

## **Public Sector Motivation *ad fonts***

Personality Traits as Antecedents of the Motivation to

Serve the Public Interest

**Arjen van Witteloostuijn.**

Tilburg School of Economics and Management, Tilburg University & Antwerp Center of Evolutionary Demography University of Antwerp. PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands Tel: +3113134663248 Email: [a.vanwitteloostuijn@uvt.nl](mailto:a.vanwitteloostuijn@uvt.nl)

**Marc Esteve**

School of Public Policy, University College London. & ESADE Business School. The Rubin Building, 29/31 Tavistock Square, London, WC1H 9QU. Tel: +44(0)2076794999 Email: [marc.esteve@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:marc.esteve@ucl.ac.uk)

**George Boyne**

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Cardiff University. Aberconway Building, Column Drive. CF10 3EU. Cardiff, Wales. Tel: + 029 20875572 Email: [Boyne@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:Boyne@cardiff.ac.uk)

## **Public Sector Motivation *ad fonts***

### Personality Traits as Antecedents of the Motivation to Serve the Public Interest

#### **ABSTRACT**

Public Service Motivation (PSM) is a topic that has generated considerable interest among Public Administration scholars. Research on PSM has mainly focused on either defining what PSM is and how this construct can be measured, or on testing how PSM affects individual and organizational variables. However, very little is known about how the motivation to serve the public interest is influenced by personality. We evaluate the psychological antecedents of PSM by distinguishing two classes of motives behind PSM: affective versus non-affective motives. Our analysis of data from responses to two independent questionnaires by 320 undergraduate students reveals that PSM is strongly influenced by core personality traits. Our results suggest that affective motives of PSM – Compassion (COM) and Self-Sacrifice (SS) – are positively influenced by the personality traits of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness, and negatively by Conscientiousness. In contrast, non-affective PSM motives – Attraction to Policy-Making (APM) and Commitment to the Public Interest (CPI) – are positively associated with the Openness to Experience trait.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Public Service Motivation (PSM) is a topic that has generated considerable interest among Public Administration scholars in recent decades (Perry et al., 2010). It has been defined as a universal concept referring to motives that are intrinsic to public sector employees, reflecting their willingness to help society and its citizens (Kim and Vandenberg, 2010; Perry and Wise, 1990). In essence, PSM examines the motives that individuals have to engage in behavior that promotes the public interest (Wise, 2000). PSM corresponds to a special individual motive, or set of motives, linked to public service (Kim, 2011), being a motivational force behind work carried out in favor of society (Brewer and Selden, 1998). PSM is not a construct that solely affects public sector employees (Brewer and Selden, 1998). Indeed, the desire to serve the public interest can motivate private sector employees, citizens and students as well (see, for example, Vandenberg, 2008a). As Brewer and Selden (1998: 416) explain, PSM is a “dynamic behavioral concept anchored in the types of behavior people exhibit rather than in the sectors in which they work.”

Research on PSM has mainly involved two distinct perspectives. The first PSM research tradition focuses on defining what PSM precisely is, and how this construct can be measured reliably and validly (Brewer and Selden, 1998; Perry, 1996; Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999). The second research stream relates to testing whether or not – and if so, in what direction – PSM affects a variety of individual and organizational variables (Christensen and Wright, 2011; Houston, 2011; Kim, 2012; Lee, 2012). Conversely, there is a lack of research on the sources of PSM – that is, on the antecedents of an individual’s high or low level of PSM. The current paper takes a step in filling this void.

Specifically, the aim of this paper is to relate the motives associated with PSM to the main dimensions, or traits, of personality identified in the psychological literature. The Public Administration literature acknowledges the importance of individual characteristics for several organizational processes and outcomes (see, e.g., Esteve et al., 2013; Kim, 2005; Lipsky, 1980). However, little research has been done to understand how an individual's personality might explain these individual characteristics. Although personality is rather new to the Public Administration literature, core personality traits have been extensively used to explain differences in individual and group behavior across the social sciences. For example, de Vries and van Kampen (2010) use core personality traits to explain why certain individuals are more egoistic, pretentious or immoral, and Weller and Thulin (2012) and Weller and Tikir (2011) relate personality to risk-taking behavior. Furthermore, for instance, personality has been used by political scientists to explain voting behavior (e.g., Gerber et al., 2010), and general management scholars have explored the impact of personality in the context of a wide range of organizational processes and outcomes (e.g., Boone et al., 2005).

Following this psychological approach, this article assesses how core personality traits are related to the two main classes of PSM motives: affective and non-affective. Affective motives relate to the 'intrinsically altruistic' sources of PSM, whereas non-affective motives refer to instrumental or normative reasons for pursuing the public interest (Perry, 1996; Perry and Wise, 1990). We examine the links between personality and these two types of PSM motives by using the HEXACO scale, which is widely regarded as a valid measure of an individual's core personality traits (Ashton and Lee, 2001; Lee and Ashton, 2004). Our study seeks to add knowledge to the extant literature regarding the roots of the motives driving PSM. As Perry (1997) argues, by

understanding the antecedents of PSM, we will be able to comprehend how PSM could be developed further among public, private and not-for-profit employees. Moreover, deeper insights into the antecedents of PSM could help to explain differences found with regard to the impact of PSM on behavioral and organizational outcomes (Perry et al., 2010), and may shed light on the ongoing debate as to whether PSM is a stable trait or a changeable attitude.

### **PERSONALITY TRAITS AS ANTECEDENTS OF PSM**

A compelling theoretical approach to the antecedents of PSM is provided by Perry (2000). Perry argues that there are three major sources that affect PSM. The first is the socio-historical context, made up of an individual's education, socialization, and life events. The second source is the motivational context that surrounds an individual, composed of the work environment, organizational incentives, and job characteristics, as well as the beliefs, values and ideology of the organization in which the individual works. The third source is individual characteristics such as abilities and competences, and the values and the identity composing the individual's self-concept, which is in line with evidence regarding a strong association of PSM with an individual orientation toward public service (Brewer et al., 2000). A few years later, Perry, Brudney, Coursey, and Littlepage (2008) developed this model further, suggesting that PSM could be affected by demographic variables such as income, education level and gender, by individual activities such as those related to religion and voluntary work, and by family socialization.

Although these studies provide a few interesting insights into potential correlates of PSM, there has been little evaluation of the roots of PSM. Specifically, although the variables considered in earlier research refer to individual characteristics, very little is

known about how the desire to serve the public interest is related to an individual's personality traits, which are known to be potential core antecedents of an individual's motives in the large psychological literature (McClelland et al., 1989; Schultheiss and Brunstein, 2010). This is somewhat surprising considering that the initial definitions of PSM acknowledge the importance of values and ideology to understand why some people have higher PSM than others (Perry, 1996, 1997, 2000).

Initially, PSM was mainly described as an intention: the desire to serve the public interest (Perry and Wise, 1990). As PSM theory evolved, however, authors have largely described PSM as an attitude in favor of the public good (Brewer et al., 2000; Kim and Vandenabeele, 2010; Pandey et al., 2008; Perry, 1996; Staats, 1988). Among social psychologists, attitudes are understood as a “psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993: 1). Ajzen and Fishbein presented a model to understand how attitudes influence behavior: the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). According to this theory, an individual's voluntary behavior is strongly influenced by two concepts: the individual's attitude toward that particular behavior (attitudes), and how other people would perceive the individual if he or she performed the behavior (subjective norm).

The theory of reasoned action has proven to be useful to understand the psychological mechanisms predicting particular behaviors, especially the role that attitudes play in voluntary behaviors (Ajzen, 1991). That is, attitudes are always inferred from explicit responses to a particular entity, issue, or object; they refer to a specific predisposition to interact with a specific environment (Ajzen, 2005). In the case of PSM, the particular entity would be represented by society at large, and the attitude would be embedded within the four main dimensions of PSM: Attraction to Policy-

Making (APM), Commitment to the Public Interest (CPI), Compassion (COM), and Self-Sacrifice (SS) (Perry, 1996).

