



Does Public Service Motivation Matter? A Study of Participation in Various Volunteering Domains

Peter L. M. Leisink, Eva Knies & Nina van Loon

To cite this article: Peter L. M. Leisink, Eva Knies & Nina van Loon (2021) Does Public Service Motivation Matter? A Study of Participation in Various Volunteering Domains, International Public Management Journal, 24:6, 865-885, DOI: [10.1080/10967494.2018.1428254](https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2018.1428254)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2018.1428254>



Copyright © 2019 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC © 2018 Peter L. M. Leisink, Eva Knies, and Nina van Loon



Published online: 01 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 12403



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 5 View citing articles [↗](#)



DOES PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION MATTER? A STUDY OF PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS VOLUNTEERING DOMAINS

PETER L. M. LEISINK AND EVA KNIES
UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

NINA VAN LOON
AARHUS UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT: *This article examines the extent to which public service motivation (PSM), more specifically the PSM dimension commitment to the public interest (CPI), is related to volunteering. The claims for the relationship between PSM and volunteering have rarely been supported by evidence based on direct measurements of PSM. Using data from a large representative sample of public and semi-public sector employees in the Netherlands, we show that CPI is positively related to volunteering. This relationship is stronger for participation in some volunteering domains than in others. We suggest that public-interest-committed employees seek out volunteering opportunities that match their motivation and that the extent to which voluntary organizations espouse public service ideals may explain the differential strength of the relationship between employees' CPI and their participation in different volunteering domains. This finding is relevant for voluntary and nonprofit organizations which need to attract volunteers to keep up welfare services.*

INTRODUCTION

Public service motivation (PSM), defined as “an individual’s orientation to delivering services to people with a purpose to do good for others and society” (Perry and Hondeghem

© Peter L. M. Leisink, Eva Knies, and Nina van Loon

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

2008:vii), has become the object of a stream of research following Perry and Wise (1990). Research has focused strongly on consequences attributed to PSM, notably the choice of public sector employment and the behavior of public servants at work (Ritz, Brewer, and Neumann 2016). However, the motivation to do good for others and society can also express itself in various forms of civic behavior beyond the workplace, such as formal and informal volunteering. Recently, PSM and volunteering have begun to attract interest (Brewer 2003; Houston 2006, 2008; Steen 2006; Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor 2009; Taylor 2010; Coursey et al. 2011; Ertas 2014; Lee and Jeong 2015; Clerkin and Fotheringham 2017). However, most empirical studies which have shown that PSM is related to volunteering (Brewer 2003; Houston 2006, 2008; Rotolo and Wilson 2006; Lee 2012; Ertas 2014) did not measure PSM directly, instead using the respondents' occupational industry as a proxy. In addition, most studies do not distinguish between volunteering domains, even though there are significant differences between voluntary organizations in the extent to which they uphold public service ideals. For instance, Houston (2008:186) suggests that sociocultural organizations "most prominently espouse public service ideals," and Rotolo and Wilson (2006:26) observe that "the sense of public mission is muted" in professional associations and trade unions. This difference in the extent to which public service ideals are salient across volunteering domains is important. As Clary et al. (1998) demonstrated, volunteering can serve a variety of motivational functions for individuals, and individuals will seek out volunteering opportunities that match their motivation. Relatedly, Clerkin and Fotheringham (2017) show that formal and informal volunteering are associated with different dimensions of PSM, which illustrates that these two types of pro-social behavior serve different motives. Thus, it seems likely that public-service-motivated employees seek out those voluntary organizations that most strongly uphold public service ideals. Therefore, it is useful to study participation in various voluntary organizations if one wishes to know how PSM matters.

This article examines the question to what extent PSM, more specifically the dimension commitment to the public interest (CPI), is related to participation in voluntary organizations in various domains. The answer to this question is based on a large survey among public and semi-public sector employees in the Netherlands.

The relevance of this article is twofold. First, it fills a gap in the knowledge about PSM by studying to what extent CPI is related to volunteering using a direct measure of CPI which makes it possible to distinguish between CPI and sector of employment. Second, this article adds to our knowledge of volunteering by examining to what extent CPI is related to volunteering in different volunteering domains and interpreting differences as related to the match between CPI and the salience of public service ideals in volunteering domains.

The article begins with a review of the literature on PSM, volunteering, and the relationship between PSM, its dimensions, and volunteering for specific civic associations. Following this, we introduce the survey on which the empirical part of the article is based. The results are then presented, leading to our conclusions and a discussion in the final section.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Public Service Motivation

Perry and Wise (1990:368) provided an early definition of PSM as "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and

organizations.” Based on later research, Perry (1996) operationalized PSM as attraction to policymaking, commitment to the public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. Theoretically, Perry (2000) grounded his four-dimensional model of PSM on Knoke and Wright-Isak’s (1982) distinctions between rational, norm-based, and affective motivations. Several authors have since developed their own definitions, including Vandenamee’s (2007:547) synthesizing definition of PSM as “the belief, values and attitudes that go beyond self-interest and organizational interest, that concern the interest of a larger political entity and that motivate individuals to act accordingly whenever appropriate.”

PSM has been studied mostly in relation to working in the public sector. However, PSM also has implications for behavior beyond the workplace, as it is likely to influence attitudes and behaviors of individuals in the civic community, such as volunteering (Houston 2008). Clary et al. (1998) show that volunteering can serve a variety of motivational functions for individuals, one of them being altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others. Likewise, we suggest that volunteering can serve individuals’ commitment to the public interest.

It is important to make clear that while we discuss the relationship between PSM and volunteering generally, the dataset used for this article contains only the item “doing work that is useful for society,” which is commonly included in the PSM dimension commitment to the public interest (CPI). Previous studies, such as Houston (2000), relied on a similar item (“meaningful public service”) and presented their analysis as dealing with PSM. However, as this single item cannot be used as an indicator of the multidimensional concept of PSM and as recent studies have shown that the individual dimensions of PSM relate to volunteering in different ways, we will use the term CPI where this is relevant (grounding of hypotheses, description of variables, results, and discussion).

