The Dimensions of Public Service Motivation and Sector Work Preferences

Review of Public Personnel Administration
32(3) 209–235
© 2012 SAGE Publications
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0734371X11433880
http://rop.sagepub.com

Richard M. Clerkin[1] and Jerrell D. Coggburn[1]

Abstract

Public service motivation (PSM) is a needs-based approach to motivation. People may sate this need in different ways, including direct government service. This article investigates the relationship between individuals' PSM and their work sector (pubic, nonprofit, or for-profit) preferences. It asks, "Does PSM affect an individual's preference for the sector of the economy in which they would ideally be employed?" Our findings indicate that PSM, measured in dimensional form, is a moderate indicator of an individual's sector preference: as PSM increases (particularly, the Self-Sacrifice dimension), the attractiveness of working in the public and nonprofit sector, relative to the for-profit sector, also increases. Focusing on a preservice sample of undergraduate students allows us to conclude that PSM is a need people have prior to entering the workplace, and it may indeed drive whether an individual works in the government, nonprofit, or for-profit sector.

Keywords

employee attitudes, behavior, and motivation, methodological issues, public service motivation, recruitment and selection, strategic management

Introduction

Effective human resource management (HRM) is essential to organizational performance. If organizations—be they public, private, or nonprofit—are unable to attract, hire, motivate, develop, reward, and retain talented individuals, then organizational performance will suffer. Looking at the beginning of this HRM cycle, government

[1]North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Corresponding Author:
Richard M. Clerkin, NC State University, School of Public and International Affairs, Department of Public Administration, Campus Box 8102, Raleigh, NC 27695-8102, USA
Email: Richard_Clerkin@ncsu.edu

and nonprofit organizations have faced ongoing challenges in attracting and, through effective assessment processes, acquiring needed talent (Partnership for Public Service, 2010b; Light, 1999; National Commission on the Public Service, 1989, 2003; National Commission on State and Local Service, 1993). These challenges are more pronounced given labor market dynamics (e.g., the graying workforce) and competitiveness, declining trust in government, declining commitment and sector switching among public service employees, and expressed preferences for private sector work among public affairs graduates (Light, 1999; Ritz & Waldner, 2011).

This makes attracting the right people—in terms of ability and motivation—and having the means for effectively assessing and selecting the best employees fundamental HR responsibilities. Unfortunately, there is considerable evidence that many public service agencies lack this HRM capacity. For example, in two reports the Partnership for Public Service not only identifies a litany of HRM challenges (2010a)—most notably, assessing job applicants (2010b)—but also reports healthy skepticism among federal human capital officers over the ability of the federal HRM workforce to meet them. This situation is potentially dire given President Obama's (2010) memo aimed at streamlining federal hiring—including the goal of eliminating burdensome and time-consuming essay requirements for applicants. Though streamlining may be a laudable goal, the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB, 2010) warns that federal agencies may struggle as they seek tools for evaluating what may end up being—thanks to these reforms and anemic job growth associated with the Great Recession—a flood of applicants. Similar pressures undoubtedly obtain at other levels of government and in nonprofit organizations where HRM capacity issues may be even more pronounced.

These pressures underscore the importance of establishing effective HRM strategies for attracting and identifying talented and committed workers, strategies that could potentially include public service motivation (PSM) (Mann, 2006). PSM is a needs-based approach to motivation. People may sate PSM needs in different ways, only one of which is direct government service. In this article, we investigate the relationship between individuals' PSM and their preferences for where they would like to work; the government, nonprofit, or for-profit sector. This article's research question is, "Does PSM affect an individual's preference for the sector of the economy in which they would ideally be employed?"

To the extent that PSM is associated with an individual's desire to work in a particular sector of society, managers in those sectors can potentially use PSM-based tools to recruit and retain employees. As Perry and Wise (1990) argue, an individual's level of PSM is something an individual has prior to joining a public serving organization, but it can also be affected by the values and culture of their workplace organization. This points to an important concern about workplace studies of PSM: namely, the extent to which observed differences in motivations are more a product of the workplace socialization than an individual's predisposition (Wright, 2001, 2008). In contrast to a wider array of motivational tools and techniques found in the private sector,

public sector managers' motivational tool kits are often limited to motivators/incentives that emphasize their employees' ability to work for the larger public interest, hence it could be these differences that account for higher observed PSM levels among public sector relative to private sector employees. So, as discussed below, the empirical findings in the literature that public and nonprofit employees have higher levels of PSM than for-profit employees may be no more than an artifact of surveying workers already in public and nonprofit workplaces rather than capturing preexisting motives of these individuals.

Most PSM research compares public and private sector employees (e.g., Perry, 1997; Perry, Mesch, & Paarlberg, 2006), an approach that can be faulted for failing to consider sizeable numbers of public service employees in the nonprofit sector (Brewer, 2011). Research consistently shows that PSM is a valid construct for predicting attitudes and behaviors in public organizations. It also finds that different motivators exist between people in public jobs versus those working in the private sector. Beginning with Lewis and Frank's (2002) work examining people's preferences for working for government or the private sector, this study joins a relatively nascent stream of PSM research (Christensen & Wright, 2011; Groeneveld, Steijn, & van der Parre, 2009; Liu, Hui, Hu, Yang, & Yu, 2011; Taylor, 2005; Vandenabeele, 2008) examining whether PSM is something individuals develop prior to entering the workforce. Our article seeks to extend this research stream by (a) widening the choices of employment sectors to include not only government and for-profit organizations but also nonprofit organizations, (b) using Perry's (1996) PSM scale instead of nonvalidated proxies and assessing the effects of PSM's dimensions on sector choice, (c) using a preemployment sample to avoid confounding individuals' PSM-influenced sector preferences with those stemming from the effects of workplace socialization, and (d) exploring gendered differences in PSM's dimensions relative to sector choice. Our findings indicate that PSM is a moderate indicator of an individual's ideal sector workplace setting. In particular, as PSM increases—particularly, the Self-Sacrifice dimension—the attractiveness of working in the government and nonprofit sectors, relative to the for-profit sector, also increases. By using a preemployment sample, we are able to more clearly establish that PSM is a need people have prior to entering the workplace and may indeed drive whether an individual works in the government, nonprofit, or for-profit sector.

To substantiate these findings, we first provide a brief review of attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) theory, which underpins our analysis, and the burgeoning PSM literature. On the latter, we focus primarily on the PSM literature that seeks to verify its validity as a construct for differentiating people's preference for working in the public versus private sector. Next, we will describe the sample of undergraduate students we use in this study, how we operationalize our dependent and explanatory variables, and the statistical technique we use to analyze our data. Finally, we discuss the findings from our models and the conclusions and implications we draw from them.

Individuals and Sector Self-Selection

In their seminal PSM article, Perry and Wise (1990, p. 320) posit that "the greater an individual's public service motivation, the more likely the individual will seek membership in a public organization." Their proposition reflects Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) theoretical framework (Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008; Wright & Christensen, 2010), which holds that individuals are attracted to certain organizations that they deem to be a good fit with their personal values; organizations, in turn, are likely to select those applicants who seem to fit the values of the organization (see also Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). A related theory, rooted in ASA (Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010; Sekiguchi 2004; Vandenabeele 2008), is person-organization fit (PO-fit) theory.[1] Like ASA, PO-fit suggests that individuals will be attracted to organizations where there is a perceived fit (i.e., "congruence") between individual and organization goals and values (Bright 2007, 2008; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Ritz & Waldner, 2011; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele 2008; Wright & Christensen, 2010). There is a considerable body of literature supporting the importance of fit (in its various forms) to understanding organizational behavior (e.g., see Kristof-Brown et al.'s 2005 meta-analysis).