At its core, PSM refers to the motives that individuals have to display behaviors that they believe will have a positive influence on promoting the public interest (Perry and Wise, 1990). Research on the motives of prosocial behaviors differentiates between two main drivers that could explain why individuals act in favor of other members of their group or society. Some authors have argued that prosocial behaviors can be rooted in purely altruistic motives, in contrast to the non-altruistic drivers to which they refer as egoistic motives (Batson and Shaw, 1991; Batson et al., 1983). In a similar vein, Perry and Wise (1990) conceptualize PSM as the result of three main motives that underlie this desire to help societies. A first class of main PSM motives is rooted in affection. Individuals driven by affective motives truly believe that certain public policies can have a positive impact on society and their communities (Wright and Pandey, 2008). Not surprisingly, it has been acknowledged that PSM “motives are usually treated as wholly altruistic” (Perry and Wise, 1990: 368). Perry (1996) argues that affective PSM motives are represented by the COM and SS dimensions of the concept.

Additionally, Perry and Wise (1990) argue that the desire to contribute to the public interest can be rooted in two types of non-affective motives, which they refer to as normative and rational motives. As Perry and Wise (1990) argue, rational motives represent the individual’s willingness to participate in policy-making processes to maximize her or his own need for power, and her or his desire to become an important actor within society. This is reflected in the APM dimension. Hence, rational motives are “grounded in individual utility maximization” (Perry and Wise, 1990: 368). The second non-affective motive is normative, and represents “an individual’s sense of

obligation to the society in which he or she lives... as a result of feeling a duty to one's government and community" (Wright and Pandey, 2008: 504), as is captured by PSM's CPI dimension. Similarly, Perry defines the normative motive with reference to "those actions generated to conform norms" (1996: 6). In this sense, it has been argued that this motive might be rooted in values such as nationalism and loyalty to the country (Perry and Wise, 1990).

In a nutshell, the desire to help others or the community at large is grounded in two main types of motives. The first are altruistic motives, or affective PSM, in which individuals have high levels of PSM because they intrinsically believe in doing good in favor of others and their societies, even at their personal expense (COM and SS). The second are non-altruistic motives, or non-affective PSM, in which PSM is instrumental, reflecting either an individual's desire to help others or their societies from a rational perspective (looking for personal benefit) or from a normative standpoint (helping out of a sense of obligation) (APM and CPI, respectively). In the next section, we develop arguments in order to better understand the personality antecedents of each type of motive underlying PSM.

### **Personality, Public Administration and PSM**

We focus on personality traits as antecedents of PSM, and both classes of its underlying motives, because personality has been identified as a main predictor of individual motives (Bandura, 2000; Mischel and Shoda, 1998). Phares (1991: 4) defines personality as a "pattern of characteristic thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that distinguishes one person from another." In a similar vein, MacKinnon (1944) refers to personality as a highly stable and enduring disposition to action formed by a subset of characteristics that make each individual unique. It is very well documented that



personality has a major role in predicting specific motives (see, for example, Paunonen and Ashton, 2001).

A recent example is the empirical evidence as to how personality affects political attitudes. Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling, Conor, and Sa (2010) analyze the effects of core personality traits on the likelihood of conservative or liberal attitudes regarding economic and social policies. For example, they report that highly conscientious individuals tend to hold conservative attitudes, whereas highly open persons tend to favor liberalism. Similarly, studies reveal evidence that personality can predict specific work-related attitudes such as job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2002), organizational commitment (Erdheim et al., 2006), and job involvement (Bozionelos, 2004). Cooper and colleagues (2012, 2014) argue that the Public Administration literature has, by and large, neglected the importance of personality traits. In their 2012 study, they report that core personality traits are closely related to public managers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. In their 2014 study, they show that personality can predict the work-related attitudes of public employees. By analyzing data from over 1,000 street-level bureaucrats, they find that core personality traits strongly predict job satisfaction.

Despite this relation between personality traits and attitudes toward public policies and organizational behaviors, personality has not yet been systematically examined as a potentially fundamental antecedent of PSM (see, for a rare exception, Jang, 2012). Identifying core personality traits that can explain PSM is particularly important given the stability of personality traits over the lives of people. As Ajzen (2005: 6) explains, “the configuration of personality traits that characterizes an individual is much more resistant to transformation (when compared to attitudes).” So, we believe that personality is a prime candidate to be an antecedent of affective and

non-affective motives to serve the public interest. Interestingly, would personality not be linked to PSM (or either of both classes of underlying motives), this could suggest that (affective and / or non-affective) PSM is a changeable attitude rather than a stable trait.

## **HEXACO**

The study of personality in psychology has generated many traits that characterize people. It was not until the 1980s that researchers began to agree on a five-dimensional model to explain an individual's core personality (Tupes and Christal, 1961), which is known as the Big Five personality traits model (Goldberg, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1985).<sup>1</sup> The Big Five personality traits model features five higher-order personality traits: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. In the 2000s, the Big Five personality traits model was further developed on the basis of a series of lexical studies of personality structure. As a result, a new model was proposed based on substantial evidence in favor of a six-dimensional personality trait model, coined HEXACO (Ashton and Lee, 2001; 2007; Lee and Ashton, 2004) from **H**onesty-Humility, **E**motionality, **eX**traversion, **A**greeableness, **C**onscientiousness, and **O**penness to Experience. The HEXACO model is summarized in Table 1.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Several studies have linked HEXACO with prosocial behaviors. While each trait seems to affect behaviors in favor of society differently, scholars have suggested that there are two main groups of personality traits within HEXACO (Ashton and Lee, 2010). The first one is formed by Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Big Five personality traits model is often referred to as the Five-Factor Model (FFM). However, both models differ slightly in their measurement (see, for a discussion, Wiggins, 1996).

which has been identified as a strong predictor for altruistic behaviors. On the contrary, a second group formed by the traits Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience seems to be unrelated to altruistic motives, although all three also have been shown to influence prosocial behaviors (Hilbig et al., 2014).

### **Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness**

Those individuals with high levels of Honesty–Humility are expected to be fair in their actions, and to show sincere behaviors vis-à-vis their peers. Honesty-Humility is associated with modesty, greed avoidance and fair-mindedness (Ashton and Lee, 2007). Individuals with high levels of Honesty–Humility show less work-delinquent behaviors—such as theft, vandalism, absenteeism, and alcohol use—and have higher personal integrity (Lee et al., 2005). Moreover, they are also less likely to take unethical decisions within their work environments (Lee et al., 2008). As Ashton and Lee (2007) argue, this core personality trait is directly related to collaborating with others. When linking Honesty-Humility to public service, we argue that this core personality trait is a fundamental characteristic sought in those serving their societies. The professional standards of civil servants demand high levels of both Honesty and Humility when dealing with public services (Hood, 1991). These arguments suggest that individuals with high levels of Honesty–Humility will be more likely to show concern for the well-being of society, and will be more likely to undertake actions that benefit the public domain.

The core personality trait of Agreeableness refers to the level of tolerance toward behaviors or opinions that an individual dislikes. Agreeableness is characterized by being easy-going, calm and cooperative with others (Shepherd and Belicki, 2008). Triandis and Such (2002) argue that Agreeableness can act as a baseline construct for

understanding organizational cultures that emphasize interpersonal harmony. It can also lead to a loss of potential gains that would result from the exploitation by others. For instance, Digman (1990) states that individuals with high levels of Agreeableness tend to approach conflict by collaborating toward common goals, suggesting that their main motive is not to damage their social affiliations. Agreeableness is considered as a predictor of management performance (Rothmann and Coetzer, 2003) and of job performance where the specific tasks to be developed entail teamwork (Judge et al., 1999). Tummers, Steijn, and Bekkers (2012) reveal how individuals who are more rebellious, and perceive their environment and other individuals as a threat to their freedom, will be less willing to implement public policies. Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, and Tobin (2007) show how individuals with high levels of Agreeableness are more likely to help other individuals. All this indicates that Agreeableness is associated with behaviors favoring collaboration and investing in a common good, which are both closely related to the desire to serve the public interest.

