

# **Does private provision jeopardize the future of public service?**

Sector differences in public service motivation between private and public Danish employees

Paper prepared for the 14. IRSPM Conference in Bern, 7 -9 April 2010.

Workshop 23: Public Service Motivation.

By Lotte Bøgh Andersen & Lene Holm Pedersen

## **Abstract**

The variation in PSM between the public and the private sector and the importance of PSM for recruitment has been a central theme in the PSM literature. We contribute to this research by investigating differences in the dimensions compassion, public interest, attraction to policy-making and user orientation when the effects of occupational category, age and gender are controlled for. Public interest is higher in the public than the private sector, and it influences the preferences for future employment in the public sector positively. In contrast, user orientation is higher in the private sector. Compassion and attraction to policy making do not differ between the sectors nor do they influence preferences for future sector employment. These results have implications for the private provision of public services and for public management.

## **1. Introduction**

Whether public service motivation (PSM) differs between the private and public sectors has long been a central theme in the public service motivation literature. Traditionally, PSM is considered to be higher in the public sector, because the possibilities of serving the public good are assumed to be better here (Andersen et al., 2009). However, a wish to serve the public may cut across the public and private sectors, including voluntary organizations (Brewer and Selden, 1998; Steijn, 2008). PSM may be a question of service rather than of sector (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008a: 3). In addition, empirical analysis suggests that the relationship between sector and PSM may be due to variations in occupational categories dominating in the public

and private sector (Buelens and Broeck, 2007; Andersen et al., 2009). An occupational category consists of persons performing approximately the same tasks, and the relationship between sector and PSM may disappear when occupational category is properly controlled for, because task, rather than sector, may affect PSM. If this is the case, private provision of public services does not necessarily jeopardize the quality of public service. Andersen et al. (2009) illustrate this for a crucial case, e.g. an occupation with identical tasks organized in the private as well as the public sector. This paper extends this research by including an encompassing range of occupational categories, and by including another important question which until now has been neglected. Due to the focus on sector differences in the *level* of PSM, it has not been tested whether the *type* of PSM differs systematically between the sectors. In this paper, we investigate sector differences in the type of PSM for several occupational categories who perform the same tasks in the private and public sectors.

We argue that employees in the public as well as the private sector have pro-social motivation, but that the reasons as well as recipients for this motivation differ. Thus, a key difference between the private and public sector is the recipients of services being based on pro-social motivation. In the public sector, the possibilities of working for “the generalised other” and the public interest are more evident. In contrast, employees in the private sector to a larger extent express their pro-social motivation by doing good for the individual user. In other words, we argue that public employees have higher commitment to the public interest and are more attracted to policy making while private employees are relatively more oriented towards the users. This statement is investigated controlling for occupational category and analyzing the importance of the PSM dimensions.

It has been a central claim that PSM matter to the recruitment in that public sector. Perry & Wise (1990: 370) state that: ‘The greater an individual’s public service motivation the more likely the individual will seek membership in a public organization’. This claim is based on the assumption that individuals seek organisational incentive systems that match their motives (Knoke & Wright-Isak, 1982). Thus, the attractiveness of an organisation increases if there is a fit between the person and the organisation (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). This idea is in line with the attraction-selection-attrition scheme which points out that people are not randomly assigned to the organisations they come to work in. In contrast, they select themselves into and out of organisations (Schneider, 1987: 400). Thus, PSM may vary between sectors, and PSM may influence the preferences for future employment.

Few studies investigate if this is the case. Most importantly, Vandenabeele (2008) finds that the PSM dimensions public interest, compassion and attraction to policymaking correlates positively with preferences for future employment in more 'public' organisations – the analysis being based on the idea that some organizations are more 'public' than others (Antonsen & Beck Jørgensen, 2008). Thus all three sub-dimensions have a significant impact on the propensity to choose a public employer, where as compassion is the only dimension which has a significant and negative impact on the choice of a private employer. In line with this Steijn finds that civil servants with higher levels of PSM are more inclined to prefer jobs in the public sector when age, gender and educational level is controlled for (2008). However, the measurement is rather weak as it is based on one single item (Steijn, 2008: 18). In line with this, Lewis and Frank (2002) found that PSM increases the preferences for working for the government in general. Among employees under the age of 30, they found that PSM is higher for government employees. However, in this study PSM does not seem to influence the preferences for future employment (Lewis and Frank, *ibid.*). Research also show that the extent to which it is seen as an important work attribute that the work is important to society and that the work is helpful to others is higher in among public employees (Crewson, 1997; Lewis and Frank, *ibid.*). Some control for occupational category is made as it shows that public sector engineers have higher scores than private sector engineers (Crewson, *ibid.*: 505). Behavioral variations between the sectors are also found (Houston, 2006; Brewer, 2003), but it is difficult to assess if the variations found are due to the specific work-tasks and professions in the public sector and if they remain if occupational category is controlled for. Thus, few studies investigate how sector affiliation influences the PSM dimensions and the preferences for future sector, and controls for occupational category are rarely made. It may be that graduates select a certain organisation influenced by their PSM. But once the choice of sector is made how does sector-based socialization influence PSM? And how does the present sector affect the preferences for future sector? In this study, we analyse PSM and its dimensions among employees in employment as well as their preferences for future employment.

## **2. Public service motivation: Concept and dimensions**

This section discusses the concept of public service motivation and its different dimensions. Perry and Wise (1990: 368) initially defined Public Service Motivation

as ‘an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organisations that might drive individuals to perform public service’. This definition implies that certain features of the public sector encourage individuals to deliver public service. However, PSM have increasingly been seen as a matter of service rather than sector, and more recent definitions see PSM as a motivational force which may exist in the private as well as the public sector. Rainey and Steinbauer (1999: 23) see PSM as a ‘general altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation or humanity’. Brewer and Selden (1998: 417) define PSM as ‘the motivating force that make individuals deliver significant public service’. Another central distinction is to what extent PSM is seen as directed towards a collective entity, or if it also includes doing good for specific others as in the latter definition. Perry and Hondeghem (2008a: 6) encompass both aspects when they see PSM as an orientation to do something good for others and society in the delivery of public service. In line with this we argue that PSM can be directed to the specific as well as the generalised other.

