non-supervisory personnel. *Public Personnel Management*, 26(3), 367–377.
- Jurkiewicz, C.J.; Massey, T.K., Jr.; & Brown, R.G. (1998). Motivation in public and private organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 21(3), 230–250.
- Karl, K.A., & Sutton, C.L. (1998). Job values in today's workforce: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(4), 515–527.
- Kellough, J.E., & Lu, H. (1993). The paradox of merit pay in the public sector: Persistence of a problematic procedure. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 13(2), 45–64.
- Kellough, J.E., & Nigro, L.G. (2009). Pay for performance in Georgia state government: Employee perspectives on Georgia Gain after 5 years. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 22(2), 146–166.
- Kelman, S. (1987). Public choice and public spirit. *Public Interest*, 87, 80–94.
- Kim, S. (2005). Individual-level factors and organizational performance in government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(2), 245–261.
- Koehler, M., & Rainey, H.G. (2008). Interdisciplinary foundations of public service motivation. In J.L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 33–55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, G.B., & Frank, S.A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 395–404.
- Lyons, S.T.; Duxbury, L.E.; & Higgins, C.A. (2006). A comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, 66(4), 605–618.
- Miner, J.B. (2005). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

- Moynihan, D.P. (2008). The normative model in decline? Public service motivation in the age of governance. In J.L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 247–267). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Naff, K.C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(5), 5–16.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pandey, S.K., & Stazyk, E.C. (2008). Antecedents and correlates of public service motivation. In J.L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 101–117). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J.L. (1996). Measuring public sector motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5–22.
- Perry, J.L. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(2), 181–197.
- Perry, J.L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). Building theory and empirical evidence about public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 499–518.
- Perry, J.L., & Wise, L.R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373.
- Perry, J.L.; Engers, T.; & Jun, S.Y. (2009). Back to the future? Performance-related pay, empirical research, and the perils of persistence. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 39–51.
- Rainey, H.G. (1982). Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic. *American Review of Public Administration*, 16(4), 288–302.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
- Sanders, R.M. (2004). Georgia Gain or Georgia loss? The great experiment in state civil service reform. *Public Personnel Management*, 33(2), 151–164.
- Stazyk, E.C. (2013). Crowding out public service motivation? Comparing theoretical expectations with empirical findings on the influence of performance-related pay. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 33(3), 252–274.
- Steijn, A.J. (2008). Person environment fit and public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 13–27.
- Tschirhart, M.; Reed, M.M.; Freeman, S.J.; & Anker, A.L. (2008). Is the grass greener? Sector shifting and choice of sector by MPA and MBA graduates. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Quarterly*, 37, 668–688.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Government calling: Public service motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice. *Public Administration*, 86(4), 1089–1105.
- 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), 87–107.
- Vandenabeele, W.; Hondeghem, A.; & Steen, T. (2004). The civil service as an employer of choice in Belgium: How work orientations influence the attractiveness of public employment. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24(4), 319–333.
- Weibel, A.; Rost, K.; & Osterloh, M. (2009). Pay for performance in the public sector: Benefits and (hidden) costs. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, 387–412.
- Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving the people or serving for pay: Reward preferences among government, hybrid sector, and business managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 14(4), 369–383.
- Wright, B.E. (2004). The role of work context in work motivation: A public sector applica-

tion of goal and social cognitive theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(1), 59–78.

Wright, B.E., & Davis, B.S. (2003). Job satisfaction in the public sector: The role of work environment. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1), 70–90.

P. Edward French is associate professor and interim director of the Stennis Institute of Government and Community Development at Mississippi State University. He also serves as graduate coordinator in the Department of Political Science & Public Administration and has published widely in the field of public administration. He is editor-in-chief of Public Personnel Management.

Melissa C. Emerson is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Mississippi State University. Formerly a practicing attorney, she is a teaching assistant specializing in human resource issues for her doctorate in public administration.