In terms of our focus on the attractiveness of specific organizations to individuals as evidenced in their sector preferences, Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) characterize the attraction process as

> . . . concern[ing] the fact that people's preferences for particular organizations are based upon an implicit estimate of the congruence of their own personal characteristics and the attributes of potential work organizations. That is, people find organizations differentially attractive as a function of their implicit judgments of the congruence between those organizations' goals (and structures, processes, and culture as manifestations of those goals) and their own personalities. (p. 749)

As this suggests, the ASA framework is relevant in suggesting that those possessed of high PSM will be attracted to organizations where such motives are perceived to exist, especially public organizations but also nonprofits. In other words, individuals will perceive that they can attain their respective career preferences and needs in some sectors over others (Tschirhart, Reed, Freeman, & Anker, 2008).

PSM Literature

After periods of stagnation and sporadic interest (Crewson, 1997), recent years have witnessed a flurry of PSM research (Perry et al., 2010). This growing body of research has focused on defining, refining, and establishing the validity of the PSM construct; identifying its antecedents; and determining its correlates. Given that the PSM literature has been reviewed thoroughly elsewhere (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Pandey &

Stazyk, 2008; Perry, 2000; Perry et al., 2010; Wright, 2001), we only offer a brief summary here as a backdrop to our discussion of PSM and employment sector choice.

Perry and Wise (1990, p. 368) define PSM as "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions or organizations." These motives include a mixture of rational (maximizing individual self-interest), normative (beliefs and values about what is proper), and affective (human emotion) motives that fluctuate in salience over an individual's lifetime (Perry & Wise, 1990; Taylor 2007). Other definitions have been offered (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Crewson, 1997; Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999; Vandenabeele, 2007; Wise, 2004), but all are essentially compatible in emphasizing the unique motives and other-regarding behavior of public servants (Perry et al., 2010). Other work has focused on developing measures of PSM and, in turn, assessing their reliability and validity (Coursey, Perry, Brudney, & Littlepage, 2008; Perry 1996, 1997; Perry, Brudney, Coursey, & Littlepage, 2008). Perry (1996) devised the first and most cited of these measures, a survey-based PSM scale consisting of four distinct PSM dimensions: Compassion, Self-Sacrifice, Civic Duty (commitment to public interest), and Attraction to Policy Making. As summarized by Andersen, Pallesen, and Pedersen (2011, p. 12), the Compassion dimension measures affective motives related to an individual's commitment to a socially important program; Civic Duty measures normative motives representing "a sense of duty and loyalty toward government and community"; and Attraction to Public Policy measures rationale motives related to the satisfaction derived from affecting desired policy change (see also Wright, 2008). Perry includes the fourth dimension, Self-Sacrifice, based "on substantive grounds because it has had a historical connection to how we think about public service" (1996, p. 20). The resulting body of research assessing PSM's validity is generally supportive (Wright, 2008; Houston, 2000).

Accepting PSM existence, researchers have gone about the task of uncovering factors that influence PSM, that is, its antecedents. As characterized by Pandey and Stazyk (2008), this research has explored sociodemographic (age, education, and gender), social institutional (religious, professional, and familial), and organizational (culture, hierarchy, regulation) factors. Findings point to positive associations between PSM levels and individuals' educational attainment (Bright, 2005; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Naff & Crum, 1999; Perry, 1997), age (Perry, 1997), religious activity (Perry, 1997; Perry et al., 2008), female gender (Bright, 2005; DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, & Pandey, 2006; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997), family socialization (Perry, 1997; Perry et al., 2008), professional experiences and memberships (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997), and volunteering (Perry et al., 2008) and negative associations between PSM and perceptions of red tape and public service tenure (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007).

Finally, PSM has been associated with a variety of important behavioral and organizational outcomes (i.e., correlates). For example, a number of scholars have examined PSM's association with employees' reward preferences, with most finding that those with high PSM value intrinsic (i.e., doing important work, having the opportunity to serve society) over extrinsic (e.g., economic rewards) aspects of work (Bright,

2005, 2009; Crewson, 1995, 1997; Houston, 2000; Perry, 1997; but see Alonso & Lewis, 2001; Gabris & Simo, 1995). Others have found PSM to be correlated with job satisfaction (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Naff & Crum, 1999), organizational commitment (Crewson, 1997), the likelihood of whistle blowing (Brewer & Selden, 1998), and both individual and organizational performance (Brewer & Selden, 2000; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Kim, 2005).

As this brief review of the literature suggests, considerable attention has been given to PSM and the findings have much to recommend. Less attention, however, has been given to one of the fundamental propositions of PSM, namely, that high PSM will increase the likelihood of an individual seeking membership in a public organization.

PSM and Sector Choice

Reflecting the notion "that individual behavior would be influenced by the magnetic effects of individual identity and organizational characteristics" (Perry et al., 2010, p. 683), Perry and Wise (1990) put forth the above-cited proposition that those possessing greater levels of PSM will be attracted to public sector work. Given its intuitive appeal and frequent reference, it is surprising that there have been relatively few studies explicitly examining the link between PSM and individuals' employment sector preferences (Bright, 2011; Wright & Christensen, 2010; Perry et al., 2008; Tschirhart et al., 2008; Vandenabeele, Hondeghem, & Steen, 2004; Wright, 2001). Generally, research that does explore this connection reports higher levels of PSM, variously measured, among those working in public organizations relative to private ones (e.g., Crewson, 1997; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Steijn, 2008). In their review of such work, Perry et al. (2010) conclude that, though limited, the extant research generally supports the sector choice proposition.

Importantly, however, Perry and Wise's (1990) proposition assumes that PSM exists *prior* to job entry, leading individuals to seek employment in organizations where their public service needs can most readily be met. In contrast, most research reports on differing PSM levels among respondents from the public and for-profit sectors (i.e., postentry), leaving in doubt whether sector choices are due to attraction and selection or socialization and adaptation (Wright, 2001; Wright & Christensen, 2010).[2] Our aim is to help clarify the issue by examining sector preferences among a group of undergraduate, preemployment respondents. Formally stated, our research hypotheses are

Hypothesis 1: Higher levels of PSM increase preferences for nonprofit sector employment relative to employment in the private sector.

Hypothesis 2: Higher levels of PSM increase preferences for public sector employment relative to employment in the private sector.

As elaborated below, we are interested in not only PSM's overall influence on sector choice but also exploring the influence of the respective PSM dimensions. For

clarity of presentation, we will not list (eight) separate hypotheses for public and nonprofit sector preferences over the private sector, respectively, for each of the four PSM dimensions. Instead, we can summarize our general expectations by stating that we expect to see higher levels on each PSM dimension to correspond with increased preferences for public and nonprofit sector employment, respectively, relative to employment in the private sector.