Perry and Wise (1990: 368) suggest that PSM derives from three types of reasons: Affective, normative and rational. Affective bonding with others is the emotional basis of serving for others (Knoke and Wright-Isak, 1982). Identification is the core of affective reasons. Employees are likely to identify with others identify with others. The sense of oneness or the feeling that oneself could be or could have been brought in the other persons situation is what may create a willingness to do good for others (Kim and Vandenberg, 2009). Norm-based reasons refer to actions generated by efforts to conform to values and norms. Norms and values are likely to be internalized and people are likely to a feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment when they contribute to realize these values. This may be expressed as serving the public interest or a desire to make a difference to the fellow citizen (Kim and Vandenberg, *ibid*). Rational reasons are sometimes seen as encompassing self-interested motives (Perry & Wise, 1990, Wright and Pandey, 2008), and in line with this as including a desire to represent special interests as well as desires for personal utility maximization (Wise, 2000) Thus individual could participate in policymaking as a way to maximize their own utility. However, the understanding of rational reasons as being individual and self-interested appears to be inconsistent, as Public Service Motivation essentially is pro-social motivation. Thus the rational self-serving motives can by definition not be public service motives regardless of the

social or public good they produce (Wise, 2000). It makes more sense to understand the rational antecedent of PSM as instrumental in the sense that participation in the delivery of public services is instrumentally motivated when it is based on an understanding of how means and measures can be combined in order to contribute to the delivery of public services. Thus the rational, instrumental reasons are based on the individual holding the understanding that exercising a particular behaviour is an instrument which can be employed in order to do good for others. This means the instrumental reasons are based on altruistic preferences. They may include working to produce public services, participate in the policy process and community activities, participate in activities for social development (Kim and Vandenaable, 2009).

Perry (1996) sees these three types of human motives (affective, normative and rational/instrumental) as antecedents of the four distinct dimensions of public service motivations. Firstly, public interest which denotes the desire to serve the society based on values and duty. Second, compassion encompasses the emotionally and empathically based motivation. Thirdly, self-sacrifice describes the will to bypass one's own needs in order to help others and society in the provision of public services. Fourthly, attraction to policy-making denotes motivation to improve decision making concerning public services. These are fundamentally different reasons can make people inclined to deliver public service. However, a three factor solution coincides with the three dimensions of motivation that are the theoretical underpinnings of the scale and self-sacrifice which is not theoretically explained is highly correlated with the public interest dimension (Perry, 1996: 19). Thus, affective reasons are linked to compassion, normative reasons to the public interest and rational reasons to attraction to policy making (Wright, 2008:82). In this analysis, the dimension self-sacrifice is excluded from the analysis due to its high correlation with public interest. Furthermore, it remains under-theorised as is remains unclear to what extent it is rooted in affective, normative or rational antecedents (see Coursey & Panday, 2007). In addition to the traditional PSM dimension, we included a dimension called user orientation which measures the motivation to help the specific user of public services (Vandenabeele, 2008a; Andersen et al., 2009). It can be discussed if this dimension should be included in the overall PSM construct. In order to ensure coherence and progression in the field, it may be an advantage to draw on similar dimensions and constructs internationally. However, in this analysis it matters less, as the focus is on the variation of dimensions. Which dimension to include in the

PSM measure is a highly relevant discussion, which should be continued (Kim and Vandenabeele, 2009).

We regard the PSM construct as first order reflexive and second order formative (Kim and Vandenabeele, 2009: 13). This means that the construct reflects underlying dimensions, which are fundamentally different in type, but which all together add up in a more aggregated construct. For instance beer, whisky, wine and gin are different, but they all contribute to alcohol consumption, which makes you drunk. In some analyses, it makes sense to use the unified construct, while the dimensions should be used individually, when theoretical arguments imply the dimensions have different causes and consequences. In line with this, we argue that compassion, public interest, user-orientation and attraction to policy making are fundamentally different in type, but that they all add together in the PSM construct, which measures the orientation to deliver public service with the purpose of doing good for others and society. We find that the dimension ‘democratic governance’ could be included in the construct, but that it cannot be done by adding it to the other dimensions, as this dimension measures the way in which the individual think that public interest is helped, that is, what values are desirable in public administration. This is also reflected in items concerning for example stability (var 59) and accountability (var 66) (Vandenaabele, 2008a: 157; see also Hood, 1991) rather than the inclination of an individual to serve the public. In sum, it is fruitful to understand PSM as a formative construct, and this implies that the dimensions (public interest, compassion, attraction to policymaking and user-orientation) may vary independently between the sectors and that they influence the preferences for future sector differently.

In sum, we expect individuals to have different *recipients* for the ‘good deeds’ and different *reasons* for helping these recipients in the context of public service delivery. We argue that the dimensions of the public service motivation capture these differences in reasons and recipients (see table 1).

Table 1: reasons and recipients in the delivery of public services

	The specific user	The public	The political system
Affective	Compassion		
Normative	User-orientation	Public Interest	

Rational/instrumental			Attraction to policy making
-----------------------	--	--	-----------------------------

In the following, we discuss how differences between the public and private sector may cause differences in reasons and recipients and hence in the variation on PSM dimensions across sectors.

Public administration research has identified core distinctions between public and private organisations regarding their external environment, the transaction between the organisation and the environment and considering the internal goals and working processes of the organisation (Rainey et al, 1976). As it has proved difficult to categorise organisations as either public or private, it has been argued that ‘publicness’ is matter of degree rather than kind, and empirical measures of the degree of publicnes have been developed such as for instance the degree of public finance (Bozeman, 1987; Bozeman, 1994). Factors such as market pressures and political authority are important in the external environment (Rainey et al., *ibid.*; Bozeman, 1994). Public organisations are publicly owned and to a higher extend they are also publicly financed, and hence to a higher extend depend on political authority in order to reach funding, while private organisations are subject to private ownership, earn their revenue from the market and hence also are more exposed to competition and bankruptcy (Rainey, 1979; Bozeman, *ibid.*). In consequence, public organisations have been seen as having stronger relations with political and government authorities and they are more exposed to political influence (Walsh, 1978; Mintzberg, 1973). Regarding organization-environment transactions public organisations are seen as more coercive, as having a broader impact with a wider scope of concern such as for instance the ‘public interest’. Furthermore, public organisations are more directly subject to public scrutiny and unique public expectations (Rainey et al., *ibid.*). Considering the internal structures and processes vague, complex and conflicting goals, a more political role for top managers, different incentives and also different characteristics of the employees have been identified as central features (Rainey et al., *ibid.*; Rainey & Linn, 1992). These factors may cause variations motivations in the working conditions and motivations of the employees in the public and the private sector respectively. In addition, an alternative research tradition sees public values as defining for the publicness of an organisation (Antonsen and Jørgensen, 1997; Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007). In this view publicness is indicative of a process of public values as inputs resulting in

public values as outcomes (Moulton, 2010). Thus higher levels of PSM among people recruited to the public sector, might result in higher levels of PSM in the public sector, which again may lead to higher levels of PSM among the people recruited. In line with this it has been argued that studying perceptions of sector differences is interesting in their own right as the public sectors image is important to future recruitment and turnover (Feeney, 2007). There is a point in this, but in order to explaining the initiation of this process some notion of the difference between the public and private sector needs to be included. We argue that the difference in reasons recipients is central.