Participation in Voluntary Organizations

Wilson’s review of research on volunteering defined volunteering as “any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group or organization” (2000:215). Wilson (2000:216) notes that volunteering typically entails some commitment of time and effort, and it is thought of as being to some extent formalized and public (Wilson 2000:216). We will follow this definition, while noting that recent reviews signal that volunteering remains a complex phenomenon and that there is a lack of consensus about its definition in the literature (Hustinx, Cnaan, and Handy 2010; Rodell et al. 2016). Wilson’s definition relates to the axes that Hustinx, Cnaan, and Handy (2010) adopt from previous reviews as driving through what most people understand to be volunteering. Each axe refers to a defining characteristic of volunteering that actually appears less unambiguous than the definition suggests. For instance, volunteering’s defining characteristic of “free will” can range in reality from one’s internal will to a school requirement, and the “formal agency” characteristic differentiates between volunteering for a formal agency and informal volunteering, such as the helping of neighbors (Hustinx, Cnaan, and Handy 2010:414). Relating to these characteristics, we are interested in formal volunteering; i.e., participation in voluntary organizations on an unpaid basis; we exclude informal helping activities such as caring for family and friends, as many surveys do, because informal volunteering is more difficult to assess (Hustinx, Cnaan, and Handy 2010:414).

Wilson (2000:216–217) notes a distinction between voluntary organizations that are focused on the amelioration of individual problems and those involving social activists who are oriented towards social change. Following this distinction, volunteering may involve delivering “Meals on Wheels,” coaching a children’s sports team, and serving as a guide in a museum, as well as raising awareness of environmental issues, campaigning for human rights through Amnesty International, and canvassing for a political party (Rotolo and Wilson 2006:26). However, Hustinx, Cnaan, and Handy (2010:413) note that, in everyday discourse, there is a tendency to emphasize the virtuous and compassionate nature of volunteering, equating it with the emotional labor characteristic of many public service jobs (Guy, Newman, and Mastracci 2008).

Rotolo and Wilson (2006) follow the logic proposed by Salamon (2002) and classify types of volunteer work based on the product or service they provide, such as providing social services, improving education, or mobilization for rights issues. Houston (2008) takes a similar approach and, following Badescu and Neller (2007), distinguishes between sociocultural groups, advocacy and interest groups, and church-affiliated groups. Reflecting on the degree to which various categories of civic organizations uphold public service ideals, Houston (2008:186) holds that sociocultural groups “most prominently espouse public service ideals.” However, a systematic analysis of the extent to which various types of voluntary organizations espouse public service ideals seems to be lacking.

These distinctions made between types of voluntary organizations appear relevant for understanding why people become actively involved in one voluntary organization rather than another. Recognizing the differences between social activist and individual problem-oriented voluntary organizations, Wilson (2000:216–217) observes that “they might well attract different kinds of people.” A connection between the type of volunteer organization and the volunteer’s motives can be found in the social psychological work of Clary et al. (1998), who have proposed that individuals seek out volunteering opportunities depending on their motives, which range from values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others to motives such as obtaining career-related benefits, expanding one’s social network, and developing new knowledge and skills. Clary et al. (1998) use the notion of person-situation match to explain that volunteers who found volunteer opportunities that provide benefits matching their motivations are more inclined to continue as volunteers. This connection between the type of organization and a person’s motives is also demonstrated by Schervish’s (2005) analysis of the determinants of charitable giving. He coins the term “consumption philanthropy” to refer to donors who contribute to causes such as schools, churches, and health and art organizations, because they are recipients of their services and because they personally identify with the individuals whose needs are met by their contributions.

To complement the psychological studies, much of the sociological research on volunteering starts from the assumption that the decision to volunteer is based largely on the weighing of costs and benefits in a personal context, which is shaped by features such as level of education, work, income, social networks, and various demographic characteristics (Dekker and Halman 2003; Dekker and De Hart 2009; Wilson 2000).

PSM and Participation in Voluntary Organizations

Many studies rely on cross-sectional data and, as a consequence, are mostly correlations between volunteering and other variables that have been established (Wilson 2000:234). This observation has a bearing on our interest in the relationship between PSM and participation in voluntary organizations. The authors disagree as to whether PSM is a determinant, as against a consequence, of volunteering. For instance, Perry et al. (2008:447) contend:

We believe that volunteering more often than not leads to PSM rather than the reverse. Research suggests that volunteering may emanate from a variety of sources and motivations. [...] Thus, although high levels of PSM are not necessary to engage volunteers, individuals who have participated versus those who have not are more likely in postvolunteering surveys to express values consonant with PSM.

On the other hand, Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) argue that, through early socialization in institutional settings, some individuals develop a level of PSM that leads them to participate in voluntary activities. We suspect, like Clerkin and Fotheringham (2017), that there is no unique causal connection between PSM and volunteering, but that both the patterns described by Perry et al. (2008) and by Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) exist.

Our interest, in this article, is in how CPI influences the participation in voluntary organizations. This focus is based on two reasons. First, we subscribe to the influence attached to early socialization. Similar to Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009), Wilson's review of volunteering research describes a pattern of parents who have encouraged pro-social attitudes in their children that may result in them getting involved in the voluntary sector sooner or later in their lives (Wilson 2000:218). Research of the antecedents of PSM follows a similar reasoning as to how socialization in the family, in the church, and at school inculcates children with PSM, which will influence choices later in their life, such as their interest in public sector employment (Pandey and Stazyk 2008). This line of reasoning underlies our assumption that CPI will be related to volunteering generally. Second, along with Clary et al. (1998) and Coursey et al. (2011), we think that person-environment fit theory helps in understanding why public-interest-committed employees will seek out voluntary organizations that provide opportunities to serve their CPI. Voluntary organizations hold out a mission that sends signals to prospective volunteers on the opportunities they offer to satisfy particular motives (Wright and Pandey 2011), and people, based on their perception of a fit between their own motives and the values that voluntary organizations espouse, will select a voluntary organization with which to engage. Thus, in following the person-environment fit theory, public-interest-committed employees, when faced with the decision as to whether to volunteer for a specific organization, will likely seek out a voluntary organization that espouses public ideals that match their own CPI.