Gender

Though our main research interest rests with assessing PSM's influence on employment sector preferences, we have a secondary interest in exploring potential gendered differences in PSM. Previous research findings on gendered differences in PSM have been mixed (Pandey & Stazyk, 2008). Some findings indicate higher levels of PSM among females on overall measures of PSM (Bright, 2005) and on the PSM dimensions of Compassion (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006) and Attraction to Policy Making (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). In contrast, Perry (1997) finds male respondents to score higher on the Attraction to Policy Making and Civic Duty dimensions while Vandenabeele (2011) reports overall PSM to be higher among male respondents. Other research has focused on gendered differences in sector choice, with the general indication being that females tend to prefer public and nonprofit sector employment over the private sector while males do not (e.g., Blank, 1985; Lewis & Frank, 2002).

In our analysis, we take a different tact in exploring gender. Instead of trying to reconcile whether males or females possess more or less PSM, respectively, we are curious about potential substantive differences in how PSM (i.e., in its dimensional forms) operates in males and females relative to sector choice. Given the mixed findings reported in the literature and the exploratory nature of our analysis of gender, we do not specify formal expectations about how PSM operates across the genders.

Data and Method

To answer our research question we surveyed 329 (70% response rate) undergraduate students taking introductory American politics courses at a large southeastern state university in 2007. Out of this group we have 287 usable responses (effectively a 61% response rate) with complete information for each of the variables used in our study. While not a random sample, given that participants are fulfilling university general education requirements, the demographic makeup of our sample is representative of this university's undergraduate population. While our sample of convenience has a greater proportion of males, and most likely a smaller proportion of African Americans, than a random sample drawn from all American colleges and universities, it nevertheless provides valuable information and insight into using the PSM construct. A sample of undergraduate students, who are preparing to enter the workforce, gives

us an opportunity to expand our understanding of the motivations of this generation at a time when Baby Boomers are retiring from organizations across the United States. Extending our knowledge of how Generation Y is attracted to work place settings offers nonprofit, government, and for-profit workplaces the opportunity to develop intentional strategies for workforce recruitment (Jacobson, 2011).

Wright (2008) and Wright and Grant (2010) have usefully framed several challenges for PSM research. Two major limitations include the reliance on cross-sectional designs and focus on postemployment respondents. Though the current study is cross-sectional, it attempts to address the second concern by targeting a sample of preemployment respondents, namely, a panel of undergraduate students. Setting aside for the moment concerns over the representativeness of this sample, we argue that this approach avoids the potential for confounding results faced by other sector choice research: by focusing on a preemployment sample we eliminate the problem of organizational socialization effects on reported levels of PSM. This allows us to address more confidently (though not definitively, since we do not know the prior work experiences of these college undergraduates) questions of causality that have plagued previous studies.

Students were questioned using Perry's (1996) 24-item PSM instrument. To further investigate students' motivations toward public service, we asked a question in which respondents rank-ordered the type of organization where they would have their ideal job. They were presented with 12 types of organizations that varied based on size and sector (government, nonprofit, for-profit). In a procedure explained below, we reduce these 12 rankings to only three based on the sector of the potential workplace. We use a rank-ordered logit model to explain the respondents' workplace rankings. This random utility model assumes that a rational individual ranks a particular workplace above another only if that option maximizes his or her utility.

> The model generalizes a version of McFadden's (1973) choice model without alternative-specific covariates, as fit by the conditional logit command. It uses richer information about the comparison of alternatives, namely, how decision-makers rank the alternatives rather than just specifying the alternative that they like best. (StataCorp, 2009, p. 1629)

Similar to a conditional logit to fit a mixed model, the rank-ordered logit model uses the characteristics of the alternatives to predict the outcome that is chosen. In this model, each ranking becomes an observation. Therefore, with three sector rankings from 287 usable responses, we have 861 observations. Using a rank-order logit model, we are able to examine (a) how the characteristics of the alternatives impact the respondents' decisions and (b) how the characteristics of the alternatives interact with the characteristics of the individuals to predict the chosen outcome.[3]

Our final analysis is centered on improving our understanding the relationship between PSM and employment sector choice among a group of individuals about to enter the workforce. Also, in response to research that seeks to understand the gendered dimensions of PSM (DeHart-Davis et. al, 2006) and calls for a better

Table 1. Average Workplace Choice Rankings

Sector	Gender	*n*	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max
Nonprofit	Female	121	1.88	0.82	1	3
	Male	166	1.64	0.78	1	3
	Overall	287	1.74	0.80	1	3
For-profit	Female	121	2.14	0.77	1	3
	Male	166	2.34	0.78	1	3
	Overall	287	2.25	0.78	1	3
Government	Female	121	1.98	0.85	1	3
	Male	166	2.02	0.75	1	3
	Overall	287	2.00	0.79	1	3

understanding of the relationship between gender, PSM, and the desire to work in the public sector (Bright, 2005), we first report findings that control for gender and then take the analysis a step further by running the model separately for men and women to see if the genders are motivated by different dimensions of PSM.

Dependent Variable

Respondents were presented with a list of 12 types of workplaces (with examples of each type) and asked to rank their preferences from most to least preferred. Data used in the analysis are recoded so that higher numbered rankings are associated with more preferred workplace. The 12 types of workplaces were large, medium, and small nonprofit, for-profit, and government organizations, entrepreneurial, professional, and military. To improve the interpretability of our results,[4] we focus only on the sector of the potential workplace. First, we extract the highest nonprofit, for-profit, and government workplace rankings for each respondent. Then, we order these three rankings from highest to lowest and assign the highest ranking a 3, the middle ranking a 2, and the lowest ranking a 1. While this data reduction technique eliminates some unique data on organizational size and occupational characteristics, it not only improves the interpretability of our results but also benefits our contribution to the literature by focusing on our analysis squarely on employment sector. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics for each workplace for men and women as well as the overall average for the sample.

On average, respondents ranked a for-profit workplace as the most desirable workplace. Nonprofit workplaces tended to receive the lowest rankings, with government workplace rankings falling between for-profits and nonprofits in terms of desirability. We observe this same pattern for both men and women.

Key Explanatory Variable

PSM. PSM is our primary explanatory variable of interest. Given our own analysis[5] and recent discussions in the literature (e.g., Coursey et al., 2008; Kim, 2009, 2011;

Kim & Vandenabeele, 2010) raising concerns over the face and content validity of the indicators in the Attraction to Public Policy dimension, we do not include that dimension or its indicators in our analysis. To substantiate the appropriateness of using Perry's (1996) PSM construct in our analysis, we performed a 2nd-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Each of the remaining 21-indicator variables was restricted to loading on only the latent PSM dimensions indicated by Perry's research. We then attempted to load the first-order latent constructs onto a second-order latent construct capturing an overall measure of PSM. However, our data failed to converge and they do not fit a second-order model. Without empirical support for a second-order model, we retreat to modeling only the three first-order dimensions of PSM: Civic Duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion.

Our first-order-only model did not allow for error correlations between the indicator and/or the latent variables. While the chi-square value of 451.98, with 186 degrees of freedom, indicates there is not a perfect fit between our data and three of Perry's dimensions,[6] an examination of multiple measures of fit provides moderate support for the model. According to Williams, Vandenberg, and Edwards (2009),

> A model can be considered favorably if the CFI [Comparative Fit Index] value exceeds 0.95 and/or the RMSEA [Root Mean Square Error of Approximation] is below 0.08, and some SEM experts recommend using these two indices together in judging a model. Another positive trend among management researchers is the increased use of the Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR), which has risen in popularity and for which a value less than 0.10 is considered to reflect a good model. (p. 585)

Since two out of the three goodness-of-fit measures are within acceptable levels, RMSEA is 0.068 and SRMR is 0.067, with the CFI (0.84) being below the accepted cutoff, we believe this represents a reasonable fit between our data and Perry's model.