Interestingly, both Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness have been argued to be strong predictors of cooperative behaviors in favor of other individuals or society at large (Ashton and Lee, 2007; Hilbig et al., 2013). However, they seem to capture different aspects of the motivation to cooperate, which complement each other when individuals with high levels of both traits display cooperative behaviors. As Hilbig, Glöckner, and Zettler explain (2014: 530), “Agreeableness represents the tendency to reactively cooperate (i.e., nonretaliation). Thus, actively self-interested versus other-regarding or prosocial behavior is predicted to be driven mainly by Honesty-Humility, at least initially (Agreeableness should only come into play as tolerance of some degree of exploitation by others and thus as a reaction rather than an action).”

A third core personality trait that has been related to prosocial behavior is Emotionality. According to Ashton and Lee (2007), Emotionality encompasses close attachment to others, harm avoidance, and help-seeking behavior associated with investment in other individuals. Emotionality is closely connected to the concept of kin altruism (for an in-depth description, see Hamilton, 1964). Kin altruism can explain why some individuals invest personal resources into helping others despite not receiving clear benefits from doing so. Indeed, Emotionality has been found to be a predictor of actions in favor of other individuals (Ashton et al., 1998). This is because, as Granovetter (1985) emphasizes, emotions shape human behaviors. Arguably, individuals with high levels of emotionality are more predisposed to empathize with problems of other individuals, and as a result they seek to help them (Ashton et al., 1998). Management scholars have linked emotions with several organizational variables, such as job performance, the quality of interpersonal relations, and the success of strategic judgment (Huy, 1999). In a similar vein, Public Administration literature has long emphasized the importance of emotions within public organizations (Brewer and Selden, 1998; Berman and West, 2008; Meier et al., 2006). Moreover, emotions have been argued to exert an influence on PSM. For example, Brewer, Selden, and Facer II (2000) claim that the affective motives that drive PSM are grounded in human emotion. If, as Ashton and Lee (2007) describe, Emotionality is closely linked with caring for others, it can be expected that this very trait can also be related to the affective motives of PSM.

Taken together, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness are the core personality traits related to altruistic behaviors. Because of this, within the HEXACO model, they have been distinguished from the other three core traits – Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience. As Ashton and Lee (2010: 351) state

very clearly, “Emotionality and Agreeableness, and also Honesty-Humility... [are] three dimensions that are relevant to altruistic versus antagonistic behaviour.” Hence, we predict that all three are positively related to the affective motives of PSM, as represented by the dimensions of Compassion and Self-Sacrifice.

***Hypothesis 1:** The core personality traits of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality and Agreeableness are positively associated with the affective PSM motives of Compassion and Self-Sacrifice.*

### **Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience**

The core personality dimension of Extraversion has been positively linked to job performance (Bing and Lounsbury, 2000). In contrast, other studies report no connection between Extraversion and job performance (Cooper et al., 2012). A plausible explanation for these ambiguous findings is that Extraversion only correlates with job performance in work roles involving social interaction (Mount et al., 1998). Similarly, Extraversion has been found to be a strong predictor of an important job-related activity that requires good interpersonal skills: job interviews (Cook et al., 2000). Moreover, it has also been revealed that extraverts tend to be more satisfied with their jobs (De Fruyt and Marviele, 1999).

Related to the above, public managers with high levels of Extraversion have been reported to show higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior (Cooper et al., 2012). These individuals are willing to engage in behaviors that favor their work colleagues and their organizations, even when these behaviors are not explicitly recognized by any reward system. Extraverts would be more interested in carrying out activities in favor of society, both because they perceive the problems as closer to them, and because they are interested in the personal recognition that contributing to this will

bring. As such, it is expected that extraversion would be positively related to non-affective PSM motives.

According to Ashton and Lee (2007), Conscientiousness corresponds to engagement in task-related endeavors. As a key feature of hard-working individuals, Conscientiousness has long been linked to several organizational variables such as job performance and training proficiency (Barrick and Mount, 1991). LePine, Colquitt, and Erez (2000: 568) differentiate between two major components of this personality trait by stating that “Conscientiousness includes a volitional component that is related to one’s will to achieve, self-motivation, and efficaciousness.” Conscientious individuals pay high attention to detail, and are very meticulous in both their personal and professional lives. Among all personality traits, Conscientiousness is the one that has been most consistently proposed as a predictor of job performance (Witt et al., 2002). A main reason for this is that conscientious people are technically very effective employees (Kiker and Motowidlo, 1999). Thus, jobs that entail dealing with complexity and that need attention to detail benefit from having employees and managers with high Conscientiousness.

Conscientiousness may have a positive influence on non-affective PSM motives because serving society involves dealing effectively with a range of complex and wicked problems (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993). Hence, the Conscientiousness personality trait could explain why some individuals display attitudes that favor supporting their societies, and working to the benefit of others in ways that require dedication and perseverance. Furthermore, Conscientiousness has been found to be a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behavior in the public sector, both toward other individuals and toward the organization as a whole (Cooper et al., 2012).

Openness to Experience has been associated with important work-related variables. Barrick and Mount's (1991) meta-analysis reveals that Openness to Experience is related to job performance, and also strongly predicts training proficiency. They argue that being open to new ideas leads to greater gains from participating in training sessions. Individuals with high levels of Openness to Experience attend those courses with their minds ready to absorb new information (Salgado, 1997). It has also been linked to the orientation toward acting in support of society. Ashton and Lee (2001) show that individuals scoring high on this personality trait are particularly interested in contributing to solving the problems of societies.

Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience have not been linked to behaviors that relate to altruism. In fact, Ashton and Lee (2007) argue explicitly that "Extraversion corresponds to engagement in social endeavours (such as socializing, leading, or entertainment), Conscientiousness corresponds to engagement in task-related endeavours (such as working, planning, and organizing), and Openness to Experience corresponds to engagement in related-idea endeavours (such as learning, imagining, and thinking)" (Ashton and Lee, 2007: 156). Thus, while these three core personality traits might influence the desire to help society at large, they do not seem to influence affective motives of PSM. In fact, we hypothesize that these core personality traits will be positively correlated with the non-affective (i.e., normative and rational) motives underlying PSM – Attraction to Policy-Making and Commitment to the Public Interest.

***Hypothesis 2:** The core personality traits of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience are positively associated with the non-affective PSM motives of Attraction to Policy-Making and Commitment to the Public Interest.*



## **METHODS**

### **Data Sources**

To obtain data to test our hypotheses, an email was sent to a sample of undergraduate students at a Dutch university to collect information on core psychological attitudes and personality traits, referring potential respondents to an online questionnaire. While bachelor students have been used in several PSM studies before (see, for example, Christensen and Wright, 2011; Clerkin et al., 2009; Vandenabeele, 2008a), their use has pros and cons that need to be carefully considered. Because the work experience of our BSc students is very limited, they arguably represent a good sample to test the relationship between core personality traits and PSM without much noise from the contextual experience effects due to job-related variance, as their PSM has not yet been influenced much by work socialization. However, a weakness of this type of sample is that the respondents' PSM is not rooted in their experience of management practice, nor in being involved in developing or implementing specific public policies. Given the fact that we are interested in fundamental human linkages (i.e., between core personality traits and PSM's underlying affective vis-à-vis non-affective motives), we believe that the pros outweigh the cons (see Bello et al., 2009).

When all information to measure independent and dependent variables is collected through single-respondent questionnaires, common-method variance (CMV) may bias regression analyses. CMV has been described as “variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent” (Podsakoff et al., 2003: 879). The main reasons not to rely on data from a single source are to avoid “the effects of consistency motifs, idiosyncratic implicit theories, social desirability tendencies, dispositional mood states, and tendencies on the part of the rater to acquiesce or respond in a lenient, moderate, or extreme manner” (Podsakoff et al.,

2003: 458). Thus, as Johnson, Morgeson, and Hekman (2011) explain, CMV can easily misguide researchers by biasing the observed relationships.