Recently, the relationship between PSM and volunteering has become a subject of empirical research. However, the number of empirical studies is still limited. Some studies that did not measure PSM directly are still relevant for our purpose, because they show and speculate about public and nonprofit sector employees' involvement in various

volunteering domains. Houston (2008) examined participation in various voluntary organizations and related this to the public service ideals they espoused. He contends that higher levels of PSM will lead to greater civic engagement and a greater propensity to engage in pro-social behavior (Houston 2008:178–179). Using the U.S. General Social Survey and drawing on the categorization of civic organizations proposed by Badescu and Neller (2007), Houston (2008:186) demonstrates that there are statistically significant differences between government and nonprofit employees on the one hand and private sector employees on the other, most notably in terms of membership of sociocultural organizations (such as school service groups) that prominently espouse public service ideals. He suggests that these differences may be attributed to PSM. However, Houston (2008:185) admits that this view is speculative, because PSM was not measured directly. The same indirect approach was followed by others. Lee (2012:114) showed that “non-profit workers are more likely to volunteer in religious and social/community organizations, while public workers are more likely to volunteer in educational organizations.” Ertas (2014:267) concluded that “government employees volunteered more in general, and participated in a wider range of organizations. However [. . .] these initial big differences are driven primarily by volunteering in two specific types of organizations: educational institutions and political groups.”

A select number of studies examine PSM and some of its dimensions directly. Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) found that PSM was positively related to decisions made by U.S. college students to donate or to volunteer. By directly measuring all four dimensions of Perry’s PSM construct, these authors were able to establish that compassion and commitment to the public interest dimensions were positively related to volunteering, while self-sacrifice was not significantly related. They also found that the attraction to the policymaking dimension of PSM was negatively related to a respondent’s decision to volunteer. In terms of volunteering domains, Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009:686–687) report that social service nonprofit organizations were more favored than arts and cultural organizations.

Taylor (2010) made use of five items in the 2005 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes dataset. Taylor argued that these five items fit three dimensions of Perry’s PSM scale—attraction to politics and policy, self-sacrifice, and compassion—and used these as a PSM index. The civic behavior that she studied consisted of voluntary activities in the political domain. Taylor found that the PSM index was significantly related to these voluntary activities.

In a study of U.S. elite volunteers, Coursey et al. (2011) found that PSM and the PSM dimensions of compassion, self-sacrifice, and commitment to public service exhibit some variance across four types of volunteering domains: religious organizations, schools, human services, and “other.” They explain these findings by theorizing institutional differences between voluntary agencies, such as the sense of community that organizations foster, the level of formalization, and the level of person-to-client activity. They contend that individuals can be expected to consider how well their motivations fit that of a potential volunteer agency. Based on domain differences related to these institutional characteristics, Coursey et al. (2011:53) elaborate on several expectations regarding dimensions of PSM and volunteering domains. Concentrating on the commitment to public service dimension, they expect that volunteers in education and social service

should score higher on this dimension than those in other voluntary agencies. However, their expectation is not supported, as religious organization volunteering ranks significantly higher than human services and the “other” category of voluntary agencies, but not school volunteering (Coursey et al. 2011:56–57).

Finally, Lee and Jeong (2015) found no relationship for commitment to the public interest and participation in volunteering activities by Korean national government employees; attraction to policymaking was the only significant predictor of participation in volunteering activities in general.

This literature review suggests that, in the relationship between PSM and participation in voluntary organizations, one should address two types of variance. First, there is variance between employees regarding their level of PSM; specifically, in this study, their level of CPI. Because this study uses a dataset containing only public and semi-public sector employees, we can expect less variance in CPI in our sample than if private sector employees had also been included. Second, voluntary organizations vary in terms of the extent to which they espouse public service ideals, suggesting varying degrees to which volunteers can fulfill their public service commitment need by participating in these organizations. This varying potential of volunteering domains is presumed to influence their attraction to individuals.

To start with, we are interested in the correlation between CPI and volunteering as such. Based on Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) and Coursey et al. (2011), we hypothesize that:

H1: There is a positive relationship between an employee’s level of CPI and their participation in voluntary activities.

In order to ensure that we truly assess the effect of CPI, it is essential to control for other variables that are known to be correlated with PSM, including various demographic variables and employment sector. Previous studies, such as those by Houston (2008) and Rotolo and Wilson (2006), have used employment sector as a proxy for PSM, which is problematic as sector may capture other aspects, such as preferences for secure pay or type of work. Other studies have, therefore, included sector as a control variable to distinguish such effects (e.g., Andersen and Serritzlew 2012). To assess the role of CPI separately from any sector effects, this study therefore controls for employment sector.

In addressing the second type of variance related to differences among voluntary organizations, we draw on Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009), Coursey et al. (2011), Houston (2008), and Rotolo and Wilson (2006). As such, we expect public-interest-committed employees to be more likely to be strongly attracted to voluntary organizations that espouse public service ideals, notably educational and cultural organizations, than to organizations such as sports and leisure organizations, which appeal to private interests. Unfortunately, we cannot base our expectation on a general and explicit hierarchy of voluntary organizations ranked by the extent to which they uphold public service ideals. However, there are specific suggestions regarding differences between various types of voluntary organizations which we can use as a starting point in hypothesizing differences. Rotolo and Wilson observe that “the sense of public mission is muted” in professional associations and trade unions (2006:26), and that the service provided by sports and hobby associations is primarily a leisure activity with a “narrower compass” (2006:35). Houston

(2008:186) suggests that sociocultural associations “most prominently espouse public service ideals.” Clerkin, Paynter, and Taylor (2009) and Coursey et al. (2011) find mixed results for education and social service organizations. Recognizing that it is relevant to examine whether these expectations for the U.S. context hold for the Netherlands, we hypothesize that the positive relationship between CPI and participation in voluntary organizations is strongest for cultural and educational organizations, which in our survey are more or less equivalent to Houston’s sociocultural organizations, and which presumably espouse public service ideals most prominently.

H2a: The positive relationship between an employee’s level of CPI and their participation in voluntary organizations is strongest for cultural and educational organizations.

Further, we interpret the argument by Rotolo and Wilson as suggesting that trade union and professional organizations and sports and leisure organizations do not uphold public service ideals but instead espouse more individually oriented motives. We therefore hypothesize:

H2b: There is no relationship between an employee’s level of CPI and their participation in trade union and professional organizations and in sports and leisure organizations.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The Survey

The data for this article were retrieved from the *Personeel-en Mobiliteitsonderzoek* [Personnel and Mobility Research] (POMO) survey, which was commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, among Dutch public and semi-public sector employees (see www.arbeidenoverheid.nl). In total, 87,500 employees were asked to participate, of whom 34,962 responded, a response rate of 40%. The Ministry guarantees that the sample is representative of the overall population of public and semi-public sector employees in terms of gender, age, ethnic background, and spread across the various employment subsectors by applying weighing factors to specific groups when necessary.