However, when examining the standardized factor loadings for the items of each dimension, four fall below 0.4, with the balance ranging from 0.47 to 0.77. After dropping these four indicators[7] (one each from the Civic Duty and Self-Sacrifice dimensions, and two from the Compassion dimension) we attempted to see if the data matched a second-order model, but once again the model failed to converge. Thus we again retreat to modeling only the three first-order dimensions of PSM.

In the revised first-order model, the chi-square value of 296.26, with 116 degrees of freedom, indicates there is not a perfect fit between our data and three of Perry's dimensions. The measures of closeness of fit are also similar to the model with all 21-inicators; RMSEA (0.065) and SRMR (0.055) are within acceptable ranges, while CFI (0.90) is just below the generally accepted cutoff. These results indicate that there is a reasonable fit between our data and the three-dimension PSM model.

Consistent with this approach to measuring PSM, we averaged respondents' answers to 5-point Likert-type scale questions for each dimension. Higher averages indicated higher levels of PSM. The descriptive statistics for the PSM dimensions are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. PSM Descriptive Statistics

PSM dimensions	Gender	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max
Compassion	Female	121	3.75	0.65	2	5
	Male	166	3.40	0.66	1.50	5.00
	Overall	287	3.55	0.67	1.86	5.00
Self-sacrifice	Female	121	3.61	0.68	1.86	5.00
	Male	166	3.60	0.69	1.50	5.00
	Overall	287	3.60	0.69	1.50	5.00
Civic duty	Female	121	3.64	0.77	1.50	5.00
	Male	166	3.39	0.77	1.00	5.00
	Overall	287	3.50	0.78	1.50	5.00

Note: PSM = Public service motivation.

The Cronbach's alphas, which measure the internal consistency of the PSM scales, meet generally accepted guidelines for indication of reliability, $\alpha = .70$ (Garson, 2007); Compassion ($\alpha = .70$), Self-Sacrifice ($\alpha = 0.80$), Civic Duty ($\alpha = .74$). The reasonable model fit between our data and these three dimensions from Perry's model and the Cronbach's alphas, provide evidence for the presence of the Compassion, Self-Sacrifice, and Civic Duty dimensions of PSM in our respondents. In focusing on the dimensions of PSM, we follow both Taylor (2007), in seeking to understand the relative importance of PSM's dimensions to sector preference, and those researchers (Coursey et al., 2008; Kim, 2011; Kim & Vandenabeele, 2010) who argue that all of PSM's dimensions should be included in PSM analyses.

Control Variables

While we are primarily interested in studying the effect of PSM on rankings of ideal workplaces, there are a number of additional factors that may affect an individual's workplace preference orderings. We report the descriptive statistics for these variables in Table 3 and describe the variables below. Table 4 reports the pairwise correlations for all of the explanatory variables used in the analysis.

Gender. Given the history of the work done in the U.S. nonprofit sector being perceived as "women's work," we expect males to rank nonprofit sector workplaces lower than females. We also expect, given the greater workplace protections from discrimination in the public sector (Lewis & Frank, 2002), that females will rank the public sector higher than males.[8] Our dichotomous gender variable is coded as 0 = *female* and 1 = *male*. About 58% of our sample is male.

Class. With slightly more than a quarter of our sample (25%) being upperclassmen (Juniors and Seniors) taking an introductory political science course, we include this variable as a proxy for age.

Table 3. Explanatory Variables Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Overall Percent	Female Percent	Male Percent
Male	57.8	—	—
Humanities and social science major	50.9	63.4	41.4
Family income greater than US$100,000	47.4	46.3	48.2
Junior/senior	25.1	22.3	27.11
High school volunteer	88.2	92.6	84.9
Mandatory high school volunteer	35.9	33.1	38
Liberal	27.5	34.7	22.3
	$n = 287$	$n = 121$	$n = 166$

Table 4. Pairwise Correlation of Explanatory Variables

	Compassion	Self-sacrifice	Civic duty	Male	Humanities and social science major	Family income >US$100,000	Junior/senior	Liberal	High school volunteer	Mandatory high school volunteer
Compassion	1									
Self-sacrifice	0.42*	1								
Civic duty	0.55*	0.69*	1							
Male	−0.26*	−0.0002	−0.15*	1						
Humanities and social science major	0.13*	−0.01	0.06	−0.22*	1					
Family income >US$100,000	−0.06	0.02	−0.01	0.02	−0.10	1				
Junior/senior	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.05	−0.06	−0.05	1			
Liberal	0.14*	−0.04	0.06	−0.14*	0.26*	−0.13*	0.04	1		
High school volunteer	0.13*	0.18*	0.28*	−0.12*	0.01	0.11	−0.19*	0.01	1	
Mandatory high school volunteer	−0.10	−0.09	−0.15*	0.05	−0.06	0.05	−0.11	−0.01	0.27*	1

*Correlation significant at $p \leq .05$.

Humanities and social sciences major. Previous research has found that educational emphasis is related to employment sector preferences (Liu et al., 2011; Tschirhart et al., 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008). Given this, we control for the potential impact that disciplinary academic socialization has on a student's rankings of ideal workplaces by including a dichotomous variable indicating whether a student is majoring in the college of humanities and social sciences (CHASS). Roughly 51% of respondents were majoring in a humanities or social sciences discipline.

Volunteering. Our survey also captured some information about the respondents' experience with volunteering in high school. Overall, 88% reported they volunteered

in high school. For more than a third of the respondents (36%) they were required to volunteer to fulfill a community service requirement for graduation. While, most likely, not all volunteering was done for nonprofit organizations, we expect that students who volunteered in high school were exposed to a nonprofit organization and should rank nonprofit work places as more desirable than those that did not volunteer. On the other hand, based on literature that suggests being rewarded and evaluated for volunteering crowds out intrinsic motivations to volunteer (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999), we expect mandated volunteering to have the opposite effect.

Family income. We include this variable to capture family influences on workplace preference orderings. We expect that students from higher income families face pressures to aspire to workplaces that allow them opportunity to generate incomes similar to their parents. We dichotomize this variable at US$100,000 and expect respondents reporting family income above this amount will rank for-profit workplaces higher than public and nonprofit workplaces. About 47% of our respondents report family income of at least US$100,000.

Political ideology. We include the respondents' political ideology to capture and impact this may have on their workplace preferences. Given the conventional wisdom that politically liberal individuals are supportive of government, we expect those respondents claiming a liberal political ideology (27% of the sample) to rank government workplaces higher than nonliberals.[9]

Results

We report the results of three models below. Since our PSM data do not support a second-order PSM construct, we do not report the results of the models of workplace preferences using the overall measure of PSM as our key explanatory variable. We are not able to evaluate our hypotheses about the relationship between the overall measure of PSM and sector work choice.[10] More importantly, and being mindful of Kim and Vandenabeele (2010), we report the impact of the dimensions of PSM on workplace sector choice in Table 5. As we describe below, a complex set of relationships between the dimensions of PSM and sector preferences emerges from our research.

