Public Service Motivation: Incidence and Antecedents in Pakistan

Prof. Dr. Syed Bashir Hussain [a,1], Ijaz Ahmad [a,2]

[a] Department of Government and Public Policy, National Defence University, Islamabad.

Abstract: *The deteriorated performance of public service deliveries in Pakistan is a multifaceted problem. One of the possible solutions could be a reliance on the motivation of public sector employees to serve their fellow citizens. This type of motivation is called public service motivation (PSM), which is a multidimensional construct. However, the very existence and the variation of PSM are dependent upon the socio-historical conditions of a country. Keeping in view the scarcity of research about the concept of PSM in Pakistan, this study has answered two empirical questions. First is about the existence, and the second is about the antecedents of PSM in Pakistan.*

Data were collected using a self-completion questionnaire. Both descriptive statistics and linear regression were used to analyze the data. The findings support a modest role of demographic and organizational factors in shaping the PSM of employees. Out of twelve independent variables, two demographic variables (Education and Gender) and three organizational variables (Supervisory Support, Formalization, and Effort) were significant correlates. Effort, Formalization, Gender, and Education were negatively correlated, while Supervisory Support was positively correlated with the dependent variables. A positive correlation of Supervisory Support and negative correlation of Formalization with PSM points out the need for human relations approach in government sector to improve efficiency, while the negative correlation of Education with PSM and its dimension suggests the need to revisit the system of education in Pakistan; a negative correlation of Gender with CPI suggests that the values of public sphere should be inculcated in women workforce, which is now joining public sphere in significant number.

Keywords: Public Service Motivation, Attraction to Public Policy, Compassion, Self-sacrifice, Organizational Culture

_____

1. Introduction

In the annual corruption perception survey of Transparency International Pakistan (TIP), conducted in 2012, Pakistan stood 33rd most corrupt country in the world (Mirza, 2012). The most important government institutions were on top in the corruption survey. For instance, Police was the most corrupt department. Similarly, other departments like judiciary, local government, education, and land department were also amongst the corrupt departments. The common citizen is disillusioned from government and its

departments. There are many independent bodies which are responsible for curbing the corruption that is pervasive in all departments of the government. However, it seems that these bodies have failed to meet the expectations of people of Pakistan.

It is clear that the situation described above is multifaceted and exact parallel of this situation is difficult to find elsewhere in the world. There are many methods to improve the quality of public services (health, education, and drinking water etc.). Some of these methods are regulation, market models, enhancing resource allocation, organization, and management. All of these methods have their associated strengths and weaknesses. A recent entry to the list of above methods is an effort to capitalize on the presumed motivation of public sector employees to serve their fellow citizens and society. This type of motivation is commonly known as public service motivation (PSM).

Public service motivation (PSM) has been considered as a viable option in many western countries to address the similar problems, mentioned above(James L Perry & Lois Recascino Wise, 1990). Unless government sector employees are motivated to serve their fellow citizens, it is hard to achieve public sector delivery targets, which are to quantify in the first instance.

However, the needed values, commonly known as public service ethos, are contrary to prevalent public choice theories(James L Perry & Lois Recascino Wise, 1990). Public Choice Theories are based on the assumption that the behavior of public officials and professionals can be best understood if they are assumed to be largely self-interested (Anderson, 2014). The desired ethical values are also contrary to the practice of extrinsic reward system which has been introduced in public sector institutions as a means to direct officials' behavior to achieve organizational goals. The extrinsic reward system, which is borrowed from private sector, is based on a similar assumption, i.e. human beings are rational and they act only after doing cost benefit analysis of their actions. Keeping these assumptions in view, it seems then illogical to assume that an employee will perform something altruistically for the betterment of other individuals or for society at large i.e., extra-rational behavior. Therefore, in order to revive the desired values (altruism, benevolence, and morality etc.), the scholars in the US and Europe have started research about the concept of public service motivation (PSM)(James L Perry & Lois Recascino Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982). They have studied the existence of PSM in public and private sector, its antecedent, and effect on employee behavior.

In order to capitalize on the concept of PSM to improve the quality of public services in Pakistan, at present there is hardly any study which can shed light on the incidence or antecedents of PSM in Pakistan. Horton (2008), however, has claimed that public service ethos are not prevalent in those Asian and African countries which were former British colonies, Pakistan for instance.

Furthermore, Grand (2003), while emphasizing the need for understanding the PSM, has argued that public policies should be designed keeping the motivation of public officials in view. If policies are designed on the assumption that public officials are motivated to serve the people, when in fact they are not, the policies will not get the desired results, or may even aggravate the societal conditions. Contrary to this, if policies are designed on the assumption that implementers of policies are motivated by their self-interest, then those policies will demotivate the altruistic implementers who want to serve the society. It is therefore very important to have concrete knowledge about different motives of public sector employees, especially the evidence of their public service motives. It is also necessary to get empirical evidence for the existence of public service motivation and to identify the socio-historical and organizational factors that shape the public service motivation in Pakistan.