Variables

The survey asked respondents whether they were involved in a volunteer organization on an unpaid basis alongside their paid job. Respondents could answer negatively (= 0) or positively (= 1). As such, the dependent variable is a dichotomous variable. Further, respondents could indicate one or more areas from a list of seven volunteering domains: political organizations; trade union and professional organizations; cultural and educational organizations; sports and leisure organizations; religious, charitable, and idealistic organizations; healthcare and welfare organizations; and other types.

CPI was measured using a single item: “To what extent is doing work that is useful for society important in your choice of employment?” The item was measured on a five-point

Likert scale, with 1 = not important at all and 5 = very important. This item is similar to the item “Meaningful public service is very important to me” that Perry (1996) included in the PSM measure as part of the dimension commitment to the public interest. Ideally, we would have preferred to measure PSM using the full PSM scale, but the available dataset included only this single item. We note that other studies (Crewson 1997; Houston 2000; Lyons, Duxbury, and Higgins 2006) used a similar one-item measurement. In order to empirically test whether our one-item measure accurately represents the dimension we intend to measure, we followed the procedure of Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) using another dataset ($n = 26,874$) which includes a four-item measure of commitment to the public interest (based on Vandenabeele 2008), but not a measure of volunteering. These data were collected from a sample that is quite similar to the sample in this article. The corrected item-total correlation, calculating the correlation between the equivalent item that measures “doing work that is useful for society is important” and the other three items from the commitment to the public interest construct, is significant ($r = .532$, $p < .001$). This fairly strong correlation allows us to interpret our findings as holding for the relationship between CPI and volunteering.

The survey provides information on a number of socio-demographic variables that are known to be correlated with volunteering, namely age, gender, and educational level. The survey contained no information on religious affiliation, which would potentially have been relevant, given its relationship with altruistic values (Bekkers 2000). Educational level was measured by asking respondents to indicate the educational level they had attained from a list ranging from primary level through to university PhD degree. For our purposes, the categories were transformed into an ordinal low-to-high scale with four values: low educational level, middle educational level, higher professional education, and university degree.

Employment sector is used as a control variable (0 = semi-public; 1 = public). In this study, public sector employees are those employed by government organizations (national, regional, local) and police, justice, defense, and water authorities. Semi-public sector employees are those employed in education (from primary to university education) and academic hospitals. In the Netherlands, educational organizations and academic hospitals are regarded as “semi-public” because they are publicly funded, do not face market competition but, as employers, are legally private entities (see Bozeman 1987). Sector in this understanding cannot be equated with PSM, as sector may refer to other characteristics of the two sectors, such as job security.

Data Analysis

Since the dependent variable is dichotomous, logistic regression analysis is the appropriate technique for examining how it is related to independent variables. Logistic regression analysis does not indicate the proportion of explained variance, but rather a Pseudo R^2 . Because alternative measures have their own strengths and weaknesses, in the tables we include both Nagelkerke’s R^2 and McFadden’s R^2 . When discussing the results of our analyses, we will refer to McFadden’s R^2 , which is a more conservative measure than Nagelkerke’s R^2 . For testing the hypotheses, we employ stepwise logistic regression analyses. In the first step, socio-demographic characteristics are added to the

model and then, in a second step, the sector (semi-public or public). In the final model, having controlled for the other variables, we add CPI to determine the extent to which this variable is related to volunteering. In Table 2, we present the results of the subsequent models (step 1, step 2, step 3). In Table 3, we only present the final model (i.e., after step 3), which includes the socio-demographic variables and the employment sector, as well as CPI. Although we do not report the model results after steps 1 and 2 in Table 3, we do report the results of the likelihood ratio tests conducted after every step. Given our large sample size, a significance level of $\alpha = 0.001$ was felt appropriate.

Descriptive Characteristics of the Survey Respondents

Of the respondents, 43.5% were women and 56.5% men, and the average age of all respondents was 46.6 years. In terms of educational level, 12.5% fell within the group with a low educational level; 24.4% in the middle educational band; 37.9% had a higher professional education; and 24.5% had obtained a university degree. Just over half of all respondents (50.5%) were classified as semi-public employees and 49.5% as public employees.

The employees' mean score for CPI was 3.89 ($SD = 0.93$) on a five-point Likert scale (with 5 = high level of CPI), indicating that, overall, respondents regarded "doing work that is useful for society" as a fairly important motive in their employment selection. The standard deviation reflects a substantial variation in the respondents' CPI levels.

Thirty-nine percent of the respondents participated in voluntary activities, with 32% participating in just one voluntary organization and 7% in more than one. Data on volunteering by the adult population (from the age of 18) in the Netherlands (Van Herten 2009) are not fully comparable to our survey data, but show that volunteering by public and semi-public employees is similar to volunteering generally. Data on the entire adult population show that men's participation (42.9%) is slightly higher than women's (41.1%). There are also minor differences in volunteering between age groups; individuals in the 35–44 age group participate more, and in the 74+ group less. Finally, there is a positive relationship between citizens' level of education and their participation in volunteering.

In terms of the organizations in which our survey's respondents were actively volunteering, sports organizations score highest with 16.9% of the sample active here. Religious, charitable, and other idealistic organizations attracted 9.3%; 8.2% were active in cultural and educational organizations; 3.2% in healthcare and welfare organizations; 1.8% in trade union and professional organizations; 1.8% in political organizations; and 6.7% in "other organizations." The categorization of volunteering domains in the survey we use differs slightly from the categorization by Van Herten's (2009) adult population study, but the rank order of volunteering domains and the proportions of volunteers are roughly similar.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the results of the correlation analysis. All variables are significantly related ($p < .001$). This might have to do with the large sample size. CPI is significantly related to volunteering ($r = .088$). In previous studies, sector (semi-public vs public) has been used as a proxy for PSM. In our sample, sector and CPI are only weakly related ($r = -.039$).

TABLE 1
Correlation Table

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Volunteering (no = 0; yes = 1)					
2. Gender (male = 0; female = 1)	-.103				
3. Educational level*	.107	.025			
4. Age	.101	-.152	-.056		
5. Sector (semi-public = 0; public = 1)	-.015	-.216	-.322	-.021	
6. Public interest commitment	.088	.088	.075	.061	-.039

Note: All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

*We display Pearson’s correlation coefficients. For educational level, we display Spearman correlation coefficient.