As the name of our analytic technique, the Rank-Ordered Logit Model, implies the coefficients reported in the models are logits. Since logits do not have any meaningful substantive interpretation, we focus only on the direction and statistical significance of the coefficients rather than their size when describing and discussing our results. For readers wishing to see a more substantive interpretation presentation of the results, we report those separately in the appendix. However, given the exploratory nature of our study, we refrain from discussing those results to avoid giving our findings more of an air of precision than we feel the data can comfortably support.

PSM Dimensions and Sector Choice

Model 1 examines the impact of the three dimensions of PSM (Compassion, Self-Sacrifice, and Civic Duty) on ideal workplace preference, controlling for the

Table 5. Rank-Order Logistic Models With PSM Dimensions

	Variables	Model 1 (Overall)	Model 2 (Male)	Model 3 (Female)
Workplace	Nonprofit	−4.17***	−3.94***	−4.69**
		(–4.40)	(–3.41)	(–2.90)
	Government	−1.86*	−2.17*	−0.8
		(–2.22)	(–2.14)	(–0.53)
PSM	Compassion × Nonprofit	0.06	0.28	−0.4
		(0.27)	(0.89)	(–1.09)
	Self-sacrifice × Nonprofit	0.59**	0.68*	0.49
		(2.39)	(2.16)	(1.19)
	Civic duty × Nonprofit	−0.01	−0.59*	0.66
		(–0.04)	(–1.74)	(1.56)
	Compassion × Government	−0.02	0.03	−0.04
		(–0.09)	(0.09)	(–0.11)
	Self-sacrifice × Government	0.58**	0.50*	0.75*
		(2.45)	(1.71)	(1.80)
	Civic duty × Government	−0.15	−0.13	−0.33
		(–0.66)	(–0.43)	(–0.83)
Controls	CHASS major × Nonprofit	0.64*	0.63	0.81*
		(2.52)	(1.85)	(2.04)
	CHASS Major × Government	1.01***	0.82*	1.30**
		(4.13)	(2.53)	(3.19)
	Male × Nonprofit	−0.46		
		(–1.81)		
	Male × Government	−0.07		
		(–0.29)		
	Income × Nonprofit	−0.06	0.09	−0.08
		(–0.24)	(0.26)	(–0.20)
	Income × Government	−0.29	−0.1	−0.64
		(–1.27)	(–0.31)	(–1.72)
	HS Volunteering × Nonprofit	0.78	0.71	1.16
		(1.64)	(1.18)	(1.26)
	HS Volunteering × Government	−0.57	−0.33	−1.48
		(–1.41)	(–0.67)	(–1.66)
	Mandatory HS volunteering × Nonprofit	0.31	0.65	−0.22
		(1.19)	(1.80)	(–0.54)
	Mandatory HS volunteering × Government	0.31	0.39	0.08
		(1.19)	(1.16)	(0.20)
	Junior/senior × Nonprofit	0.28	0.17	0.46
		(1.01)	(0.43)	(1.02)

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

Variables	Model 1 (Overall)	Model 2 (Male)	Model 3 (Female)
Junior/senior × Government	0.18	0.11	0.29
	(0.66)	(0.30)	(0.65)
Liberal × Nonprofit	0.39	0.95*	−0.17
	(1.41)	(2.37)	(–0.43)
Liberal × Government	−0.01	0.2	−0.2
	(–0.04)	(0.52)	(–0.50)
Observations	861	498	363
Number of groups	287	166	121

Note: z statistics in parentheses. PSM = Public service motivation. CHASS = college of humanities and social sciences.

*$p < .05$, one-tailed for PSM, two-tailed all other variables. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

respondents' gender. Model 2 examines the impact of the dimensional measures of PSM on ideal workplace preference for male respondents only. Model 3 examines the impact of the dimensional measures of PSM on ideal workplace preference for female respondents only. In general, holding all else constant in Model 1, respondents rank working in a for-profit business higher than government or nonprofit workplaces. However, when running the model separately for men and women, we see a difference. For women (Model 3), there is not a statistically significant difference in the ranking of government and for-profit workplaces.

When looking at the impact of PSM dimensions on workplace rankings, the Self-Sacrifice dimension appears to be the most important dimension that increases the attractiveness of nonprofit and government workplaces for our male respondents (Model 2), while the Civic Duty dimension increases the rankings of the nonprofit workplace for women (Model 3).[11] We explore these impacts of the dimensions of PSM on workplace rankings in detail below.

Nonprofit workplace rankings and dimensions of PSM. Nonprofit workplace rankings provide the most unexpected results and also highlight the importance of examining the impact of the dimensions of PSM separately for men and women. The Self-Sacrifice PSM dimension is an important indicator of increased ranking of nonprofit workplaces relative to for-profit workplaces. In Model 1, the model that controls for gender, Self-Sacrifice is the only statistically significantly dimension. In looking at Model 2, the male-only model, we find Self-Sacrifice to be statistically significantly related to ranking nonprofit workplaces relative to for-profit workplaces, but it is not significant in women-only model (Model 3). We see something very different playing out when looking at the impact of the Civic Duty dimension of PSM. In the overall model (Model 1) there is no significant impact on how a respondent ranks a nonprofit workplace relative to a for-profit workplace. However, this appears to be the result of men and women

canceling each other out in the regression. Somewhat surprisingly, the Civic Duty PSM dimension is negatively related to preferences for the nonprofit versus for-profit workplace ranking for men (Model 2). In Model 3, the female-only model, while coefficient on the Civic Duty PSM dimension is positive, it is not statistically significant. The different direction of the impact of Civic Duty PSM on nonprofit sector workplaces for men and women highlights the importance of not only controlling for gender but also looking at how PSM dimension drive men and women in different ways. Indeed, with the significant negative effect on nonprofit workplace rankings, men with high levels on the Civic Duty PSM dimension may sate this need outside of the workplace.

Government workplace rankings and dimensions of PSM. The interaction between the Self-Sacrifice dimension and government workplace ranking is positively related to increasing government workplace rankings in the overall model (Model 1), the male-only model (Model 2), and the female-only model (Model 3). Also, similar to the nonprofit workplace rankings, the Civic Duty dimension for men (Model 2) actually lowers the ranking of government workplaces relative to for-profit workplace. However, neither the Compassion nor the Civic Duty dimensions are statistically significant in any of the models.

Control Variables

Only two control variables, majoring in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS) and being ideologically liberal, are statistically significant in any of the models. Gender, which is controlled for only in Model 1, family income, high school volunteering experiences, and class standing do not have a statistically significant impact on the relative rankings of preferences for government and nonprofit workplaces relative to for-profit workplaces. We report the findings for the CHASS and politically ideology control variables below.

Humanities and social sciences major. Across all three models, majoring in CHASS increases a respondent's ranking of government workplaces relative to for-profit workplaces. We find that, while being a CHASS major increases the likelihood of ranking nonprofit workplaces higher than for-profit workplaces in the overall model (Model 1), this seems to be driven by the women in our sample. When we run the models separately for men (Model 2) and women (Model 3), being a CHASS major is only significantly related to increasing a woman's ranking of the nonprofit workplace relative to a for-profit workplace. These findings may indicate that nonprofit and government employers may have trouble attracting college graduates with degrees in engineering, business, and the physical sciences.