Pro-social motivation and its affective, normative and rational/instrumental antecedents exist in the public as well as the private sector, but delivering service to people with the purpose of doing good for others and society can be directed towards many different recipients. We make a distinction between three main types. Firstly, people may be ready to do something good for society by addressing a specific user of the public service. In this case, a specific user or user group is seen as the recipient. This corresponds to Vandenaabee's (2008a) user/customer orientation dimension. Second, a concern for the fellow citizen in more general terms may be expressed as an inclination to do good for society in general. Rather than a specific other, the recipient is then society in general, corresponding to the public interest dimension. The normative desire to serve the community based on values and duty is found in both sectors, but it is only in the public sector that it can be directed to the generalized other and to serving the public interest. In the private sector doing good for others means doing good for the customer. Hence, we expect that public interest is higher in the public sector, while user orientation is higher in the private sector. When regards compassion and the inclination to do good on affective grounds, we see this being directed to a specific other. However, there is no reason to expect that this driving force should differ between the sectors when occupational category is controlled for. Thirdly, people can be prepared to serve through influencing the overall political system. In other words, people may see the political system as the recipient for their efforts to do good for society. To the extent than an organization is more constrained or enabled by political authority it is more public, where as an increase in constraint by economic authority increases the privateness of the organization (Bozeman, 1987). This also means that public sector personnel especially in the higher echelons have a more direct interaction with the political system (Rainey et al., *ibid*: 237), and that the decision making processes at least in

some cases more evidently is a recipient of the work of public sector employees. Therefore it can be expected that public sector employees are more attracted to policy-making and that they for instrumental reasons may see the political system as a recipient. In this case, the individual may be motivated to serve by contributing in the decision making processes. This corresponds to the PSM dimension concerning attraction to policy making (see table 1). The reasons behind and possible recipients for intentions to 'do good' vary between institutional contexts, and we do not argue that the dimensions applied here are universally exhaustive, but we claim that the four dimensions are the most relevant in Western Europe and US. User-orientation may be more relevant in Europe due to the more universal character of the welfare states, where a much larger part of 'public service' is directed towards specified users (child care, schools, health care etc.) who are not in a disadvantaged situation which appeals to the feelings (compassion).

The most relevant personal characteristics are gender and age which may cause variation in the PSM dimensions. Although the literature disagrees on the direction of the effect of gender on total PSM (Perry (1997: 190; DeHart-Davis m.fl. 2006), it is an important control variable in relation to especially the compassion dimension. Existing studies indicate that women have higher compassion than men (Camilleri, 2007; Pandey & Stazyk, 2008: 102), which is theoretically meaningful, because women initially have better empathizing abilities (Baron-Cohen 2003) and because affective motives have traditionally been constructed as feminine (Stivers 2002: 58). Age is also an important control variable, because individuals may mature in terms of being more public service motivated when they get older (Pandey & Stazyk, 2008: 102). The specific expectation to the relationships between sector and the PSM dimensions are therefore as follows:

Proposition 1a: Controlled for occupational category, age and gender, there is no difference in compassion between public and private employees.

Proposition 1b: Controlled for occupational category and age, private employees have higher levels of user orientation than public employees.

Proposition 1c: Controlled for occupational category and age, employees in public organizations have higher levels of commitment to public interest than private employees.

Proposition 1d: Controlled for occupational category and age, employees in public organizations have higher level of attraction to public policy making than private employees.

After finding out if there is a difference in the PSM between the public and private sector and how it varies on the dimensions of PSM, we take this one step further by analysing how the dimensions influence the attrition and preferences for future sector. This is important as it matters to the possibilities of recruiting personnel. Our expectations to this variable corresponds to our expectations to proposition 1a-1d, except that we of course controls for the present sector, as this is expected to influence the preferences for future jobs.

Proposition 2a: Compassion does not influence the preferences for future employment in the private or public sector when present sector, occupational category, gender and age is controlled for

Proposition 2b: User orientation negatively influences future preferences for employment in the public sector controlled for present sector, occupational category, gender and age.

Proposition 2c: Public interest positively influences future preferences for employment in the public sector controlled for present sector, occupational category, gender and age.

Proposition 2d: Attraction to policy making positively influences future preferences for employment in the public sector controlled for present sector , occupational category, gender and age.

### 3. Data

The data was collected in a web-survey undertaken in June 2009 using a web-panel. 15.000 invitations were sent by e-mail to people in the age 25-64 years. The respondents were 3.304 Danish private and public sector employees between 25 and 64 years. Web-panels cannot be assumed to be representative due to unobserved selection. Thus, some respondents may be more likely to select to undertake web-surveys than others, for example because not all societal groups have equal access to ICT, equal time to fill out questionnaires or equal writing abilities. Although the representativeness of web-panels can be seriously questioned, it is less problematic,

because we are interested in testing a causal relation, rather than getting a full picture of the Danish population.

We based our measures of the PSM dimensions on the short form developed by Coursey and Pandey (2007). Wright and Christensen (2009: 15) found that this short form had a moderately good fit with the data. Appendix 1 presents principal component analyses of the items, and these analyses show that the used indexes (commitment to public interest, compassion, attraction to policy making and user-orientation) are consistent and reliable.

The coding of occupational category is based on the respondents' own detailed descriptions of their jobs. This description was afterwards coded based on DISCO 88. It is the official Danish version of the international occupational classification ISCO-88. This nomenclature contains 372 groups with approximately similar work functions. A description of DISCO 88 can be seen at <http://www.dst.dk/Vejviser/Portal/loen/DISCO/DISCO-88.aspx>. The respondents have reported their sector affiliation themselves, and it has been coded so that 1 is public sector and 0 is private sector. Concerning future sector preferences, we asked the respondents to express how likely they would be to choose the private sector over the public sector if they should seek new employment (10 means 'very likely' while 0 is 'very unlikely'). Definitions, means and standard deviation for all the used variables can be seen in table A2 in Appendix A.

#### 4. Results

In this section, we firstly present the results regarding how the PSM dimensions vary between the sectors and how they influence the preferences for future employment.