Therefore, in order to minimize the possible effects of CMV, we gathered the data for our PSM variable in a separate paper-based offline questionnaire that was administered during class tutorials to the same individuals three weeks after they had completed the online personality survey. This reduced the likelihood of CMV by avoiding any priming effect that gathering both independent and dependent variables together can have on respondents (Podsakoff et al., 2003). As part of the online questionnaire, participants were asked to generate a unique identification code, offering the opportunity to match the online survey data with the information from the second offline questionnaire while ensuring anonymity. The HEXACO personality trait scale along with items related to the control variables were part of the first online survey, whereas the PSM scale was included in the second paper-based questionnaire. In the end, after excluding unmatched surveys and those with missing data, 320 valid matched online-offline surveys were received from first-year students of a Bachelor degree program in Business and Economics at a major university in the Netherlands in November 2011.

## **Measures**

A variety of definitions of PSM circulate in the literature (Wright, 2008), as well as longer and shorter versions of a PSM scale (see, for example, Coursey and Pandey, 2007; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). In the present study, we measure our two classes of PSM motives by using a multi-dimensional scale composed of four dimensions: Attraction to Policy-Making (APM), Commitment to the Public Interest (CPI), Compassion (COM), and Self-Sacrifice (SS) (Perry, 1996). This measure has been used

in several studies (see, for example, Bright, 2008; Taylor, 2007). However, other scholars report empirical evidence in favor of a three-dimensional model, combining the dimension of Compassion with that regarding Self-Sacrifice (see, for example, Vandenberg, 2008b). Since these two dimensions capture the affective properties of PSM (Perry, 1996), we have also opted to merge them into a single dimension: Affective PSM (i.e., COM and SS combined).

Recently, an effort has been made to assess the different PSM measurement instruments to test the effects that each instrument has on the dimensionality, reliability and validity of the underlying PSM construct (Kim, 2009a, 2009b, 2011). Following this research, we decided in favor of the revised 12-item measure of PSM as proposed by Kim (2011). This scale is very much based on the original one developed by Perry (1996), but modifies the three items measuring APM to get a better grasp of the individual's predisposition to participate in policy formulation and implementation processes (Kim, 2009a). Since the sample in our study is made up of BSc students, and not of public sector employees, a few of the original items proposed by Kim (2011) were rephrased slightly. The final wording for each of the 12 items is included in Appendix I. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) of the overall PSM scale is .79 (referred to as PSM Overall); for the Affective PSM dimension (COM and SS combined),  $\alpha = .69$ ; for APM,  $\alpha = .62$ ; and finally for CPI,  $\alpha = .80$ . These results are similar to those reported in prior work applying this PSM measurement (see, for example, Kim, 2009a).

We measure personality with the 60-item HEXACO personality inventory developed by Ashton and Lee (2009), reproduced in Appendix II.<sup>2</sup> This scale includes

---

<sup>2</sup> Jang (2012) reports the effect of a limited set of personality traits on the desire to serve the public interest among public employees from Taiwan. He assesses personality traits with a very succinct measure of personality: the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (Gosling et al., 2003). However, Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann (2003) explicitly warn that this brief measure of personality is not suitable for

10 items for each of the six personality traits: Honesty–Humility ( $\alpha = .75$ ), Emotionality ( $\alpha = .79$ ), Extraversion ( $\alpha = .79$ ), Agreeableness ( $\alpha = .71$ ), Conscientiousness ( $\alpha = .81$ ), and Openness to Experience ( $\alpha = .74$ ). All items use a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree.”

In addition to these explanatory variables, three control variables considered in previous studies on the antecedents of PSM are included in the analysis (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997; Perry et al., 2008). The first control variable is religiosity, which is a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent is religious (1) or not (0). Religiosity is included because people who consider themselves as being religious have been found to report higher levels of PSM (Perry, 1997; Perry et al., 2008). Furthermore, following prior work on PSM antecedents, we add two further control variables: respondent’s age (in years and months) and gender (coded 1 when the respondent is a female, and 0 when he is a male).

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations between all the variables included in our study. The correlations between the explanatory variables are low to moderate, without any extreme values. Furthermore, the HEXACO scores are very similar to those obtained in other studies in other countries, using participants with work experience (Lee et al., 2005). This is consistent with earlier work suggesting that core personality traits do not differ among samples formed by university students vis-à-vis community members (de Vries et al., 2008). Regarding our dependent variable, PSM, we report a mean of 3.92. As in the HEXACO case, this value is consistent with that found in other studies using similar PSM scales (see, for example, Bright, 2008;

---

studies in which personality is the primary topic of interest. Because of that, in the present study, we opted for a more comprehensive measure of all core personality traits, well known in the psychological literature as the Big Six.

Taylor, 2007). To assess multicollinearity, we checked the variance inflation factors (VIF); the coefficients were all below 1.5, indicating that multicollinearity should not be a concern when interpreting the regression results (Damanpour and Schneider, 2009; Hair et al., 2006).

## **RESULTS**

A Shapiro-Wilk's test ( $p > .05$ ), and visual inspection of the histograms, normal Q–Q plots and box plots showed that our all dependent variables – PSM Overall, Affective PSM (COM and SS combined), APM, and CPI – are normally distributed. Hence, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was applied to test our hypotheses. Five different models were estimated. Model 1 includes only the control variables to explain PSM Overall: religiosity, age, and gender. Model 2 adds the six personality variables to estimate their effect on PSM Overall. The dependent variable for Models 3 is Affective PSM (COM and SS combined). Model 4 takes Commitment to the Public Interest (CPI) as the dependent variable, exploring the rational motives of PSM. Finally, Model 5 focuses on Attraction to Policy-Making (APM) as the dependent variable, representing the normative motives of PSM. For each model, we assessed the homogeneity of variance by plotting the residuals against the fitted values. No pattern was observed in any of the models, showing no evidence of heteroscedasticity (Chatterjee et al., 2000).

As shown in Table 3, the control variables explain very little variation in PSM Overall (Model 1 with  $R^2 = 1.7\%$ ). However, when the six HEXACO variables are included, the  $R^2$  rises substantially to 15.4%. Model 2 reveals significantly positive relationships between four core personality traits and PSM Overall – i.e., for Honesty–Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience. The positive

relationship between Agreeableness and PSM is not significant. Also, Conscientiousness is not significantly associated with PSM.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Table 4 shows the effects of personality on the affective and non-affective motives associated with PSM. Fully in line with our first hypothesis, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness indeed are all positively and significantly related to Affective PSM. In addition, Table 4 shows that Conscientiousness is negatively associated with Affective PSM, which was not predicted in Hypothesis 1. Our second hypothesis argues for a positive link between the personality traits Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience with both non-affective PSM motives. Table 4 reveals that we find evidence for this relationship only for Openness to Experience, which is positively and significantly related to both Commitment to the Public Interest (CPI) and Attraction to Policy-Making (APM). Thus, Hypothesis 2 is only partially supported.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

## **DISCUSSION**

Overall, we find comprehensive and consistent support for our first hypothesis: the personality traits of Honest-Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness are positively associated with affective motives regarding PSM (and, unexpectedly, Conscientiousness is negatively linked to affective PSM). By contrast, the evidence on our second hypothesis is much more mixed; we find support only for the impact of Openness to Experience on non-affective PSM motives. So, our evidence reveals that although four out of six core personality traits influence PSM in the aggregate, their influence on the

affective and non-affective sub-components are distinctively different, largely in line with our theory.

Hence, our first contribution is that we have shown that certain personality traits act as predecessors of PSM in the aggregate. Personality traits have been used to explain a very wide range of organizational behaviors, attitudes and values, such as job satisfaction (Judge et al., 1997), organizational commitment (Erdheim et al., 2006), and job involvement (Bozionelos, 2004). From the perspective of this line of work, our evidence supports the inclusion of core personality traits as antecedents of overall PSM, by exhibiting how PSM is rooted in the individual's personality, particularly Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience. This adds to both the theory and evidence regarding PSM in the aggregate.