Tables 2 and 3 contain the results from the logistic regression analyses for volunteering. Table 2 shows the results for volunteering as such. Table 3 reports the models with results related to volunteering in a specific domain.

The Relationship Between CPI and Volunteering

In the final model detailed in Table 2, reflecting the results for volunteering as such and including the four control variables, McFadden R^2 is .031.

Considering the relationship between the independent variables and volunteering, we first see that employment sector does not have a significant relationship with volunteering, whereas CPI does have a significant and positive relationship ($B = .195$, $p < .001$). Using a likelihood ratio test, we indeed see that adding CPI to the model improves the model over the variables included in Step 2. This result provides support for Hypothesis 1.

The socio-demographic characteristics all have significant relationships with volunteering. Men are more likely to participate in voluntary activities than women ($B = -.431$, $p < .001$). The more highly educated that employees are, the more likely they are to volunteer (B varying between .413 and .800 ($p < .001$) for the different educational groups). Age is also positively related to volunteering ($B = .018$, $p < .001$), but rather weakly, which may have to do with the nonlinear relationship between age and volunteering (Wilson 2000). These results are in line with the general characteristics of volunteering in the Netherlands reported earlier.

The Relationship Between CPI and Volunteering in Various Domains

Models 2 through 7 in Table 3 report the results of the logistic regression analyses for volunteering in each of the six volunteering domains considered. The category “other voluntary organizations” is not included in this analysis because we have no information on these “other” organizations and, consequently, would not be able to draw any meaningful conclusions. In Table 3, the final models, including all of the variables following step 3 (CPI plus the four control variables), are displayed. McFadden R^2 values range

TABLE 2
Logistic Regression Results: Relationship between CPI and Volunteering in General

Variable	Model #1: Volunteering		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Gender (male = 0; female = 1)	-.403*** (.668)	-.392*** (.675)	-.431*** (.650)
Education: middle educational level (reference cat: low)	.400*** (1.492)	.403*** (1.497)	.413*** (1.511)
Education: higher professional education (reference cat: low)	.739*** (2.094)	.761*** (2.140)	.743*** (2.102)
Education: university education (reference cat: low)	.803*** (2.232)	.824*** (2.280)	.800*** (2.226)
Age	.019*** (1.020)	.020*** (1.020)	.018*** (1.018)
Sector (semi-public = 0; public = 1)	—	.053 (1.054)	.048 (1.049)
Public interest commitment	—	—	.195*** (1.216)
Constant	-1.761 (.172)	-1.814*** (.163)	-2.487*** (.083)
<i>n</i>	34,720		
-2 Log Likelihood	45,316.557	45,312.015	45,061.445
Step χ^2	1187.902***	4.542	250.571***
Model χ^2	1187.902***	1192.444***	1443.014***
Hosmer-Lemeshow χ^2 test	63.796***	27.371***	5.129
Percentage correctly predicted without model	60.8%		
Percentage correctly predicted with model	61.3%	61.4%	62.1%
Nagelkerke R2	.046	.046	.055
McFadden R2	.026	.026	.031

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized parameter estimates (odds ratios are in parentheses). ***p < 0.001.

TABLE 3
 Logistic Regression Results: Relationship between CPI and Participation in Voluntary Organizations in Various Domains

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model #2: Political</i>	<i>Model #3: Trade union, professional</i>	<i>Model #4: Cultural, educational</i>	<i>Model #5: Sport, leisure</i>	<i>Model #6: Religious, charity</i>	<i>Model #7: Health, welfare</i>
Step 1						
Gender (male = 0; female = 1)	-.885*** (.413)	-.739*** (.478)	-.207*** (.813)	-.680*** (.507)	-.084 (.920)	.336*** (1.399)
Education: middle educational level (reference cat: low)	.775 (2.170)	.723*** (2.060)	.420*** (1.522)	.260*** (1.296)	.505*** (1.657)	.234 (1.264)
Education: higher professional education (reference cat: low)	1.673*** (5.330)	.738*** (2.092)	.967*** (2.630)	.367*** (1.443)	.967*** (2.631)	.340 (1.405)
Education: university education (reference cat: low)	2.153*** (8.611)	1.247*** (3.479)	1.375*** (3.956)	-.024 (.976)	.886*** (2.426)	.589*** (1.802)
Age	.015*** (1.015)	.038*** (1.039)	.023*** (1.023)	.001(1.001)	.022*** (1.023)	.034*** (1.035)
Step 2						
Sector (semi-public = 0; public = 1)	.424*** (1.528)	.213 (1.237)	-.159*** (.853)	.149*** (1.160)	-.172*** (.842)	.026 (1.027)
Step 3						
Public interest commitment [95% CI odd ratio]	.410*** (1.507) [1.363-1.665]	.109 (1.115) [1.020-1.219]	.179*** (1.196) [1.144-1.250]	.027 (1.027) [.996-1.060]	.284*** (1.329) [1.272-1.387]	.284*** (1.328) [1.235-1.427]
Constant	-7.869*** (.000)	-6.947*** (.001)	-4.969*** (.007)	-1.754*** (.173)	-5.105*** (.006)	-6.697*** (.001)
n	34,720	34,720	34,720	34,720	34,720	34,720
-2 Log Likelihood	5,747.980	6,059.238	18,919.550	30,895.147	20,887.669	9,620.141
Step χ^2 step 1	318.299***	244.742***	708.779***	643.567***	493.493***	178.100***

(Continued)

TABLE 3
Continued

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model #2: Political</i>	<i>Model #3: Trade union, professional</i>	<i>Model #4: Cultural, educational</i>	<i>Model #5: Sport, leisure</i>	<i>Model #6: Religious, charity</i>	<i>Model #7: Health, welfare</i>
Step χ^2 step 2	26.897***	6.329	12.268***	21.635***	16.526***	.280
Step χ^2 step 3	70.939***	5.929	63.935***	2.977	175.312***	63.051***
Model χ^2 step 3	416.134***	257.001***	784.982***	668.180***	685.331***	241.431***
Hosmer-Lemeshow χ^2 test	5.361	8.320	4.853	23.116***	16.902	9.210
Percentage correctly predicted without model	98.2%	98.2%	91.8%	81.3%	90.6%	96.8%
Percentage correctly predicted with model	98.2%	98.2%	91.8%	83.1%	90.6%	96.8%
Nagelkerke R2 step 3	.073	.044	.052	.032	.042	.028
McFadden R2 step 3	.068	.041	.040	.021	.032	.024

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized parameter estimates (odds ratios are in parentheses). Only the final models (including all variables) are displayed. *** $p < 0.001$.

from .021 for volunteering in sport/leisure organizations up to .068 when it comes to involvement in political organizations.