Table 2: Compassion

	All respondents		Only 'occupational category'-relevant respondents		
	Model 2-1	Model 2-2	Model 2-3	Model 2-4	Model 2-5 <sup>a</sup>
(Intercept)	49,995*** (41,194)	50,086*** (41,592)	52,275*** (26,158)	51,898*** (26,091)	59,513*** (24,339)
Age (years)	0,266***	0,234***	0,248***	0,226***	0,214***

	(10,027)	(8,767)	(5,8)	(5,257)	(4,978)
Gender (1=woman)	8,094***	7,224***	7,799***	6,829***	5,591***
	(15,103)	(13,257)	(8,769)	(7,439)	(5,48)
Sector (1=public)		4,071***		3,586***	0,775
		(7,298)		(3,93)	(0,748)
Occupational category					15 dummies included (not shown)
N	3304	3304	1230	1230	1230
Adj. R-square	0,09	0,104	0,083	0,094	0,12
F-værdi for fuld model	163,697***	128,613***	56,769***	43,440***	11,519***

<sup>a</sup>Controlling for occupational category. \*0,05≥p>0,01; \*\*0,01≥p>0,001; \*\*\*0,001≥p. NOTE: t-values in ()

Proposition 1a stated that there is no difference in compassion between public and private employees. This is confirmed by the analysis. Table as model 2-4 shows there appears to be a significant relationship, however, this becomes insignificant when occupational category is controlled for (see model 2-5). Our interpretation is that compassion is a matter of gender and occupational category – not a matter of sector.

Table 3: User Orientation

	All respondents		Only 'occupational category'-relevant respondents		
	Model 3-1	Model 3-2	Model 3-3	Model 3-4	Model 3-5 <sup>a</sup>
(Intercept)	65,669*** (48,929)	65,521*** (48,996)	64,512*** (-28,392)	64,671*** (-28,452)	66,912*** (23,593)
Age (years)	0,241*** (8,254)	0,268*** (9,051)	0,245*** (-5,049)	0,256*** (5,223)	0,24*** (4,832)
Gender (1=woman)	2,089*** (3,540)	2,761*** (4,584)	3,037** (-3,021)	3,485*** (3,34)	1,828 (1,559)
Sector (1=public)		-3,148*** (-5,095)		-1,65 (-1,591)	-2,751* (-2,3)
Occupational category					15 dummies included (not shown)
N	3233	3233	1202	1202	1202
Adj. R-square	0,024	0,031	0,027	0,028	0,035
F-value for model	40,215***	35,670***	17,804***	12,728***	3,701***

<sup>a</sup>Controlling for occupational category. \*0,05≥p>0,01; \*\*0,01≥p>0,001; \*\*\*0,001≥p. NOTE: t-values in ( )

Proposition 1b stated that private employees would have higher levels of user orientation than public sector employees. The analysis confirms that the level of user-orientation is significantly lower in the public sector than in the private sector when occupational category, gender and age is controlled for (see table 3). As seen in model 3.5, the correlation between sector and user-orientation becomes significant, when occupational category is controlled for. Thus, there is a spurious non-association in the sense that there appears to be no relationship in model 3-4, but when occupational categories are included in the analysis in model 3-5, the relationship becomes visible. This shows how important it is to control for occupational category, when investigating sector differences. Similarly, gender appears to be significant, but this relationship disappears when occupational category is included in model 3-5. Thus occupational category mediates the effect from gender on user-orientation.

Table 4: Public Interest

	All respondents		Only 'occupational category'-relevant respondents		
	Model 4-1	Model 4-2	Model 4-3	Model 4-4	Model 4-5 <sup>a</sup>
(Intercept)	68,774*** (57,109)	68,878*** (57,966)	69,804*** (35,753)	69,393*** (35,777)	75,181*** (31,177)
Age (years)	0,189*** (7,171)	0,148*** (5,627)	0,161*** (3,853)	0,136*** (3,244)	0,121** (2,851)
Gender (1=woman)	2,051*** (3,857)	0,93 (1,73)	2,571** (2,955)	1,498 (1,671)	1,256 (1,246)
Sector (1=public)		5,223*** (9,485)		3,982*** (4,466)	2,315* (2,26)
Occupational category					15 dummies included (not shown)
N	3274	3274	1224	1224	1224
Adj. R-square	0,019	0,045	0,018	0,033	0,039
F-value for model	33,051***	52,620***	12,071***	14,821***	4,090***

<sup>a</sup>Controlling for occupational category. \*0,05≥p>0,01; \*\*0,01≥p>0,001; \*\*\*0,001≥p. NOTE: t-values in ()

In proposition 1c it was expected that public interest is higher in the public than in the private sector. This is confirmed (see table 4 – model 4-5). Public sector employees to a higher extent report that they find it important to contribute to the community and to society in general and that meaningful public service directed to their fellow citizens is very important.

Proposition 1d stated that attraction to policy-making would be higher in the public than the private sector. However, this is not confirmed by the analysis – see table 5. Age has a negative impact on ATP, however, there are no significant relationships between gender or sector. Furthermore, there is no significant variation between the

occupational categories (see table A3 in appendix A). The attraction to policy making is higher among administrative professionals, who are situated closer to the organisational decision-making processes, but it is not significantly higher.

Table 5: Attraction to Policy Making

	All respondents		Only 'occupational category'-relevant respondents		
	Model 5-1	Model 5-2	Model 5-3	Model 5-4	Model 5-5 <sup>a</sup>
(Intercept)	52,791*** (33,909)	52,772*** (33,894)	49,406*** (19,338)	49,433*** (19,324)	50,288*** (15,878)
Age (years)	-0,194*** (-5,719)	-0,189*** (-5,48)	-0,147** (-2,688)	-0,145** (-2,625)	-0,154** (-2,754)
Gender (1=woman)	-2,318*** (-3,376)	-2,174** (-3,091)	-2,531* (-2,232)	-2,454* (-2,088)	-1,879 (-1,426)
Sector (1=public)		-0,682 (-0,946)		-0,296 (-0,252)	-0,374 (-0,277)
Occupational category					15 dummies included (not shown)
N	3237	3237	1202	1202	1202
Adj. R-square	0,013	0,013	0,009	0,008	0,019
F-value for model	22,145***	15,061***	6,316**	4,229**	2,447**

<sup>a</sup>Controlling for occupational category. \*0,05≥p>0,01; \*\*0,01≥p>0,001; \*\*\*0,001≥p. NOTE: t-values in ()

The analysis also shows (see model 6-1) that the present sector affiliation is very important to the reported choice of future sector. Thus once people have been employed in the public sector, this offers a good explanation of where they see themselves as being likely to seek future employment. This indicates that the careers people pursue rarely cut across sectors. Proposition 2a stated that compassion would not influence the preferences for future employment when present sector, occupational category, gender and age was controlled for. The results show a positive correlation between the level of compassion (see model 6-2), however, this

disappears when the other dimensions are included in the analysis (see model 6-6). In proposition 2b it was expected that user orientation would have a negative influence on the choice of future sector. As can be seen model 6-5 the influence is negative, but it is not significant. Thus the expectation cannot be confirmed. As stated in proposition 2c public interest has a positive influence on the preferences for future sector, also when the other PSM dimensions are included in the analysis and when present sector, age, gender and occupational category is controlled for. In contrast to the expectation raised in 2d there is no relationship between ATP and future sector. Our interpretation of this is that serving the public interest is the core of public service motivation and the most important dimension in attracting employees to the public sector.