As shown above, however, not all core personality traits are related with overall PSM. Although the literature has linked Agreeableness with a strong tendency to help other individuals (Graziano et al., 2007), and with having harmonious interpersonal relations, the effect on overall PSM is insignificant. Perhaps, this is so because PSM does not refer to an individual, but rather to society at large: Agreeableness might only have an effect on the desire to help others when these others represent individuals who can be identified, and not when referring to a more abstract concept such as society. The second core personality trait that does not influence overall PSM significantly is Conscientiousness. Hardesty and Westerman (2009) link Conscientiousness to a known antecedent of PSM: religiosity. However, a direct relation between Conscientiousness and overall PSM cannot be identified.<sup>3</sup> Again, as with

---

<sup>3</sup> To further examine whether the personality-PSM relation is affected by our control variables, we tested for interaction effects of gender and religiosity on the relationship between personality and PSM Overall. None of the interaction terms reached significance, except marginally for the interaction of Conscientiousness and religiosity ( $\beta = .163, p < .1$ ), which indicates that Conscientiousness may affect overall PSM more strongly among religious individuals.

Agreeableness, an explanation may be that Conscientiousness, characterized by attention to detail, does not relate well to an abstract and high-level notion such as serving society. Moreover, Conscientiousness can relate to pursuing private as well as public interests, depending on other attitudes held by the individual concerned.

While personality acts as a predecessor of overall PSM, our results have showed that they do not affect different PSM motives equally. This is our second contribution. As predicted, our results reveal a strong positive correlation between those core personality traits associated with altruistic behaviors and the affective motives of PSM. Being honest is not only related to being less prone to incur “work-delinquent” behaviors (Lee et al., 2005), but also to being more concerned with the well-being of society at large. This lends support to the argument proposed by Brewer, Selden, and Facer II (2000) that PSM is grounded in emotions, reinforcing the finding that Emotionality is a valid predictor of altruistic behaviors (Ashton et al., 1998). As for Agreeableness, our finding is in accordance with the existing literature on the effects of personality that has linked Agreeableness to having harmonious interpersonal relations, enhancing an individual’s tendency to help others (Graziano et al., 2007).

Moreover, when looking at both non-affective PSM motives separately, we have revealed that those individuals with high levels of Openness to Experience do report higher values for both non-affective PSM motives – i.e., Attraction to Policy-Making (the rational motive) and Commitment to the Public Interest (the normative motive). None of the other personality traits has an effect, though. We return to an interpretation of these non-findings in the Conclusion. As Openness to Experience refers to individuals who are more prone to new ideas, experiences and things (Ashton and Lee, 2001), one could argue that high-PSM individuals who are rationally or normatively



motivated to serve the public interest are more favorable inclined toward innovations that they believe will improve the well-being of society.

Next to a few unexpected nonsignificant findings, our results also show one unexpected significant association. It seems that those persons with high levels of Conscientiousness present lower levels of affective PSM. Although most research on Conscientiousness focuses on the performance benefits of this trait, recent work has started to disclose what has been coined the dark side of Conscientiousness (see Boyce et al., 2010). From this perspective, conscientious individuals are highly worried by failures and lack of effort of other individuals (Barrick et al., 1993), which may translate into antipathy toward serving a collective interest.

## **CONCLUSION**

The study of PSM is very popular (Perry et al., 2010), but there has been a lack of empirical research on the antecedents of PSM (for an exception, see Perry et al., 2008). Using the HEXACO Big Six personality inventory (Ashton and Lee, 2007, 2009), this study aims to contribute to filling this void by developing theory and providing empirical evidence regarding the impact of an individual's personality traits on the desire to serve the public interest. In so doing, additionally, we distinguish how personality influences the affective vis-à-vis non-affective motives underlying PSM. Of course, being the first systematic examination of the Big Six personality traits as potential determinants of PSM and its underlying motives, our study cannot be but exploratory in nature.

Our model explains 5 to 15 per cent of variance in affective, non-affective and overall PSM, which is in line with prior studies linking personality and motivation (e.g., Furnham et al., 2009). Therefore, most of the variance in PSM across individuals remains to be explained. Probably, PSM is determined not only by personal attributes,

but also by institutional characteristics (Perry and Vandenabeele, 2008). Moynihan and Pandey (2007) use data from the Phase II of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP-II), and find that PSM is negatively affected by red tape and length of organizational membership, and positively related to hierarchical authority and reform efforts. Given this, future studies may examine whether – and if so, how – personality traits mediate or moderate the relationship between PSM and institutional characteristics. Then, perhaps, a comprehensive model of the antecedents of PSM may come into sight.

Another main contribution of this paper is that we theoretically argue and empirically find that certain core personality traits influence the affective vis-à-vis non-affective motives underlying PSM differently. Vogel and Kroll (2015) argue that PSM is a stable trait, but recent empirical evidence calls for further studies on how and why certain PSM motives seem vary more than others. Our study speaks to this ambiguity. Our results show that personality traits that are most closely related with altruistic behaviors are more frequently associated with affective than with non-affective public service motives. We also reveal that both rational and normative PSM are positively linked to the personality trait of Openness to Experience, but not related to any other personality trait. Thus, our study indicates that within the group of persons willing to serve the public interest, we find different personality profiles that will translate into an emphasis on different dimensions of PSM. On the one hand, affective motives are significantly associated with five personality traits; on the other hand, non-affective motives are significantly related with only one personality trait. Together, this set of findings suggest that affective PSM is a trait-like – and hence stable – individual characteristic, whereas non-affective PSM is more akin to a changeable attitude.

So, we relate PSM and its dimensions with core personality traits, opening a research line to consider PSM within the classic hierarchical conceptualization of factors influencing individual's behavior: traits, values and attitudes. Together, our set of findings suggest that PSM is more than a changeable attitude, given its association with stable personality traits. However, our study, being the first of its kind, cannot be but an exploratory step on the road to unraveling the roots of PSM and its dimensions. While our evidence supports the differentiation of PSM motives (Perry, 1996) by showing how they are rooted in distinct personality traits, particularly affective versus non-affective motives, future studies could further contribute to our understanding of PSM's antecedents by distinguishing the values and attitudes that are embedded in and/or related to the PSM concept.

This study is not without limitations, of course, which point to additional future research opportunities. First of all, and related to the above, future research could explicitly assess whether or not – and if so, to what extent and in what direction – PSM and its underlying affective and non-affective motives change over time. Perhaps, as an individual develops a career within a job that is or is not aimed at serving society, PSM evolves over time, negatively, positively or non-linearly. Indeed, recent research has shown that an individual's PSM can change over time. In particular, Kjeldsen and Jacobsen (2013) reveal that PSM declines after job entry, although the effect is smaller for those students joining a public organization. Looking at PSM's dimensions, Kjeldsen (2014) reports that commitment to public interest does not reveal significant changes, but compassion and attraction to policy-making are associated with a general drop.

Other work suggests that participating in a particular program can modify an individual's PSM, such as the AmeriCops programs which are positively related to the

participants' levels of commitment to the public interest and civic awareness – both non-affective PSM motives. Arguably, affective PSM motives that are strongly rooted in core personality traits can be expected to be stable over time, and change only as a result of exposure to extreme events. This is in line with the findings of Brænder and Andersen (2013), who showed that soldiers returning from a military campaign in Afghanistan have lower levels of compassion, and higher levels of commitment to the public interest.

Our sample includes Dutch bachelor students in a Business and Economics degree program, and not students in other degree programs or employees with direct experience in the area of policy-making and public management. Future studies could seek to investigate whether or not the effects that we have found uphold in other student samples and in other countries, as well as in samples of practitioners, analyzing whether effects of personality on PSM and its underlying motives vary with the extent and nature of job experience. Related, prior research has shown that personality traits can vary slightly across geography and culture (Lee and Ashton, 2004). In a similar vein, PSM varies across different societal cultures (Ritz and Brewer, 2013). In their study of Swiss public employees, Ritz and Brewer (2013) find that individuals subjected to Germanic cultures show higher PSM when compared to individuals from Latin cultures. In line with this, a recent study by Kim et al. (2013), analyzing PSM across 12 nations, concludes that PSM varies across countries and languages, and that current PSM measures do not seem to capture these differences. Accordingly, more research is needed to assess whether the effects of the psychological antecedents of PSM are contingent on cultural, geographical and societal characteristics.