Our interest is primarily in the relationship between CPI and volunteering in various domains. In order to test this relationship when controlling for gender, educational level, age, and sector, we examined the regression coefficients and performed likelihood ratio tests to see if adding CPI improves the models over the variables in Step 2. CPI appears to have no significant relationship with volunteering when it comes to volunteering in trade unions/professional organizations and in sport/leisure organizations. CPI is significantly related to volunteering in the other domains. The regression coefficients vary between .179 for participation in cultural/educational organizations and .410 for participation in political organizations.

We conducted a robustness check to examine the relationship between CPI and volunteering in different domains, using only the data from those respondents who participate in volunteering activities. The results are very much in line with the results presented in Table 3. For four of the six volunteering domains, the relationship between CPI and volunteering is significant: volunteering in political organizations, cultural/educational organizations, religious/charitable/idealistic organizations, and healthcare/welfare organizations. For one of the six volunteering domains, the relationship between CPI and volunteering is non-significant: trade union/professional organizations. These results corroborate the findings presented in Table 3. The only exception regards volunteering in sport/leisure organizations. Instead of finding a non-significant effect, we found a negative effect, indicating that employees with higher levels of CPI are less likely to volunteer in sport/leisure organizations when we only analyze the data from those who volunteer in general.

We are also interested in whether the strength of the relationship between CPI and volunteering varies across the different domains. The 95% confidence intervals displayed in Table 3 show that the relationship between CPI and volunteering is substantively weaker for participation in cultural/educational organizations [95% CI 1.144;1.250] compared to participation in religious/charitable/idealistic organizations [95% CI 1.272;1.387] and political organizations [95% CI 1.363;1.665].

In Hypothesis 2a, we predicted that the positive relationship between the employees' level of CPI and their participation in voluntary associations would be strongest for cultural and educational organizations. Although we did find a positive relationship, there were stronger positive relationships between CPI and volunteering in religious/charitable/idealistic and political domains. Therefore, Hypothesis 2a is rejected. However, our results do provide support for Hypothesis 2b, which foresaw a non-significant relationship between the level of CPI and employees' participation in trade union/professional organizations and sports/leisure organizations.

The sector of employment has no significant relationship with volunteering as such, but was significant when it came to the specific volunteering domains, with the exception of trade unions/professional organizations and healthcare/welfare organizations. We found that semi-public employees were more likely to volunteer in religious/charitable/idealistic ($B = -.172$, $p < .001$) and cultural/educational ($B = -.159$, $p < .001$) organizations, whereas public employees were more likely to volunteer in political organizations ($B = .424$, $p < .001$) and sports/leisure organizations ($B = .149$, $p < .001$).

Turning next to the relationship between the various demographic variables and volunteering, we note that men are more likely than women to participate in the various voluntary domains, with the exception of healthcare/welfare organizations (where women are more likely to volunteer) and religious/charitable/idealistic organizations (where we did not find a significant difference between men and women). More highly educated employees are generally more likely to volunteer than less well-educated ones, but this relationship does not hold for volunteering in all volunteering domains. Some specific exceptions were found in the case of sports/leisure organizations, healthcare/welfare organizations, and in the case of political organizations. Age is also positively, albeit weakly, related to volunteering in the various domains, again with the exception of sports and leisure organizations.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This article has addressed the question as to what extent commitment to the public interest (CPI) is related to participation in voluntary organizations in a range of domains. The results, which are based on a survey among a large representative sample of public and semi-public sector employees in the Netherlands, show that CPI is positively related to the likelihood of volunteering. The results also show that the strength of the relationship between employees' CPI and their propensity to volunteer for various voluntary organizations varies, ranging from high for political and religious/charitable/idealistic organizations to low for cultural/educational organizations. Further, participation in sports/leisure organizations and trade union/professional organizations is not significantly related to CPI.

Our findings lead to some observations with regard to earlier pioneering studies into the relationship between PSM and activities in the public domain. Our first observation concerns the relationship between PSM and volunteering as such. Whereas some earlier studies (Brewer 2003; Houston 2006, 2008) used public sector employment as a proxy for PSM, the direct measurement of CPI while controlling for employment sector (semi-public or public sector employees) has enabled us to distinguish between the effect of CPI and employment sector. Here, an important conclusion is that CPI does have a significant relationship with volunteering as such when employment sector is controlled for.¹ This confirms that CPI does indeed have a role in behaviors beyond the workplace. The relationship found between CPI and volunteering is, as we expected, positive. However, CPI predicts the likelihood of employees' volunteering only to a small degree, which is similar to what Houston (2006:77) and Coursey et al. (2011:57) noted. Since many factors contribute to individuals' volunteering, it is not that surprising that the contribution made by CPI is small.

Another important finding is that, when the relationship between CPI and participation in various voluntary sectors is considered, the strength of the relationship varies. This grounds two theoretical interpretations. First, there is no significant relationship between CPI and participation in those voluntary domains that do not uphold public service ideals. Here, we interpreted Rotolo and Wilson's (2006:26, 35) argument that sports and leisure organizations appeal to private interests and that the sense of public mission is muted in trade union or professional organizations, as indicating that these organizations do not

uphold public service ideals. From Schervish (2005), we draw the additional explanation that the high proportion of employees who volunteer in sports and leisure organizations may be related to the benefits they themselves and/or their children get as service users, rather than to the motive of being committed to the public interest.