Table 6: Association between PSM and future sector ((10 = very likely to choose public sector over private.)

	Model 6-1	Model6- 2	Model6- 3	Model6- 4	Model6- 5	Model6- 6
(Intercept)	3,874*** (8,105)	3,329*** (5,906)	3,716*** (6,504)	2,773*** (4,509)	4,069*** (7,929)	2,569*** (3,567)
Age (years)	0,012 (1,401)	0,008 (1,014)	0,013 (1,557)	0,007 (0,863)	0,01 (1,155)	0,009 (1,097)
Gender (1=woman)	0,273 (1,389)	0,221 (1,135)	0,243 (1,245)	0,241 (1,256)	0,297 (1,526)	0,218 (1,096)
Compassion		0,011* (2,012)				0,007 (1,167)
Userorientation			0,001 (0,277)			-0,003 (-0,683)
Public interest				0,018*** (3,256)		0,016** (2,576)
Attraction to policy making					-0,001 (-0,262)	-0,002 (-0,567)
Sektor (1=offentlig)	3,221*** (15,939)	3,142*** (16,095)	3,224*** (16,2)	3,085*** (15,747)	3,194*** (16,049)	3,154*** (15,546)

N	1107	1172	1149	1169	1146	1107
Adj. R-square	0,302	0,307	0,305	0,307	0,303	0,307
F-værdi for fuld model	30,940***	31,561***	30,572***	31,442** *	30,288** *	25,554** *

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper we have investigated how PSM dimensions vary between the sectors and influence the choice of future sector, when occupational category, gender and age are controlled for. The table below summarizes the major findings

Table 7: Major findings

	Variation between sectors	Future employment in the public sector
Compassion	No difference: Confirmed	No influence: Confirmed
User orientation	Higher in private sector: Confirmed	Negative influence: Not confirmed
Public Interest	Higher in public sector: Confirmed	Positive influence: Confirmed
Attraction to Policymaking	Higher in public sector: Not confirmed	Positive influence: Not confirmed

Public administration theory is defined by the idea that public and private organisations though similar, serve different purposes in society. One of the ideals of the public sector is that it should administer the public will and the public good according to complex accountability structures, even if the practical realities of decision making and administration may be more down to earth. One important theoretical development in research on the delivery of public services is that public service and motivation of doing public good have been found in the public as well as the private sector (Stein, 2008). Thus it has been argued that rather than analysing what makes an organisation public it is relevant to analyse what makes an organisation provide for public outcomes (Moulton, 2009). However, this paper shows that the motivational bases of the sectors vary fundamentally. We have argued that the reason why public interest is higher in the public than the private sector, is

that the recipients between the sectors vary. In the public sector pro-social motivations can be directed to the generalised other, e.g. ‘the public’, while pro-social motivations in the private sector are directed to the specific other, e.g. the user. Therefore, employees in the private sector to a higher extent report that it gives them energy to know that they helped the user that the job is done, when the user is satisfied and the individual user is more important than formal rules. In contrast, public sector employees more frequently report that it is important to contribute to the community and that it is a civic duty to deliver public service (see appendix A).

It is also a main finding that compassion is a matter of gender and occupational category – not a matter of sector. Compassion is driving force in some jobs rather than others and certainly more dominant among women than men. It may matter when people select their occupation, but it does not influence their preferences for sectoral employment once in jobs. The reasons why ATP does not differ substantially between sectors and does not influence the preferences for future sector may be substantial as well as methodological. The substantial reasons may be the political system does not in a significant way constitute a recipient of the rational, instrumental reasons for providing public services. We would have expected the occupational categories in the upper echelons close to decision making to have higher levels of ATP, this could have been seen as a sign of the latter. However, this is not the case (see appendix A - table A3). In addition, the original items have been critiqued for not being appropriate for measuring personal attraction to public policy, as they tap dissatisfaction with politicians more than interest in public policy making. Thus it has been suggested that items of ATP should be developed which to a higher extent can be seen as indicators of instrumental motives (Kim and Vandenaabele, 2009).

These results have implications for to what extent to which contracting out can be expected to jeopardize the future provision of public services. The central finding is that public interest is a core motivational driving force in the public sector, where as user orientation is a core driving force in the private sector. This does have implications for the discussion on which services to produce in which sector. This question has been much discussed and studied focussing on the efficiency of the service production in the different sectors (Boyne, 2002). However, the public service

motivation angle adds to this discussion. We argue that if the public interest is a central concern for the services produced, they may be better placed in the public sector, but if concerns for the individual user are more important, they may better placed in the private sector – that is if both motivational types influence performance and if the type of service can be equally efficiently produced in both sectors. Basically, we argue that services with a public content may make the most of employees being motivated by serving the public interest, whereas services with central concerns for the individual users may be better placed in the private sector. One implication is that the specification of the contract should be made in the public sector, where public interest is a central motivation, where as the production and provision of services should take place in the private sector where the user is a central motivation. However, there may also be services which in the production and delivery involve trade-offs between concerns for the public and the specific user. A classical example is teaching where it is a public concern that all citizens are educated, but certainly also a concern that the individual learns as much as possible. This may involve a trade-off as weak pupils profit from being integrated in classes with stronger pupils (Rangvid, 2007). Thus the result does not solve the discussion on which services to produce in the public and the private sector respectively, but it adds the PSM to the analytical dimensions which are relevant in the discussion of this issue.

The results also have implications for management in the public sector as employees may become more motivated if it communicated how their work benefits the public interest. Recent insight suggest, that value congruence has a mediating effect between PSM and performance (Wright and Pandey, 2010). This means that the person-organization value fit, for instance the congruence between public interest values of the employees recruited and the values they experience to be present in the organizations where they find employment, may result in increased job satisfaction, reduced turnover intention and better performance (Wright and Pandey, 2010; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). In line with this, the communication of how the mission and task of the organisation contribute to the public interest, the centrality of the role of the employees in the organisation and the real benefits that their work make has a positive influence on work motivation (Wright, 2007; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Boardman and Sundquist, 2009). Thus if the delivery of public

services is to profit from the employees – and potential employees - being publicly interested, then it depends on to what extent the public sector can make it clear that it actually works for the public interest rather than short term political goals, and that the work efforts contribute by making results of their work visible. This may also have some implications for the regulations of the public sector employees which sometimes are perceived as being signs of mistrust.

As the study does not include panel data it is difficult to analyse if people choose a job and then develop a certain type and level of PSM or if the PSM influences what job people choose. In other words, PSM may be a result of on the job socialization, but it may also exist before getting the first job. Previous studies show that this is the case and the present study contributes by showing that it is not just when seeking the first employment that the PSM dimensions matter (Vandenabeele, 2008b), it is also once in jobs and when gender, age and occupational category is controlled for.