Finally, a major limitation of this study, and of PSM research at large, is the measure of PSM itself. The weaknesses of current PSM measures are well described in

the literature (see, for example, Kim et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2013). There is still much room for improvement not only to better capture each of the PSM dimensions, but also to assess whether the dimensions that currently form PSM do really encapsulate the different aspects of an individual's desire to help society and its members. An initial line of research could examine whether PSM has different effects across different levels of analysis, such as society at large vis-à-vis a particular community or even an individual. In terms of Ajzen's (1991) theory of reasoned action, our study considers society as the particular locus of PSM, following extant PSM definitions. However, one could challenge this core notion by arguing that PSM can influence behaviors targeted at particular individuals, such as the users of a public service. Arguably, affective PSM motives might be stronger predictors of prosocial behaviors targeted at particular groups or individuals, while non-affective motives could explain behaviors in support of society at large.

While several studies have focused on how to measure PSM, more studies of the conceptualization of PSM are needed. Recent research has highlighted the need to strengthen the theoretical foundations of PSM (Bozeman and Su, 2015). Our results suggest that this can be done both by further developing the embryonic insights regarding cultural, job and lifecycle contingencies of PSM, as well as by considering how PSM is related with the large body of literature on personality characteristics, values, attitudes and motives. For now, we have shown that a few core personality traits are a significant antecedent of PSM, and that different personality traits influence different motives for serving the public interest. This evidence is an important insight not only on the psychological sources of PSM, but also on the underlying structure of the relationship between the fundamental characteristics of individuals and their orientation towards the welfare of society as a whole.

## REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. 2005. *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill International.
- Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process* 50: 179–211.
- Ajzen, I., and M. Fishbein. 1980. *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ashton, M.C., and K. Lee. 2010. Joint factor structure of self-reports and observer reports on the HEXACO Personality Inventory–Revised. *European Journal of Personality* 24: 278–289.
- Ashton, M.C., and K. Lee. 2009. The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 91: 340–345.
- Ashton, M.C., and K. Lee. 2007. Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 11: 150–166.
- Ashton, M.C., and K. Lee. 2001. A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality* 15: 327–353.
- Ashton, M.C., S.V. Paunonen, E. Helmes, and N.J. Douglas. 1998. Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 19: 243–255.
- Bandura, A. 2000. Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9: 75–78
- Barrick, M.R., and M.K. Mount. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 44: 1–26.

- Barrick, M.R., M.K. Mount, and J.P. Strauss. 1993. Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test of the mediating effects of goal-setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78: 715–722.
- Batson, C.D., K. O'Quin, J. Fultz, M. Vanderplas, and A.M. Isen. 1983. Influence of self-reported distress and empathy on egoistic versus altruistic motivation to help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45: 706–718.
- Batson, C.D., and L.L. Shaw. 1991. Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry* 2: 107–122.
- Bello, D., K. Leung, L. Radebaugh, R.L. Tung, and A. van Witteloostuijn. 2009. From the Editors: Student samples in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies* 40: 1-5.
- Berman, E.M., and J.P. West. 2008. Managing emotional intelligence in U.S. cities: A study of public managers. *Public Administration Review* 68: 740–756.
- Bing, M.N., and J.W. Lounsbury. 2000. Openness and job performance in U.S.-based Japanese manufacturing companies. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 14: 515–522.
- Boone, C., W. van Olffen, and A. van Witteloostuijn. 2005. Team locus-of-control composition, leadership structure, information acquisition, and financial performance: A business simulation study. *Academy of Management Journal* 48: 889–909.
- Boyce, C.J, A.M. Wood, and G.D.A. Brown. 2010. The dark side of Conscientiousness: Conscientious people experience drops in life satisfaction following unemployment. *Journal of Research in Personality* 44: 535–539.
- Bozeman, B., and X. Su. 2015. Public service motivation concepts and theory: A critique. *Public Administration Review* 75: 700–710.

- Bozionelos, N. 2004. The Big Five of personality and work involvement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19: 69–81.
- Brænder, M., and L.B. Andersen. (2013). Does deployment to war affect public service motivation? Panel study of soldiers before and after their service in Afghanistan. *Public Administration Review* 73: 466–477.
- Brewer, G.A., and S.C. Selden. 1998. Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 8: 413–439.
- Brewer, G.A., S.C. Selden, and R.L. Facer II. 2000. Individual conceptions of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review* 60: 254–264.
- Bright, L. 2008. Does Public Service Motivation really make a difference on the job satisfaction and turnover intentions of public employees? *American Review of Public Administration* 38: 149–166.
- Chatterjee, S., A. Hadi, and B. Price. 2000. *Regression Analysis by Example*. New York: Wiley.
- Christensen, R.K., and B.E. Wright. 2011. The effects of Public Service Motivation on job choice decisions: Disentangling the contributions of person-organization fit and person-job fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 21: 723–743.
- Clerkin, R.M., S.R. Paynter, and J.K. Taylor. 2009. Public Service Motivation in undergraduate giving and volunteering decisions. *American Review of Public Administration* 39: 675–698.
- Cook, K.W., C.A. Vance, and P.E. Spector. 2000. The relation of candidate personality with selection interview outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30: 867–885.



- Cooper, C.A., D. Carpenter, A. Reiner, and D. McCord. 2014. Personality and job satisfaction: Evidence from a sample of street-level bureaucrats. *International Journal of Public Administration* 37: 155–162.
- Cooper, C.A., H.G. Knotts, D.M. McCord, and A. Johnson. 2012. Taking personality seriously: The Five-Factor Model and public management. *American Review of Public Administration* 43: 397–415.
- Coursey, D.H., and S.K. Pandey. 2007. Public Service Motivation measurement. *Administration & Society* 39: 547–568.
- Damanpour, F., and M. Schneider. 2009. Characteristics of innovation and innovation adoption in public organizations: Assessing the role of managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 19: 495–522.
- De Fruyt, F., and I. Mervielde. 1999. RIASEC types and Big Five traits as predictors of employment status and nature of employment. *Personnel Psychology* 52: 701–727.
- Digman, J. 1990. Personality structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model. *Annual Review of Psychology* 41: 417–440.
- Eagly, H.A., and S. Chaiken. 1993. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Erdheim, J., M. Wang, and M.J. Zickar. 2006. Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organisational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences* 41: 954–970.
- Esteve, M., G. Boyne, V. Sierra, and T. Ysa. 2013. Organizational collaboration in the public sector: Do Chief Executives make a difference? *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 23: 927–952.

- Fishbein, M., and I. Ajzen. 1975. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Furnham, A., A. Eracleous, and T. Chamorro-Premuzic. 2009. Personality, motivation and job satisfaction: Hertzberg meets the Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 24: 765–779.
- Gerber, A.S., G.A. Huber, D. Doherty, C.M. Dowling, M. Conor M., and S.E. Ha. 2010. Personality and political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. *American Political Science Review* 104: 111–133.
- Goldberg, L.R. 1993. The structure of phenotypic personality traits: Authors' reactions to the six comments. *American Psychologist* 48: 1303–1304.
- Gosling, S.D., P.J. Rentfrow, and W.B. Swann. 2003. A very brief measure of the Big Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality* 37: 504–528.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 481–510.
- Graziano, W.G., M.M. Habashi, B.E. Sheese, and R.M. Tobin. 2007. Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person x situation perspective. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 93: 583–599.
- Hair, J., R. Anderson, R. Tatham, and W. Black. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hamilton, W.D. 1964. The genetical evolution of social behavior: I, II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 7: 1–16.
- Hardesty, A., and J.W. Westerman. 2009. Relating religious beliefs to workplace values: Meta-ethical development, locus of control, and conscientiousness. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*: 1–6.