Second, CPI is differentially related to participation in the various voluntary domains that are presumed to uphold public service ideals. Since we have no independent information on the extent to which voluntary organizations in the Netherlands uphold public service ideals, we followed Houston's (2008:186) suggestion and hypothesized that the strength of the relationship between CPI and volunteering would be highest in cultural and educational organizations. However, our evidence does not provide support for this. This could be due to differences between the groups of voluntary organizations examined by Houston and those in our dataset. Our contrary finding could also be related to institutional differences between apparently similar voluntary organizations in the U.S. and Dutch contexts. Without an independent measure for the extent to which organizations uphold public service ideals and systematic comparative information on the scores of U.S. and Dutch voluntary organizations on this variable, one cannot draw any firm conclusions. However, we do feel that the assumption remains tenable that the strength of the relationship between CPI and volunteering in various voluntary organizations is related to the extent to which these uphold public service ideals. Arguably, political, religious/charitable/idealistic, healthcare/welfare, and cultural/educational organizations uphold public service ideals to different degrees and, therefore, are attractive to a different extent to public-interest-committed employees. This reasoning is in line with the assumptions made by Coursey et al. (2011) based on person-environment fit theories and by Wright and Pandey (2011), who emphasize the importance of voluntary organizations communicating their mission. Further research is needed to provide evidence to validate these assumptions. Our finding that CPI is differentially related to volunteering in various domains is relevant to the study of volunteering, as this suggests that voluntary organizations such as, for instance, political and religious/charitable/idealistic organizations provide more opportunities to public-interest-committed employees to fulfill their volunteering motive than others, such as sports organizations.

However, we must note that additional analyses are needed to further disentangle whether CPI is just driving people to volunteer regardless of domain, or whether it has an impact on both the decision to volunteer as well as the domain in which the person volunteers. Using a selection model would allow us to answer the question if CPI explains volunteering in general only or different domains of volunteering over and above the motivation to just volunteer. It might well be that the decision to volunteer and the domain of that volunteering are actually part of the same decision.

This article has some limitations that should not be ignored. First, it uses cross-sectional data, and while we have argued that there are theoretical reasons to assume that PSM influences the decision to volunteer, there are also theoretical reasons, as noted by Perry et al. (2008), to argue that volunteering generates PSM. Having only cross-sectional data, it would be speculative to comment on the direction of causality. Future studies that adopt a longitudinal approach are needed to shed light on this issue. Second, the data we use are self-reported data. However, the dependent variable is measured by a survey question that refers very concretely to actual behavior, by asking "do you do unpaid

voluntary work alongside your job?" Therefore, the risk of common source bias is very limited. On the other hand, this binary indicator of whether someone volunteers provides only limited information about an individual's participation in voluntary organizations. Future studies could collect richer information by including indicators that refer, for instance, to hours per week spent on volunteering or to the number of years served as a volunteer. These would provide a more detailed insight into the consequences of the CPI motive for volunteering. In addition, we should acknowledge that the overall response to this survey could be biased in the sense that public-interest-committed employees may have been more willing to participate in the survey. A fourth concern is that this study drew on a third-party survey that included only a single CPI item. Although we demonstrated that this single item is fairly strongly correlated to a multiple item measure of "commitment to the public interest," which supports our interpretation of the findings, a more comprehensive operationalization would increase the validity of the measurement. Lastly, we tested the relationship between CPI and volunteering while controlling for other variables using logistic regression. We know from research that the relations between the variables involved are more complex than simple, independent variable models like logistic regression bring out. For instance, we control for education, which is often theorized and found to be related to PSM as antecedent, as well as for employment sector choice, which is usually considered a consequence of PSM. In addition, we include age as a control variable, although Wilson (2000) has discussed the complex nonlinear relationship between age and volunteering. Future research could model these complex relationships. Furthermore, it may be that the proposed relationship between CPI and volunteering is spurious, meaning that both CPI and volunteering are caused by a third variable, such as religion or parental socialization, which are not included in our dataset so that we simply do not know their effect. Overall, it is important that future research includes other variables that potentially influence the relationship between CPI and volunteering, and that data are collected that facilitate analysis of the complex relations between these variables.

Despite these limitations, this article has contributed to the emerging evidence that CPI is relevant to understanding civic action in the public domain. Moreover, this article adds to the body of knowledge by showing that the association between CPI and volunteering differs for the various volunteering domains. In addition, we hope that voluntary organizations will benefit from insights in this study. The need for voluntary organizations to communicate their public service ideals so as to attract volunteers from public-interest-committed employees is particularly relevant at a time when many governments restrain the budgets for public services and service provision has become more dependent on volunteers. One may wonder whether the number of volunteers can increase much further, given the high proportion of citizens who already volunteer in countries such as the Netherlands. We do not know how far the willingness of citizens to provide public services can be stretched. Nevertheless, it may well be that the emphasis on public service ideals which voluntary organizations espouse, in combination with empowerment at the local level, will increase the attractiveness of volunteering for employees who are public interest committed. Many voluntary organizations serve public ideals, and these could be better communicated as part of their mission statements. Mission valence, as Wright and Pandey (2011) argue, has the benefit of salience and of being attractive to

individuals, such that they are motivated to join the organization. Our study shows that many voluntary organizations have the potential to attract public-interest-committed employees by communicating their public ideals in the form of a worthy mission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Dutch Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations for allowing them to use the dataset of the BZK Personeels- en Mobiliteitsonderzoek. The authors would also like to express their gratitude to Wouter Vandenebeeke and two anonymous reviewers for their critical comments and helpful suggestions, which have contributed to the revision of earlier versions of this article.

NOTE

1. As a robustness check, we also computed the models without sector as a control variable. In these models, the B-values were very similar to those in the models with sector as a control variable.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, L. B. and S. Serritzlew. 2012. "Does Public Service Motivation Affect the Behavior of Professionals?" *International Journal of Public Administration* 35(1):19–29. doi:10.1080/01900692.2011.635277.
- Badescu, G. and K. Neller. 2007. "Explaining Associational Involvement." Pp. 158–87 in *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracy: A Comparative Analysis*, edited by J. W. Deth, J. R. Montero, and A. Westholm. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bekkers, R. 2000. "Religieuze Betrokkenheid en Vrijwilligerswerk: Een Kwestie van Psychologische Dispositie of Sociale Organisatie?" [Religious Commitment and Volunteering: A Matter of Psychological Disposition or Social Organisation?] *Sociologische Gids* 47(4):268–92.
- Bozeman, B. 1987. *All Organizations are Public*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brewer, G. 2003. "Building Social Capital: Civic Attitudes and Behaviour of Public Servants." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13:15–26. doi:10.1093/jpart/mug011.
- Clary, E., M. Snyder, R. Ridge, J. Copeland, A. Stukas, J. Haugen, and P. Miene. 1998. "Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(6):1516–30. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.74.6.1516.
- Clerkin, R. and E. Fotheringham. 2017. "Exploring the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Formal and Informal Volunteering." *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs* 3(1):23–39. doi:10.20899/jpna.3.1.23-39.
- Clerkin, M., S. Paynter, and J. Taylor. 2009. "Public Service Motivation in Undergraduate Giving and Volunteering Decisions." *American Review of Public Administration* 39(6):675–98. doi:10.1177/0275074008327512.
- Coursey, D., J. Brudney, L. Littlepage, and J. Perry. 2011. "Does Public Service Motivation Matter in Volunteering Domain Choices? A Test of Functional Theory." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 31(1):48–66. doi:10.1177/0734371x10394405.
- Crewson, P. 1997. "Public Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7:499–18. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024363.