## Appendix A

Table A1: Principal component analysis of all items (pattern matrix)

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
I associate politics with something positive	0,290	0,739	0,078	-0,008
The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me (R)	0,162	0,680	0,051	-0,064
I do not care much about politicians (turned)	0,001	0,848	0,009	0,112
I contribute to my community	0,658	-0,090	0,114	0,130
Meaningful public service is very important to me	0,619	0,159	-0,054	-0,257
I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests	0,759	0,002	-0,120	-0,016
I consider public service my civic duty	0,766	-0,068	-0,012	-0,121
It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.	0,099	0,059	0,126	-0,674
To me, considering the welfare of others is one of the most important values	0,177	0,037	0,101	-0,719
I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves (R)	0,154	0,121	0,133	-0,681
I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another	0,245	0,078	0,174	-0,681
The individual user is more important than formal rules	-0,187	-0,007	0,631	-0,141
It gives me energy to know that I helped the user/patient	0,216	-0,043	0,695	0,026
If the user/patient is satisfied, the job is done	-0,036	0,040	0,818	0,085

R: Reversed. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Table A2: Main variables – definitions and statistics

Variable	Operational definition	Mean	Min	Max	Std. d.	N
User orientation	Motivation to serve the user of the service (the specific other)	77,2	0	100	17,3	1202
Public Interest	Motivation to serve the <i>general</i> public (the generalized other)	78,4	0	100	15,1	1224
Compassion	Emotionally based motivation to serve the interest of community of people, a state, a nation or humankind	67,9	18,75	100	16,0	1230
Attraction to policy making	Motivation to serve the interest of community of people, a state, a nation or humankind by affecting the public policy process	41,4	0	100	19,4	1202
Overall PSM	Level of general, altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation or humankind	65,6	24,31	95,83	11,2	1184
Sector	Employment sector. 1 is public sector, 0 is private.	0,54	0	1	0,498	1243
Preferred future sector	A scale from 0 to 10 expressing how likely the respondent is to choose the public sector over the private if the respondent where to seek new occupation. 10: 'very likely' 0: 'very unlikely'.	5,82	0	10	3,31	1183
Occupational category	Occupational category based on the Danish version of ISCO-88 <sup>1</sup>					
Administrative professionals	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'administrative associate professionals not elsewhere classified' and 'administrative secretaries and related associate professionals'	0,11	0	1	0,315	1243
Science technicians	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'physical and engineering science technicians not elsewhere classified', 'chemical and physical science technicians' and 'life science technicians'	0,0	0	1	0,237	1243
Secretaries and other clerks	A compound of respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'secretaries' and 'other office clerks'	0,11	0	1	0,307	1243
Lawyers and legal professionals	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'lawyers' and 'Legal professionals not elsewhere classified'	0,02	0	1	0,143	1243
Protective services workers	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'Fire-fighters', 'prison guards', 'protective service workers not else classified' and 'doorkeepers, watchpersons and related workers'.	0,02	0	1	0,151	1243
Architects, engineers and related professionals	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'architects, engineers and related professionals', 'architects, engineers and related professionals not elsewhere classified' and 'decorators and commercial designers'	0,05	0	1	0,221	1243
Modern health associate professionals (except nursing)	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'modern health associate professionals (except nursing)', 'dieticians and nutritionists', 'dental assistants' and 'pharmaceutical assistants'	0,02	0	1	0,146	1243
Personal care and related workers	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'special education teaching associate professionals', 'institution-based personal care workers' and 'home-based personal care workers'	0,11	0	1	0,323	1243
Personnel managing/ressource professionals	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'personnel and career professionals' and 'personnel and industrial relations department managers'	0,03	0	1	0,177	1243
School teachers	Respondents that fall into the ISCO-88 kategori 'primary education teaching professionals'	0,15	0	1	0,359	1243
Material-recording and library clerks	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: 'stock clerks', 'library and filling clerks' and 'production clerks'	0,04	0	1	0,187	1243
Nurses	Respondents that fall into 'nursing associate professionals'	0,06	0	1	0,243	1243
Computer and computing	Respondents that fall into one of the following ISCO-88 categories: computer assistants, computer equipment	0,15	0	1	0,352	1243

professions	operators, industrial robot controllers'					
Business or bureaucracy prof.	Respondents that belong to 'business professionals not elsewhere classified' <sup>2</sup>	0,06	0	1	0,237	1243
Age	Respondents age in years	44,2	25	64	10,2	1243
Gender	Respondents' gender. 1 is female, 0 is male	0,60	0	1	0,491	1243

<sup>1</sup>ISCO-88 is an abbreviation for "International Standard Classification of Occupations" and stems from ILO. For a full overview of ISCO-88 see <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/isco88/major.htm>. <sup>2</sup>The Danish translation of this category comes closer to 'special functions concerning organisation, including management consultancy'. This classification leads way to a large number of public employed bureaucrats in this category.

Table A3: Occupational category and Public Service Motivation

	User orientation	Public interest	Compassion	Attraction to policy making
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
(Intercept)	66,912*** (23,593)	75,181*** (31,177)	59,513*** (24,339)	50,288*** (15,878)
Age (years)	0,24*** (4,832)	0,121** (2,851)	0,214*** (4,978)	-0,154** (-2,754)
Gender (1=woman)	1,828 (1,559)	1,256 (1,246)	5,591*** (5,48)	-1,879 (-1,426)
Sector (1=public)	-2,751* (-2,3)	2,315* (2,26)	0,775 (0,748)	-0,374 (-0,277)
Occupational category <sup>b</sup>				
Administrative professionals	-2,175 (-1,082)	-4,11* (-2,39)	-7,413*** (-4,262)	3,842 (1,705)
Science technician	-1,084 (-0,431)	-5,721** (-2,706)	-7,491*** (-3,498)	-3,836 (-1,383)
Secretaries and other office clerks	1,654 (0,796)	-6,127*** (-3,425)	-6,084*** (-3,381)	-3,25 (-1,394)
Lawyers and legal professionals	-7,272* (-1,961)	-7,174* (-2,239)	-9,749** (-2,995)	-3,278 (-0,785)
Protective services workers	-1,612 (-0,464)	-5,692 (-1,893)	-5,654 (-1,855)	1,821 (0,465)
Architects, engineers and related professionals	-1,587 (-0,579)	-5,249* (-2,28)	-6,512** (-2,779)	0,751 (0,25)
Modern health associate professionals (except nursing)	1,615 (0,444)	-2,855 (-0,92)	-1,911 (-0,599)	-4,326 (-0,999)
Personal care and rated workers	4,537* (2,374)	-3,317* (-2,011)	-0,184 (-0,11)	-3,257 (-1,496)
Personnel managing/ressource	1,681 (0,542)	-5,421* (-2,013)	-5,464* (-2,027)	-1,741 (-0,501)
Material-recording and library clerks	2,204 (0,741)	-4,171 (-1,621)	-5,113* (-1,963)	3,111 (0,911)
Nurses	2,341 (1,003)	-3,857 (-1,912)	-1,285 (-0,63)	-2,319 (-0,863)
Computer and computing professionals	-2,355 (-1,185)	-6,345*** (-3,713)	-8,561*** (-4,956)	-2,607 (-1,166)
Business or bureaucracy professionals	-1,329 (-0,561)	-2,467 (-1,197)	-8,632*** (-4,137)	4,841 (1,811)
N	1202	1224	1230	1202
Adj. R-square	0,035	0,039	0,12	0,019
F-værdi for full model	3,701***	4,090***	11,519***	2,447**