- Hilbig, B.E., I. Zettler, F. Leist, and T. Heydasch, T. 2013. It takes two: Honesty-humility and agreeableness differentially predict active versus reactive cooperation. *Personality and Individual Differences* 54: 598–603.
- Hilbig, B.E., A. Glöckner, and I. Zettler. 2014. Personality and prosocial behavior: Linking basic traits and social value orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 107: 529–539.
- Hood, C. 1991. A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration* 69: 3–19.
- Houston, D.J. 2011. Implications of occupational locus and focus for Public Service Motivation: Attitudes toward work motives across nations. *Public Administration Review* 71: 761–771.
- Huy, Q.N. 1999. Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review* 24: 325–45 .
- Jang, C. 2012. The effect of personality traits on Public Service Motivation: Evidence from Taiwan. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 40: 725–733.
- Johnson, M.D., F.P. Morgeson, and D.R., Hekman. 2012. Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 33: 1142–1167.
- Judge, T.A., J.Y. Bono, R. Ilies, and M.W. Gerhardt. 2002. Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 765–780.
- Judge, T.A., C.A. Higgins, C.J. Thoresen, and M.R. Barrick. 1999. The Big Five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology* 52: 621–652.

- Judge, T.A., E.A. Locke, and C.C. Durham. 1997. The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 19: 151–188.
- Kiker, D.S., and S.J. Motowidlo. 1999. Main and interaction effects of task and contextual performance on supervisory reward decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84: 602–609.
- Kjeldsen, A.M. 2014. Dynamics of public service motivation: Attraction, selection, and socialization in the production and regulation of social services. *Public Administration Review* 74: 101–112.
- Kjeldsen, A.M., and C.B. Jacobsen. 2013. Public service motivation and employment sector: Attraction or socialization? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23: 899–926
- Kim, S. 2005. Individual-level factors and organizational performance in government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 15: 245–261.
- Kim, S. 2009a. Testing the structure of Public Service Motivation in Korea: A research note. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 19: 839–851.
- Kim, S. 2009b. Revising Perry's measurement scale of Public Service Motivation. *American Review of Public Administration* 39: 149–163.
- Kim, S. 2011. Testing a revised measure of Public Service Motivation: Reflective versus formative specification. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 21: 521–546.
- Kim, S. 2012. Does person-organization fit matter in the public sector? Testing the mediating effect of person-organization fit in the relationship between Public

- Service Motivation and work attitudes. *Public Administration Review* 72: 830–840.
- Kim, S., and W. Vandenberg. 2010. A strategy for building Public Service Motivation research internationally. *Public Administration Review* 70: 701–709.
- Kim, S., W. Wouter, E.B. Wright, L.B. Andersen, F.P. Cerase, R.K. Christensen, et al. 2013. Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23: 79–102.
- Lee, K., and M.C. Ashton. 2004. Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 39: 329–358.
- Lee, K., M.C. Ashton, D.L. Morrison, J. Cordery, and P.D. Dunlop. 2008. Predicting integrity with the HEXACO personality model: Use of self- and observer reports. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology* 81: 147–167.
- Lee, K., M.C. Ashton, and R.E. de Vries. 2005. Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality structure. *Human Performance* 18: 179–197.
- Lee, Y. 2012. Behavioral implications of Public Service Motivation: Volunteering by public and nonprofit employees. *American Review of Public Administration* 42: 104–121.
- LePine, J.A., J.A. Colquitt, and A. Erez. 2000. Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology* 53: 563–593.
- Lipsky, M. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: The dilemmas of the individual in public service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- McCrae, R.R., and P.T. Costa. 1985. Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in the natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49: 710-721.
- McClelland, D.C., R. Koestner, R., and J. Weinberger. 1989. How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review* 96: 690-702.
- Meier, K.J., S.H. Mastracci, and K. Willson. 2006. Gender and emotional labor in public organisations: An empirical examination of the link to performance. *Public Administration Review* 66: 899-909.
- Mischel, W., and Y. Shoda. 1998. Review reconciling processing dynamics and personality dispositions. *Annual Review of Psychology* 49: 229-258.
- Mount, M.K, M.R. Barrick, and G.L. Stewart. Five-Factor Model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance* 11: 145-165.
- Moynihan, D.P., and S.K. Pandey. 2007. The role of organizations in fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review* 67: 40-53.
- Pandey, S.K., B.E. Wright, and D.P. Moynihan. 2008. Public Service Motivation and interpersonal citizenship behavior in public organizations: Testing a preliminary model. *International Public Management Journal* 11: 89-108.
- Paunonen, S.V., and M.C. Ashton. 2001. Big Five factors and facets and the prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81: 524-539.
- Perry, J.L. 1996. Measuring Public Service Motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 6: 5-22.
- Perry, J.L. 1997. Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 7: 181-197.

- Perry, J.L. 2000. Bringing society in: Toward a theory of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 10: 471–488.
- Perry, J.L., J.L. 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: 445–458.
- Perry, J.L., A. Hondeghem, and L.R. Wise. 2010. Revisiting the motivational bases of public service: Twenty years of research and an agenda for the future. *Public Administration Review* 70: 681–690.
- Perry, J.L., and W. Vandenabeele. 2008. Behavioral dynamics: Institutions, identities, and selfregulation. In *Motivation in Public Management: The call of public service*, Perry, J.L., and A. Hondeghem (Eds), 57–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J.L., and L.R. Wise. 1990. The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review* 50: 367–373.
- Phares, J.E. 1991. *Introduction to Psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. MacKenzie, J.Y. Lee, and N.P. Podsakoff. 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88: 879–903.
- Rainey, H.G., and P. Steinbauer. 1999. Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 9: 1–32.
- Ritz, A., and G.A. Brewer. 2013. Does societal culture affect Public Service Motivation? Evidence of sub-national differences in Switzerland. *International Public Management Journal* 16: 224–251.

- Rothmann, S., and E.P. Coetzer. 2003. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Industrial Psychology* 29: 68–74.
- Sabatier, P., and H.C. Jenkins-Smith. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An advocacy coalition approach*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Salgado, J.F. 1997. The Five-Factor Model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82: 30–43.
- Schultheiss, O.C., and J.C. Brunstein. 2010. *Implicit Motives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shepherd, S., and K. Belicki. 2008. Trait forgiveness and traitedness within the HEXACO model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences* 45: 389–394.
- Staats, E.B. 1988. Public service and the public interest. *Public Administration Review* 48: 601–605.
- Taylor, J. 2007. The impact of public service motives on work outcomes in Australia: A comparative multi-dimensional analysis. *Public Administration* 85: 931–959.
- Triandis, H.C., and E.M. Suh. 2002. Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53: 133–160.
- Tummers, L., B. Steijn, and V. Bekkers. 2012. Explaining the willingness of public professionals to implement public policies: Content, context, and personality characteristics. *Public Administration* 90: 716–736.
- Tupes, E.C., and R.E. Christal. 1961. Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Technical Report ASD-TR-61-97*, TX: Lackland Air Force Base.
- Vandenabeele, W. 2008a. Government calling: Public Service Motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice. *Public Administration* 86: 1089–1105.



- Vandenabeele, W. 2008b. Development of a Public Service Motivation measurement scale: Corroborating and extending Perry's measurement instrument. *International Public Management Journal* 11: 143–167.
- Voegel, D., and A. Kroll. 2015. The stability and change of PSM-related values across time: Testing theoretical expectations against panel data. *International Public Management Journal* 19: 53–77.
- Vries, R.E. de, K. Lee, and M.C. Ahton. 2008. The Dutch HEXACO personality inventory: Psychometric properties, self–other agreement, and relations with psychopathy among low and high acquaintanceship dyads. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 90: 142–151.
- Vries, R.E. de, and D. van Kampen. 2010. The HEXACO and 5DPT models of personality: A comparison and their relationships with psychopathy, egoism, pretentiousness, immorality, and Machiavellianism. *Journal of Personality Disorders* 24: 244–257.
- Weller, J.A., and E.W. Thulin. 2012. Do honest people take fewer risks? Personality correlates of risk-taking to achieve gains and avoid losses in HEXACO space. *Personality and Individual Differences* 53: 923–926.
- Weller, J.A., and A. Tikir. 2011. Predicting domain-specific risk taking with the HEXACO personality structure. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* 24: 180–201.
- Wiggins, J.S. 1996. *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical perspectives*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Wise, L.R. 2000. The public service culture. In *Public Administration Concepts and Cases* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.), Stillman II, J. R. (Ed.), 342–53. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Witt, L.A., L.A. Burke, M.A. Barrick, and M.K., Mount. 2002. The interactive effects

of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 164–169.