Political ideology. In Model 1, the model controlling for gender and in Model 3, the female-only model, there is no impact of being politically liberal on sector workplace preferences. In Model 2, though, the male-only model, being politically liberal increases the nonprofit workplace rankings relative to for-profit workplaces.

Discussion

While we report some statistically significant findings above, there are two important stories that emerge from our study. First, PSM is not only a product of socialization in public workplaces. At least as far as our analysis of undergraduates shows, as an individual's level of PSM (in particular, the Self-Sacrifice dimension) increases, the desire to work for government and nonprofit organizations increases relative to the desire to work for a for-profit organization. This finding lends credence to Kim and Vandebabeele's (2010) effort to base a more universal definition of PSM on Self-Sacrifice. Second, gender matters. It is not enough to just control for gender in our models; different dimensions of PSM drive workplace rankings for men than for women. We discuss these two important findings in more detail below.

A Needs-Based Approach to Government and Nonprofit Workplace Recruitment

This study is one of the first to show that PSM is not something developed only once people enter the government or nonprofit workplaces. In our sample of undergraduates, PSM influences their preferences for their ideal workplace. In particular, for this sample of undergraduates, the Self-Sacrifice dimension is consistently the most important dimension for both men and women desiring to work in the government and nonprofit sectors. In addition to thinking about recruitment in terms of knowledge, skills, and abilities for particular positions, framing recruitment of the next generation of government and nonprofit employees in the affective terms of Self-Sacrifice may be another important consideration to attract and increase interest in these positions. Just as important, if nonprofit workplaces want to attract male applicants, then they may need to avoid framing recruitment messages along normative, Civic Duty lines.

Controlling for Gender

When controlling for gender, we do not find any statistically significant differences between men and women and their preferences for working in the government or nonprofit sector relative to the for-profit sector. We also learn in this model, that holding all else constant, only the Self-Sacrifice dimension of PSM is related to a respondent's ranking of government and nonprofit workplaces relative to for-profit workplaces. However, as we discussed above in regard to PSM, not all else is constant in regard to gender. Simply controlling for gender misses the insight that sector workplace preferences of men and women are driven by different factors. In addition to the Civic Duty dimension of PSM leading to different preferences for men than for women, there are a couple of other variables that work differently in the men-only model than in the women-only model.

Controlling for gender misses potentially interesting differences between men and women in regard to college major and political ideology. For instance, in the model

controlling for gender, we see that respondents majoring in CHASS rank nonprofit workplaces higher than those not majoring in CHASS. However, when running the models separately for men and women we see that this relationship is only statistically significant for women.

While we believe these are indeed interesting findings, there is at least one weakness in our research that we need to point out that causes us to somewhat temper our interpretation of our results. In particular, we recognize that most, if not all, of our respondents have probably engaged in paid employment at some point in their lives. Therefore, they are not ranking their workplace preferences tabula rasa. They have undergone at least some minimal form of workplace/career socialization that has influenced their level of PSM. Unfortunately, we did not collect data that allows us to control for these potential influences. In future research, we hope to capture this information in addition to tracking respondents on graduation to see how actual workplace employment decisions match with stated preferences.

As we have discussed above, and in light of our concerns about contamination of previous workplace experiences, our findings indicate that PSM has an impact on the desirability of potential workplaces for undergraduate students. In particular, the Self-Sacrifice dimension appears to be the most important dimension increasing the desirability of working in the government and nonprofit sectors. With these findings in mind, we draw some general conclusions and implications for practice below.

Conclusion and Implications

Given the promise of PSM for producing desirable HRM and performance outcomes, there is a need to provide clearer guidance on how PSM knowledge can be used in practice (Wright & Grant, 2010). Though not based on results from quasi-experimentation or field experimentation (Wright & Grant, 2010), efforts are now being made to offer practical advice for integrating PSM into HRM practices. Relative to our focus on sector choice, there are several strategies related to attracting and selecting employees who possess high PSM.

Previous work has discussed the selection phase, where assessment of PSM might occur through structured interviews, behavioral interviews, and the like (Paarlberg & Lavigna, 2010; Paarlberg, Perry, & Hondeghem, 2008). Given the aforementioned presidential memorandum geared toward streamlining and improving federal hiring, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) is developing a variety of assessment tools for agencies throughout the federal government (http://www.opm.gov/hiringreform/). This may represent a genuine opportunity to introduce PSM-related considerations into federal assessment tools and, importantly, to assess their reliability and validity in practice.

We generally agree with the importance of incorporating PSM as a selection criterion into public service employment despite practical challenges (Mann, 2006), but we also want to reiterate the importance of including certain PSM messages from the very beginning of the recruitment process as part of a human resources marketing strategy

(Jacobson, 2011; Ritz & Waldner, 2011). Owing to the attraction-selection-attrition framework, public service organizations should consider incorporating PSM, especially elements related to the Self-Sacrifice dimension, as a key component of their recruitment efforts (e.g., Liu et al., 2011; Doverspike, Qin, Magee, Snell, & Vaiana, 2011). If the goal is to develop a large pool of qualified applicants with high PSM, then it behooves organizations to send clear and accurate messages in their job announcements about both the organization's values and the nature of jobs being filled (MSPB, 2010; Tschirhart et al., 2008). Offering a realistic portrayal of what the organization stands for and a preview of what a specific job entails should help facilitate an applicant self-selection process where high PSM prospects are more apt to apply than those with low PSM.[12] Similarly, research showing that those with high PSM who are currently working in private sector organizations have heightened desire to switch to the public sector (Steijn, 2008; Wright & Christensen, 2010) suggests a potential strategy for recruitment: public organizations should consider targeted recruitment, including advertising in trade publications, that aims to attract high PSM talent from the private sector. Given conventional views about for-profit firms poaching public agencies' best talent, such a strategy would represent a rather dramatic role reversal. Still, if public employers were successful in appealing to unmet PSM needs in private sector workers who have had other salient needs (e.g., income security) satisfied or, as Wright and Christensen (2010) suggest, have found aspects of their job and/or organization less satisfying than expected, then such a strategy might yield positive results—for both the employee and the public service organization.

Of course, the importance of PSM does not end on entry to the organization. Previous research has established the importance of organizational influences on PSM (e.g., Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). On this, Paarlberg and Lavigna (2010) use a transformational leadership frame to suggest a portfolio of strategies, including (among others) aligning employee and organizational values, communicating an inspirational ideology, providing effective "on-boarding" (i.e., the interval between selection and socialization), and setting clear and important public service goals. Such practices point to the importance of ensuring that initial value judgments made during the attraction and selection phases are confirmed and reinforced throughout the employment relationship.

In conclusion, we do not argue that PSM is a panacea when it comes to human capital attraction and acquisition. Indeed, our two most important findings may well be that (a) the relationship between PSM and sector preference may be driven primarily by a single dimension, Self-Sacrifice, which suggests that researchers should be wary of testing relationships between PSM and other variables without separating the effects of each dimension or risk drawing conclusions about PSM that are too strong or broad; and (b) studies that do not test for potential moderating effects of gender may miss some of the more nuanced effects of PSM (Perry et al., 2010), a possibility that might help explain why studies that have investigated relationships between PSM and gender have produced conflicting results.