<sup>a</sup>PSM is a formative index that consist of 'Public Interest', 'Compassion' and 'Attraction to Policy Making'. <sup>b</sup>Reference category for occupational category is school teachers. \*: 0,05≥p>0,01. \*\*: 0,01≥p>0,001. \*\*\*: 0,001≥p. T-values in ().

Table A4:

Association between PSM and future sector (10 = very likely to choose public sector over private.)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
(Intercept)	3,874***	3,329***	3,716***	2,773***	4,069***	2,569***
	(8,105)	(5,906)	(6,504)	(4,509)	(7,929)	(3,567)
Age (years)	0,012	0,008	0,013	0,007	0,01	0,009
	(1,401)	(1,014)	(1,557)	(0,863)	(1,155)	(1,097)
Gender (1=woman)	0,273	0,221	0,243	0,241	0,297	0,218
	(1,389)	(1,135)	(1,245)	(1,256)	(1,526)	(1,096)
Occupational category <sup>a</sup>						
Administrative professionals	-0,875**	-0,799*	-0,871**	-0,885**	-0,891**	-0,744*
	(-2,61)	(-2,423)	(-2,618)	(-2,693)	(-2,681)	(-2,205)
Science technician	-0,822*	-0,79*	-0,828*	-0,818*	-0,87*	-0,672
	(-1,963)	(-1,967)	(-1,996)	(-2,041)	(-2,144)	(-1,601)
Secretaries and other office clerks	-0,501	-0,443	-0,467	-0,425	-0,522	-0,343
	(-1,428)	(-1,286)	(-1,344)	(-1,23)	(-1,5)	(-0,969)
Lawyers and legal professionals	-0,046	-0,153	-0,189	-0,017	-0,286	0,126
	(-0,074)	(-0,254)	(-0,313)	(-0,028)	(-0,465)	(0,201)
Protective services workers	-1,204*	-1,178*	-1,192*	-1,177*	-1,243*	-1,075
	(-2,07)	(-2,038)	(-2,052)	(-2,033)	(-2,135)	(-1,851)
Architects, engineers and related professionals	-0,834	-1,048*	-0,702	-0,98*	-1,014*	-0,708
	(-1,796)	(-2,348)	(-1,525)	(-2,211)	(-2,273)	(-1,525)
Modern health associate professionals (except nursing)	-1,033	-0,979	-0,953	-0,744	-1,095	-0,971
	(-1,656)	(-1,666)	(-1,612)	(-1,283)	(-1,751)	(-1,56)
Personal care and related workers	0,207	0,326	0,295	0,345	0,217	0,283
	(0,641)	(1,043)	(0,93)	(1,096)	(0,678)	(0,874)
Personnel managing/ressource	-0,496	-0,281	-0,495	-0,426	-0,502	-0,383
	(-0,936)	(-0,557)	(-0,967)	(-0,835)	(-0,987)	(-0,725)
Material-recording and library clerks	-0,121	-0,295	-0,182	-0,318	-0,295	-0,004

	(-0,238)	(-0,608)	(-0,369)	(-0,654)	(-0,587)	(-0,009)
Nurses	-0,579	-0,467	-0,458	-0,438	-0,631	-0,491
	(-1,484)	(-1,232)	(-1,194)	(-1,152)	(-1,619)	(-1,259)
Computer and computing professionals	-0,484	-0,484	-0,543	-0,518	-0,586	-0,32
	(-1,449)	(-1,471)	(-1,641)	(-1,58)	(-1,775)	(-0,951)
Business or bureaucracy professionals	-1,452***	-1,341***	-1,371***	-1,457***	-1,434***	-1,326***
	(-3,651)	(-3,398)	(-3,488)	(-3,71)	(-3,662)	(-3,315)
Compassion		0,011*				0,007
		(2,012)				(1,167)
Userorientation			0,001			-0,003
			(0,277)			(-0,683)
Public interest				0,018***		0,016**
				(3,256)		(2,576)
Attraction to policy making					-0,001	-0,002
					(-0,262)	(-0,567)
Sektor (1=offentlig)	3,221***	3,142***	3,224***	3,085***	3,194***	3,154***
	(15,939)	(16,095)	(16,2)	(15,747)	(16,049)	(15,546)
N	1107	1172	1149	1169	1146	1107
Adj. R-square	0,302	0,307	0,305	0,307	0,303	0,307
F-værdi for fuld model	30,940***	31,561***	30,572***	31,442***	30,288***	25,554***

## References:

Andersen, Lotte Bøgh (2009). "What determines the behaviour and performance of health professionals? Public service motivation, professional norms and/or economic incentives", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 75: 79-97.

Andersen, Lotte Bøgh (2005) Offentligt ansattes strategier. Århus: Politica.

Andersen, Lotte Bøgh, Lene Holm Pedersen and Thomas Pallesen (2009): Does employment sector matter for professionals' public service motivation?. Paper presented at the 2009 International public Service motivation Research Conference in Bloomington, Indiana

- Andersen, Lotte Bøgh and Lene Holm Pedersen (2010) *Public service motivation and professionalism* Paper prepared for the 14. IRSPM Conference in Bern, 7 -9 April 2010. Workshop 23: Public Service Motivation..
- Antonsen Marianne and T Jørgensen (1997): The Publicness of Public Organizations, in *Public Administration* 75 (2): 337-57
- Baron-Cohen, S. (2003), *The Essential Difference: The Truth about the Male and Female Brain*, New York: Perseus Books Group.
- Boardman, Craig and Eric Sundquist (2009): Toward Understanding Work Motivation – Worker Attitudes and the Perception of Effective Public Service, in *The American Review of Public Administration*, 39 (5): 519-535)
- Boyne, George (2002): Public and Private Management: What’s the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies* 39 (1): 97-122
- Bozeman, Barry (1987): *All Organizations Are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bozeman, Barry and Stuart Bretschneider (1994): The Publicness Puzzle in Organization Theory: A Test of Alternative Explanations of Differences between Public and Private Organisations, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol.4, no. 2 (197-22)
- Brewer, G. & S.C. Selden (1998). “Whistle Blowers in the federal civil service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8 (3): 413-39.
- Brewer, G. A. (2003) Building Social Capital: Civic Attitudes and Behavior of Public Servants *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13:5-26.
- Buelens, Marc and Herman Van den Broeck (2007): An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations, in *Public Administration Review*
- Camilleri, E. (2006): Towards Developing an Organizational Commitment – Public Service Motivation Model for Maltese Public Service Employees. *Public Policy and Administration* 21: 63-83