Wright, B.E. 2008. Methodological challenges associated with Public Service Motivation research. In *Motivation in Public Management*, Perry, J.L., and A., Hondeghem (Eds), 80–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, B.E., and S.K. Pandey. 2008. Public Service Motivation on the assumption of person-organization fit: Testing the mediating effect of value congruence. *Administration & Society* 40: 502–521.

Wright, B.E., R.K. Christensen, and S.K. Pandey. 2013. Measuring public service motivation: Exploring the equivalence of existing global measures. *International Public Management Journal* 16: 197–223.

## **APPENDIX I: PSM**

Measurement of the PSM construct (on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, being 1 “I strongly disagree” and 7 “I strongly agree”):

1. I am interested in those public programs that are beneficial for my country or the community I belong to.
2. Sharing my views on public policies with others is attractive to me.
3. Seeing people getting benefits from a public program where I would have been deeply involved in would bring me a great deal of satisfaction.
4. I consider public service my civic duty.
5. Meaningful public service is very important to me.
6. I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
7. It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.
8. I am often reminded by daily events how dependent we are on one another.
9. I feel sympathetic for the plight of the unprivileged.
10. Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.
11. I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of the society.
12. I believe in putting duty before self.

## **APPENDIX II: HEXACO**

Measurement of the HEXACO construct (on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5, 1 being “I strongly disagree” and 5 “I strongly agree”):

### **Honesty-Humility:**

- 6. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
- 30 (R). If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
- 54. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
- 12 (R). If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
- 36. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
- 60 (R). I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.
- 18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
- 42 (R). I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
- 24 (R). I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
- 48 (R). I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.

### **Emotionality:**

- 5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
- 29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
- 53(R). Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
- 11. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
- 35(R). I worry a lot less than most people do.
- 17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
- 41(R). I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
- 23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
- 47. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
- 59(R). I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.

**Extraversion:**

- 4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
- 28(R). I feel that I am an unpopular person.
- 52(R). I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
- 10(R). I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
- 34. In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
- 58. When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
- 16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
- 40. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
- 22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
- 46(R). Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.

**Agreeableness:**

- 3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
- 27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
- 9(R). People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
- 33. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
- 51. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
- 15(R). People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
- 39. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
- 57(R). When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
- 21(R). People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
- 45. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.

**Conscientiousness:**

- 2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
- 26(R). When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
- 8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.

- 32(R). I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
- 14(R). When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
38. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
50. People often call me a perfectionist.
- 20(R). I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
- 44(R). I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
- 56(R). I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.

**Openness to Experience:**

- 1(R). I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
7. I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
- 31(R). I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
37. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
- 49(R). I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
- 19(R). I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
43. I like people who have unconventional views.
- 55(R). I find it boring to discuss philosophy.

**Table 1:** Description of the HEXACO Scale

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Example traits</b>	<b>Benefits of high levels?</b>	<b>Costs of high levels?</b>
Honesty-Humility	Reciprocal altruism (fairness)	Fairness, sincerity, (low) entitlement	Gains from cooperation (mutual help and nonaggression)	Loss of potential gains that would result from exploitation of others
Agreeableness (versus Anger)	Reciprocal altruism (tolerance)	Tolerance, forgiveness, (low) quarrelsomeness	Gains from cooperation (mutual help and non-aggression)	Losses because of being exploited by others
Emotionality	Kin altruism	Empathy/attachment, harm-avoidance, help-seeking	Survival of kin (especially offspring); personal survival (especially as favors kin survival)	Loss of potential gains associated with risks to self and kin
Extraversion	Engagement in social endeavors	Sociability, leadership, exhibition	Social gains (friends, mates, allies)	Energy and time, risks from social environment
Conscientiousness	Engagement in task-related endeavors	Diligence, organization, planfulness	Material gains (improved use of resources), reduced risk	Energy and time
Openness to Experience	Engagement in idea-related endeavors	Curiosity, imaginativeness, depth	Material and social gains (resulting from discovery)	Energy and time, risks from social and natural environment

Source: Ashton and Lee (2007).

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
PSM	3.92	1.30												
Affective PSM (SS-COM)	3.95	1.31	.79*											
Normative PSM (CPI)	3.65	1.23	.68*	.21*										
Rational PSM (APM)	4.04	1.32	.35*	-.68	.23*									
Religiosity	.65	.47	.14*	.09	.12*	.08								
Gender	.33	.47	-.00	.06	-.00	-.19*	.08							
Age	18.8	1.36	-.06	-.08	.00	-.04	.01	.12*						
Honesty-Humility	3.04	.57	.23*	.26*	.19*	-.14*	.12*	.29*	.05					
Emotionality	2.90	.62	.16*	.21*	-.01	.00	.08	.50*	.10	.23*				
Extraversion	3.45	.55	.06	.01	.07	.06	-.04	-.10	.08	-.01	-.26*			
Agreeableness	3.03	.52	.07	.12*	.07	-.16*	-.05	-.03	.07	.26*	-.05	-.08		
Conscientiousness	3.33	.63	-.02	-.08	.06	.01	.09	.26*	.19*	.25*	.19*	-.01	-.04	
Openness to Experience	2.77	.60	.21*	.05	.21*	.29*	.02	-.06	-.21*	-.09	-.00	.02	-.14*	-.00

Note: \* $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 3: Regression Results for PSM Overall**

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Coeff.	SE	t-stat	Coeff.	SE	t-stat
Religiosity	.197	.073	2.69**	.164	.068	2.40*
Gender	-.011	.074	-.15	-.189	.082	-2.29*
Age	-.032	.025	-1.26	-.018	.025	-.73
Honesty-Humility				.253	.063	3.99**
Emotionality				.229	.062	3.68**
Extraversion				.136	.061	2.21*
Agreeableness				.086	.066	1.30
Conscientiousness				-.083	.055	-1.52
Openness to Experience				.230	.055	4.17**
Constant	63.919	51.010	1.25	36.385	49.943	.73
F-Stat	2.92			7.46		
Adjusted $R^2$	.017			.154		
$\Delta R^2$				.151**		
Number of Observations	320			320		

Notes: Robust standard errors are reported; N = 320; Directional hypotheses are evaluated with a one-tailed test, and the other explanatory variables with a two-tailed test; and \*\* $p \leq .01$ . and \* $p \leq .05$ .



**Table 4:** Regression Results for Affective and Non-Affective Public Service Motives

	<b>Affective Motives</b>	<b>Non-Affective Motives</b>	
	<b>Model 3</b> SS-COM	<b>Model 4</b> CPI	<b>Model 5</b> APM
Religiosity	.130 (.093)	.165 (.091)	.127 (.078)
Gender	-.013 (.11)	-.100 (.109)	-.333 (.094)**
Age	-.053 (.034)	.020 (.033)	.015 (.028)
Honesty-Humility	.351 (.086)**	.162 (.084)	-.019 (.072)
Emotionality	.355 (.085)**	.087 (.083)	.013 (.071)
Agreeableness	.159 (.090)*	.055 (.088)	-.104 (.075)
Extraversion	.149 (.084)	.112 (.081)	.046 (.070)
Conscientiousness	-.207 (.075)*	.043 (.073)	.063 (.063)
Openness to Experience	.085 (.075)	.254 (.073)**	.372 (.062)**
Constant	106.795 (68.297)	-42.854 (66.435)	-30.999 (56.839)
F-stat	6.55	2.83	7.39
Adjusted $R^2$	.135	.049	.152

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses; N = 320; Directional hypotheses are evaluated with a one-tailed test, and the other explanatory variables with a two-tailed test; and \*\* $p \leq .01$ . and \* $p \leq .05$ .