Finally, our inability to empirically support a second-order PSM construct raises concerns with the reliability and validity of this currently accepted way of measuring

PSM in the literature. On this point, the current effort by Kim et al. (2011) to develop a more reliable and valid measurement of PSM is timely. Improved PSM measures will further strengthen the argument that PSM can be an important consideration that ought to be incorporated into public service organization's recruitment and selection processes. Indeed, we concur with Leisink and Stein's (2008) assertion that PSM provides an indication of why a person may be pursuing a public service job, but it does not necessarily provide an indication of their ability to actually perform. As such, PSM should be considered alongside other assessment considerations, most notably ability.[13] Assuming similar levels of ability, PSM may offer meaningful cues about who will succeed on the job (Brewer & Selden, 1998; Naff & Crum, 1999). And, importantly, our article supports such assessments by offering some assurance that PSM exists prior to job entry.

Appendix

Percent Change in the Odds of being Ranked Ahead Versus Ranked Behind

Variable	Model 1 (Overall)	Model 2 (Male)	Model 3 (Female)
Nonprofit	−98.5	−98.1	−99.1
Government	−84.4	−88.6	
Compassion × Nonprofit			
Self-sacrifice × Nonprofit	80.8	98.1	
Civic duty × Nonprofit		−44.5	
Compassion × Government			
Self Sacrifice × Government	78.3	65.3	112.5
Civic duty × Government			
CHASS Major × Nonprofit	89.6		125.5
CHASS Major × Government	175.1	127.1	266.1
Male × Nonprofit			
Male × Government			
Income × Nonprofit			
Income × Government			
HS Volunteering × Nonprofit			
HS Volunteering × Government			
Mandatory HS Volunteering × Nonprofit			
Mandatory HS Volunteering × Government			
Junior/senior × Nonprofit			
Junior/senior × Government			
Liberal × Nonprofit		158.3	
Liberal × Government			

We report the percent change in odds for only the statistically significant findings. For alternative specific variables (Nonprofit and Government) the percent change in the odds can be interpreted as follows: All else being equal, comparing a job in the government sector to a job in the for-profit sector decreases the respondents' odds of preferring the government sector job by 98.5%. For the case-specific variables (i.e., those presented as interactions), the interpretation is as follows: All else being equal, a standard deviation increase in a male's Self-Sacrifice PSM score increases the odds of ranking a government workplace ahead of a for-profit workplace by 98%.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. PO-fit is one of several "fit" theories falling under the broad person-environment fit (PE-fit) umbrella, including person-job (PJ-fit), person-group (PG-fit), person-supervisor (PS-fit). Given our focus on individuals' attraction to sector workplaces (and not specific jobs), PO-fit is most relevant. For a complete discussion, see Kristof-Brown et al. (2005).
2. Notable exceptions include Vandenabeele (2008), who assesses the relationship between PSM (using a reduced PSM scale) and the attractiveness (as opposed to ranked preferences) of public and industrial organizations; Wright and Christensen (2010), who examine attorneys' sector preferences both cross-sectionally and longitudinally, including their initial job selection; and Liu et al (2011), who examine the Self-Sacrifice and commitment to public interest PSM dimensions among a sample of Chinese undergraduates.
3. "Rologit requires the data to be arranged with one alternative per row. Incidentally, this is why the model is sometimes referred to as the exploded logit model, since 1 observation with ranks is 'exploded' into multiple observations, with one observation for each rank" (Long & Freese, 2006, p. 342). These alternatives are grouped by respondent. Since case-specific explanatory variables (e.g., a respondent's gender or Civic Duty PSM score) are invariant within the exploded group, they must be interacted with the alternative specific variable (e.g., nonprofit, government, for-profit workplace) to be included in the model.
4. We thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.
5. Our analysis of the PSM construct provides additional justification for excluding the Attraction to Policy Making dimension. Specifically, while an overall PSM model including the dimension was found to be significantly related to sector choice, one of the indicators for Attraction to Policy Making had a standardized factor loading of only .38 and the dimension itself was very weakly correlated with the other three PSM dimensions.
6. The chi-square test is often discounted as a measure of fit because of its sensitivity to sample size, with large sample sizes less likely to reach acceptable thresholds.

7. The four questions dropped are "I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the community, even if it harmed my interests."; "There are few public programs I wholeheartedly support."; "I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves."; "Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds."
8. Similar relationships might reasonably be expected for different races, but our survey instrument did not include a question on race in the respondent demographic section so we cannot control for this in our model.
9. We have also run the models with a three-level political ideology variable with moderate being the excluded category. In those models, there are no significant differences between conservatives and moderates and the statistically significant difference between moderates and liberals in those models are the same as the ones reported between liberals and nonliberals below. Therefore, we use political ideology as a dichotomous, rather than trichotomous, variable to ease interpretability.
10. We struggled with the decision to drop this portion of our analysis. While we do not have the empirical support for this second-order latent construct in our data, the theorizing and extant literature behind PSM suggests that the construct is valid. Indeed, when we do run models that include an overall measure of PSM, calculated as the average of the respondents' dimensional PSM scores, we find that this overall measure of PSM influences sector work choice in the expected direction. The higher a person's overall level of PSM, the more he or she prefers government and nonprofit workplaces.
11. Based on a suggestion from a reviewer, we also tested for differences between rankings for Government versus Nonprofit Sector workplaces. In testing for the equality of the value of the PSM coefficients in each of the models, we find only one statistically significant difference. For women, increasing Civic Duty increases the ranking of Nonprofit over Government workplaces.
12. It is worth noting that this strategy is suggested by the complementary Person-Job fit (P-J fit) framework and its focus on the congruence between an individual's PSM needs and the particular responsibilities of a specific job as opposed to the goals and values of the sector or organization, suggested by Person-Organization fit (P-O fit; see Christensen & Wright, 2011; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Leisink & Steijn, 2008).
13. This could also work against the potential danger of creating, over time, a homogenous organization that can impede organizational adaptability and performance (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995).

References

Andersen, L. B., Pallesen, T., & Pedersen, L .H. (2011). Does ownership matter? Public service motivation among physiotherapists in the private and public sectors in Denmark. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*(1), 10-27.

Alonso, P., & Lewis, G. B. (2001). Public service motivation and job performance: Evidence from the federal sector. *American Review of Public Administration, 31*(4), 363-80.

Blank, R. M. (1985). An analysis of workers' choice between employment in the public and private sectors. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 38*(2), 211-224.

Brewer, G. A. (2011). A symposium of public service motivation: Expanding the frontiers of theory and empirical research. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*(1), 3-9.

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 8*, 413-439.

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: Assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(4), 685-711.

Bright, L. (2005). *Public employees with high levels of public service motivation*. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 25*, 138-154.

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), 361-379.

Bright, L. (2008). Does public service motivation really make a difference on the job satisfaction and turnover intentions of public employees? *American Review of Public Administration, 38*, 149-166.

Bright, L. (2009). Why do public employees desire intrinsic nonmonetary opportunities? *Public Personnel Management, 38*(3), 15-37.

Bright, L. (2011). Does public service motivation affect the occupation choices of public employees? *Public Personnel Management, 40*(1), 11-24.