- Dekker, P. and J. De Hart. 2009. *Vrijwilligerswerk in Meervoud*. [Voluntary work: A diversity of forms.] Den Haag, Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Dekker, P., and L. Halman. 2003. *The Values of Volunteering: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Ertas, N. 2014. "Public Service Motivation Theory and Voluntary Organizations: Do Government Employees Volunteer More?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43(2):254–71. doi:10.1177/0899764012459254.
- Guy, M., M. Newman, and S. Mastracci. 2008. *Emotional Labor: Putting the Service in Public Service*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Houston, D. 2000. "Public Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test." *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 10(4):713–27.
- Houston, D. 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. doi:10.1093/jopart/mui028.
- Houston, D. 2008. "Behavior in the Public Square." Pp. 177–99 in *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. Perry, and A. Hondeghem. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hustinx, L., R. Cnaan, and F. Handy. 2010. "Navigating Theories of Volunteering: A Hybrid Map for a Complex Phenomenon." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 40(4):410–34. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2010.00439.x.
- Knocke, D. and C. Wright-Isak. 1982. "Individual Motives and Organizational Incentive Systems." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 1:209–54.
- Lee, Y. J. 2012. "Behavioral Implications of Public Service Motivation Volunteering by Public and Nonprofit Employees." *The American Review of Public Administration* 42(1):104–21. doi:10.1177/0275074011398120.
- Lee, Y. J. and J. W. Jeong. 2015. "The Link between Public Service Motivation and Volunteering: The Case of South Korean Civil Servants." *International Journal of Public Administration* 38(5):355–63. doi:10.1080/01900692.2014.938819.
- Lyons, S. T., L. E. Duxbury, and C. A. Higgins. 2006. "A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees." *Public Administration Review* 66(4):605–18. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00620.x.
- Pandey, S. and E. Stazyk. 2008. "Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation." Pp. 101–17 in *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. Perry, and A. Hondeghem. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. 1996. "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity." *Journal of Public Administration and Theory* 6(1):5–23. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303.
- Perry, J. 2000. "Bringing Society in: Toward a Theory of Public Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration and Theory* 10(2):471–88. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024277.
- Perry, J., J. Brudney, D. Coursey, and L. Littlepage. 2008. "What Drives Morally Committed Citizens? A Study of the Antecedents of Public Service Motivation." *Public Administration Review* 68(3):445–58. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.00881.x.
- Perry, J. and A. Hondeghem. 2008. "Editors' Introduction." Pp. 1–14 in *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by J. Perry, and A. Hondeghem. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. and L. Wise. 1990. "The Motivational Bases of Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 50(3):367–73. doi:10.2307/976618.
- Ritz, A., G. Brewer, and O. Neumann. 2016. "Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook." *Public Administration Review* 76(3):414–26. doi:10.1111/puar.12505.

- Rodell, J., H. Breitsohl, M. Schröder, and D. Keating. 2016. "Employee Volunteering: A Review and Framework for Future Research." *Journal of Management* 40(1):55–84. doi:10.1177/0149206315614374.
- Rotolo, T. and J. Wilson. 2006. "Employment Sector and Volunteering: The Contribution of Nonprofit and Public Sector Workers to the Volunteer Labor Force." *The Sociological Quarterly* 47:21–40. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2006.00036.x.
- Salamon, L. 2002. "The Resilient Sector: The State of Nonprofit America." Pp. 3–64 in *The State of Nonprofit America*, edited by L. Salamon. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Schervish, P. 2005. "Major Donors, Major Motives: The People and Purposes behind Major Gifts." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* 47:59–87. doi:10.1002/pf.95.
- Steen, T. 2006. "Public Sector Motivation: Is there Something to Learn from the Study of Volunteerism?" *Public Policy and Administration* 21(1):49–62. doi:10.1177/095207670602100104.
- Taylor, J. 2010. "Public Service Motivation, Civic Attitudes and Actions of Public, Nonprofit and Private Sector Employees." *Public Administration* 88(4):1083–98. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01870.x.
- Van Herten, M. 2009. *Vrijwillige Inzet 2008*. [Volunteering 2008.] Den Haag, Netherlands: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2007. "Toward a Public Administration Theory of Public Service Motivation: An Institutional Approach." *Public Management Review* 9(4):545–56. doi:10.1080/14719030701726697.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2008. "Development of a Public Service Motivation Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument." *International Public Management Journal* 11(1):143–67.
- Wanous, J., A. Reichers, and M. Hudy. 1997. "Overall Job Satisfaction: How Good are Single-Item Measures?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(2):247–52. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.82.2.247.
- Wilson, J. 2000. "Volunteering." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215–40. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215.
- Wright, B. E. and S. K. Pandey. 2011. "Public Organizations and Mission Valence: When does Mission Matter?" *Administration & Society* 43(1):22–44. doi:10.1177/0095399710386303.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Peter L. M. Leisink (P.L.M.Leisink@uu.nl) is a full professor at the Utrecht University School of Governance, the Netherlands. His research interests include management of public service organizations, public value, public service motivation, red tape, and public service employment relations.

Eva Knies (E.Knies@uu.nl) is an associate professor at the Utrecht University School of Governance, the Netherlands. Her research interests include public service performance, public value creation, strategic human resource management in the public sector, and public leadership.

Nina van Loon (nina@ps.au.dk) is an assistant professor at the Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, Denmark. Her research interests include performance management, motivation, red tape, and coping behavior with a focus on public service providers.