- Camilleri, E. 2007. Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel review*. 26 (3): 356-377.
- Coursey, D. H. & S.K. Pandey (2007). "Public Service Motivation Measurement: Testing an Abridged Version of Perrys Proposed Scale", *Administration & Society* 39: 547-68.
- Crewson, Phillip E. (1997). "Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7: 499-518.
- DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J. and Pandey, S. J. 2006. Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public administration review*. 66 (6) : 873-887
- Feeney, Mary (2007): Sector Perceptions among State-Level Public Managers, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 18: 465-494
- Frank, Sue A. & G. B. Lewis (2004) "Government Employees. Working Hard or Hardly Working?" *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 34, No. 1, 36-51
- Freidson, Eliot (2001). *Professionalism. The third logic*. Cambridge: Policy Press.
- Gabris, Gerald T. & Gloria Simo (1995). "Public Sector Motivation as an Independent Variable Affecting Career Decisions", *Public Personnel Management* 24: 33-51.
- Grant, A. (2008). "Employees without a Cause: The Motivational Effects of Prosocial Impact in Public Service", *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 48-66.
- Hood, Christopher (1991): *A New Public Management for All Seasons*
- Houston, David 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(1): 67-86.
- Jørgensen, Torben and Barry Bozeman (2007): Public Values an inventory, in *Administration & Society* 39 (3): 354-81
- Kim, S (2009a): Revising Perry's Measurement Scale of Public Service Motivation. *American Review of Public Administration* 39: 149-163
- Kim, Sangmook (2009b): Testing the Structure of Public Service Motivation in Korea: A Research Note. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19: 839-851
- Kim and Vandenberg (2009): A Strategy for Building Public Service Motivation Research Internationally, research note, version 6.0 august 19th

- Knoke and Wright-Isak, 1982: Individual Motives and Organizational Incentive Systems, in *Research in the Sociology of Organisations*, 1: 209-54
- Kristof-Brown et al. (2005): Consequences of Individuals Fit at Work: A Meta-analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organisation, Person-Group, Person-Superior fit, *Personnel Psychology* 58 (2): 281-342
- Lan, Z. and Rainey. H (1992): Goals, Rules, and Effectiveness in Public, Private, and Hybrid Organizations – More Evidence on Frequent Assertions About Differences.
- Lewis, Gregory B & Sue A. Frank (2002): Who Wants to Work for Government, in *Public Administration Review*, vol. 62, no. 4: 395-404.
- Mead, George Herbert (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Perspective of a Social Behaviorist*, edited, with an Introduction, by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mintzberg, 1973: The nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper and Row
- Moynihan, D. & S. Panday (2007): The role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation, in *Public Administration Review*
- Moulton, S. (2009): Putting Together the Publicness Puzzle: A Framework for Realized Publicness, in *Public Administration Review*
- National Board of Health (2004) Vejledning om fysioterapeuters ordnede optegnelser <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=9876>
- Pandey, S.K. & E.C. Stazyk (2008). “Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation”, pp. 101-17 in James L. Perry & Annie Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, James L. (1996). “Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1): 5-24.
- Perry, James L. & Annie Hondeghem (2008a). “Editors introduction”, pp. 1-16 in James L. Perry & Annie Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management. The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, James L. & Annie Hondeghem (2008b). “Directions for Future Theory and Research”, pp. 294-314 in James L. Perry & Annie Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management. The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Perry, James L. & Wouter Vandenberghe (2008). "Behavioral Dynamics: Institutions, Identities, and Self-Regulation", pp. 56-79 in James L. Perry & Annie Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management. The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, James L. & Lois R. Wise (1990). "The Motivational Bases of Public Service", *Public Administration Review*, 50: 367-73.
- Rainey, Hal, Backoff, R, and Levine, C. (1976): Comparing public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 36:233-244
- Rainey, H.G. & P. Steinbauer (1999). "Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(1): 1-32.
- Rangvid, Beatrice Schindler (2007): School Composition Effects in Denmark: Quantile Regression Evidence from PISA 2000, in *Empirical Economics*, 33(2):359-388
- Regionernes lønnings- og takstnævn & Danske Fysioterapeuter (2008a). *Overenskomst om almindelig fysioterapi* (www.okportal.dk).
- Regionernes lønnings- og takstnævn & Danske Fysioterapeuter (2008b). *Overenskomst om vederlagsfri fysioterapi*. (www.okportal.dk)
- Schneider, B. (1987): The People make the Place, *Personnel Psychology*, 40 (437-53)
- Steen, Trui (2008): Not a Government monopoly: The Private, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sectors, pp. 203-223 in James L. Perry & Annie Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management. The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stivers, Camilla (2000) *Bureau men, settlement women*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas
- Steijn, B. (2008). "Person-Environment Fit and Public Service Motivation", *International Public Management Journal* 11 (1): 13-27.
- Steinhaus, C.S & J.L. Perry (1996). "Organizational commitment: Does sector matter?", *Public Productivity & Management Review* 19(3): 278-88.
- Vandenberghe, Wouter (2007). "Towards a Theory of Public Service Motivation: An Institutional Approach", *Public Management Review* 9(4): 545-56.

- Vandenabeele, Wouter (2008a). "Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroboration and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument", *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 143-67.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter (2008b). "Government calling: Public Service Motivation as an element in selecting Government as an employer of choice", *Public Administration* 86(4): 1089-1105
- Walsh, A.H. (1978): *The politics and practice of government corporations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wise, Lois (2000): *The Public Service Culture*, in *Public Administration concepts and Cases*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Edited by Richard J Stillman II, 342-353. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wright, Bradley E. (2007): *Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter?*, in *Public Administration Review*
- Wright, Bradley E. (2008). "Methodological Challenges Associated with Public Service Motivation Research", pp. 80-98 in James Perry & Anne Hondeghem (eds.), *Motivation in Public Management - The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Bradley E. & Sanjay K. Pandey (2010): *Public Service Motivation and the Assumption of Person Organization Fit: Testing the Mediating Effect of Value Congruence*, in *Administration & Society*, vol. 40 no. 5
- Wright, Bradley E. and Robert K. Christensen (2009): *Public Service Motivation: Testing Measures Antecedents and Consequences*. Paper presented at the 2009 International Public Service Motivation Research Conference in Bloomington, Indiana