Christensen, R. K., & Wright, B. E. (2011). The effects of public service motivation on job choice decisions: Disentangling the contributions of person-organization fit and person-job fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. doi:10.1093/jopart/muq085

Coursey, D. H., Perry, J. L., Brudney, J. L., & Littlepage, L. (2008). Psychometric verification of perry's public service motivation instrument. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 28*(1), 79-90.

Crewson, P. E. (1995). A Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Sector Entrant Quality. *American Journal of Political Science, 39*(3), 628-639.

Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*, 499-518.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (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*, 873-887.

Doverspike, D., Qin, L., Magee, M. P., Snell, A. F., & Vaiana, L. P. (2011). The public sector as a career choice: Antecedents of an expressed interest in working for the federal government. *Public Personnel Management, 40*(2), 119-132.

Frank, S. A., & Lewis, G. B. (2004). Government employees: Working hard or hardly working? *American Review of Public Administration, 34*(1), 36-51.

Gabris, G. T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management, 24*(1), 33-51.

Garson, G. (2007). *Statnotes: Topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved from http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/reliab.htm

Groeneveld, S., Steijn, B., & van der Parre, P. (2009). Joining the Dutch Civil Service: Influencing motives in a changing economic context. *Public Management Review, 11*, 173-189.

Jacobson, W. S. (2011). Creating a motivated workforce: How organizations can enhance and develop public service motivation. *Public Personnel Management, 40*, 215-238.

Kim, S. (2005). Individual-level factors and organizational performance in government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 15*, 245-261.

Kim, S. (2009). Revising Perry's measurement scale of public service motivation. *American Review of Public Administration, 39*, 149-163.

Kim, S. (2011). Testing a revised measure of public service motivation: Reflective versus formative specification. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 21,* 521-546.

Kim, S., & Vandenabeele, W. (2010). A strategy for building public service motivation research internationally. *Public Administration Review, 70*, 701-709.

Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R. K., Desmarais, C., . . . Wright, B. E. (2011, June). *The development of an international instrument to measure public service motivation: A research note*. Paper presented at the 11th National Public Management Research Conference. Syracuse, NY.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 281-342.

Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work of the government? *Public Administration Review, 62*, 395-404.

Leisink, P., & Steijn, B. (2008). Recruitment, attraction, and selection. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management*: *The call of public service* (pp. 118-135). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Light, P. C. (1999). *The new public service*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.

Liu, B., Hui, C., Hu, J., Yang, W., & Yu, X. (2011). How well can public service motivation connect with occupational intention? *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 77*, 191-211.

Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using state*. (2nd ed.). College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.

Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: Public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public Personnel Management, 35*(1), 33-48.

McFadden, D. (1973). Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior. In P. Zarembka (Ed.), *Frontiers in econometrics*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Merit Systems Protection Board. (2010). The New Importance of Job Announcements. *Issues of Merit, 15*(4), 1-7.

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review, 67*(1), 40-53.

Naff, K. C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *19*(3), 5-16.

National Commission on the Public Service (Volcker Commission). (1989). *Leadership for America: Rebuilding the public service*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

National Commission on the Public Service (Volcker Commission). (2003). *Urgent business for America: Revitalizing the federal government for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.

National Commission on the State and Local Public Service (Winter Commission). (1993). *Hard truths/tough choices: An agenda for state and local reform*. Albany, NY: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Obama, B., Office of the President of the United States. (2010, May 11). *Presidential memorandum*: *Improving the federal recruitment and hiring process***.** Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/presidential-memorandum-improving-federal-recruitment-and-hiring-process

Paarlberg, L. E., & Lavigna, B. (2010). Transformational leadership and public service motivation: Driving individual and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review, 70*(5), 710 -718.

Paarlberg, L. E., Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). From theory to practice: Strategies for applying public service motivation. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 268-293). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Partnership for Public Service and Grant Thorton LLP. (2010a). *Closing the gaps: Seven obstacles to a first-class federal workforce*. Washington, DC: Author.

Partnership for Public Service and PDRI. (2010b). *The weakest link: How strengthening assessment leads to better federal hiring*. Washington, DC: Author.

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 6*(1), 5-22.

Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*, 181-197.

Perry, J. L. (2000). Bringing society in: Toward a theory of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(2), 471-488.

Perry, J. L., Brudney, J. L., Coursey, D., & Littlepage, L. (2008). What drives morally committed citizens? A study of the antecedents of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review, 68*, 445-458.

Perry, J. L., Hondeghem, A., & Wise, L. R. (2010). Revisiting the motivational bases of public service: Twenty years of research and an agenda for the future. *Public Administration Review, 70*, 681-690.

Perry, J. L., Mesch, D., & Paarlberg, L. (2006). Motivating employees in a new governance era: The performance paradigm revisited. *Public Administration Review, 66*, 505-514.

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review, 50*, 367-373.

Rainey, H. G., & Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 9*(1), 1-32.

Ritz, A., & Waldner, C. (2011). Competing for future leaders: A study of attractiveness of public sector organizations to potential job applicants. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*, 291-316.

Schneider B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437-454.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 747-773.

Sekiguchi, T. (2004). Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. *Osaka Keidai Ronshu, 54*, 179-196.

StataCorp. (2009). Stata: Release 11 [Statistical Software]. College Station, TX: Author.

Steijn, B. (2008). Person–Environment fit and public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal, 11*(1), 13-27.

Taylor, J. (2005). The next generation of workers in Australia: Their views on organizations, work and rewards. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*, 1919-1933.

Taylor, J. (2007). The impact of public service motives on work outcomes in Australia: A comparative multi-dimensional analysis. *Public Administration, 85*, 931-959.

Tschirhart, M., Reed, K. K., 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 Sector Quarterly, 37*, 668-688.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a public administration theory of public service motivation: An institutional approach. *Public Management Review, 9*(4), 545-556.

Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Government calling: Public service motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice. *Public Administration, 86*, 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*, 87-107.

Vandenabeele, W., Hondeghem, A., & Steen, T. (2004). The civil service as an employer of choice in Belgium. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 24*, 319-333.

Williams, L. J., Vandenberg, R. J., & Edwards, J. R. (2009). Structural equation modeling in management research: A guide for improved analysis. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*, 543-604.

Wise, L. R. (2004). Bureaucratic posture: On the need for a composite theory of bureaucratic behavior. *Public Administration Review, 64*, 669-680.

Wright, B. E. (2001). Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 11*, 559-586.

Wright, B. E. (2008). Methodological challenges associated with public service motivation research. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 80-98). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wright, B. E., & Christensen, R. K. (2010). Public service motivation: A test of the job-attraction-selection-attrition model. *International Public Management Journal, 13*, 155-176.

Wright, B. E., & Grant, A. M. (2010). Unanswered questions about public service motivation: Designing research to address key issues of emergence and effects. *Public Administration Review, 70*, 691-700.

Bios

Richard M. Clerkin is an assistant professor of public administration at North Carolina State University's School of Public and International Affairs (SPIA). His research interests include motivations for giving and volunteering, PSM, and the advocacy and accountability of nonprofits. His published work appears in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Public Administration Review, Administration & Society,* and the *American Review of Public Administration*.

Jerrell D. Coggburn is a professor of public administration at North Carolina State University's School of Public and International Affairs (SPIA). His primary research interests include public sector human resource management, public management, and administrative reform.