This study has addressed two empirical questions. First, what is the level of public service motivation of employees working in public sector organizations of Pakistan? Second, what are the demographic and organizational antecedents of public service motivation in Pakistan?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conceptual Definition of PSM

There are four conceptual definitions of public service motivation. First definition, forwarded by Rainey and Steinbauer (1999), is "general, altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation, or humankind"(p.23). A few studies have been conducted on the basis of this definition (Crewson, 1997; Kilpatrick, Cummings, & Jennings, 1964; Rainey, 1982).

Second definition , introduced by James L Perry and Lois R Wise (1990), is more comprehensive and also supported by motivation theories. According to this definition, public service motivation is "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations" (p.368). According to this definition public service motivation is a consequence of rational, normative, and affective motives of an individual. This conceptualization has an edge over earlier conceptualization as it also identifies that public service motivation could be the result of rational

motives, like involvement of a person in public programs and policies to help a particular interest group or for fame. Most of the studies on public service motivation are based on this definition (Brewer, Selden, Facer, & Rex, 2002; Leisink & Steijn, 2009; Perry, 1996).

According to a third definition, put forward by Brewer and Selden (1998), public service motivation is "the force that induces individuals to perform meaningful public service(i.e., public, community, and social service)" (p.417).

The most recent definition of public service motivation is forwarded by Vandenabeele (2007) who defines public service motivation 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"(p.547).

2.2.   Operational Definition of PSM and its Dimensions

PSM has been operationalized in three different ways, thus gave rise to three categories of studies. First group of studies has relied on reward preference of employees to measure the public service motivation (Crewson, 1997; Kilpatrick et al., 1964; Rainey, 1982). For instance, preferring intrinsic rewards, which include helping others, doing something worthwhile for society, and belief in importance of work etc.

Second group of studies (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1996; Vandenabeele, 2008) have considered PSM as a multidimensional construct. Perry (1996) initially put forward four dimensions of PSM. The four dimensions of public service motivation are *self-sacrifice(SS)*, *compassion(COM)*, *commitment to the public interest(CPI)* and *attraction to public policy(APP)*. These dimensions are a consequence of an individual's affective(SS, COM), normative(CPI), and rational motives(APP). Some of these studies have relied on a full four dimensions and some have not relied on all dimensions of PSM. Vandenabeele (2008), while corroborating Perry's four dimensional model has discovered a fifth dimension in his study conducted in Netherland; this dimension is characterized as 'democratic governance'. Noting the cultural discrepancy in the conceptualization and measurement of PSM, Kim et al. (2013) conducted a study in twelve countries to develop an instrument to measure PSM globally. The study led to five dimensions of PSM. These dimensions were: *Attraction to Public Participation* (APP), *Commitment to Public Values* (CPV), *Commitment for Public Interest* (CPI), *Compassion* (COM), and *Self-Sacrifice* (SS). Recently, Park (2013) has indicated two new dimensions of PSM: "*Influence on Society*" and "*Contribution to Social Development*". The new dimensions are better replacement for "*Attraction to Public Policy*" and "*Commitment for Public Values*". *Compassion* and *Self Sacrifice*, which represent affective motives, are stable across the cultural contexts. However, dimensions which represent normative and rational motives

vary according to cultural context. It is important to note that in order to identify new dimensions of PSM, the scholars have used a qualitative strategy such as focus group discussions, or grounding theory, before they employed correlational surveys.

Third group of studies has used behavior of employees to measure public service motivation. For instance, Houston (2006) has used blood donation, giving money to charities, and spending time for helping others by employees of both public and private organizations as a measure of public service motivation.

2.3. Antecedents of Public Service Motivation

Antecedents of PSM can be broadly categorized in three types: demographic, social institutions, and organizational.

Socio-demographic variables are considered as control variables in most of the multivariate studies (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Houston, 2000, 2006). However, some studies have explored the correlation of some socio-demographic variables such as *Age*, *Education*, and *Gender* with PSM. *Age* has a limited positive correlation with PSM (Houston, 2000; Perry, 1997). Camilleri (2007) has found that individuals who have children and are of higher age have higher level of PSM.

Education in almost all of the studies is positively correlated with PSM (Bright, 2005; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997). However, DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, and Pandey (2006) have noted a negative correlation between *education* and *compassion*. Contrary to simply measuring the level of education, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) have therefore recommended to examine the educational process to know the reasons which inculcates or nurtures the values associated with PSM.

Gender on the other hand has mixed correlation with PSM and with all of its dimensions, except for *compassion*. It is found that females have higher level of compassion. (Camilleri, 2007; DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Perry, 1997). However, *gender* has marginal positive correlation with APP, and does not have a significant correlation with *commitment for public service* or *public interest (*CPS/CPI*)*. DeHart-Davis et al. (2006) have therefore proposed further investigation to know whether *commitment for public intere*st or *service* are gender neutral motivations.

In *social institution* as antecedents, *Family*, *Profession*, and *Religion* are the most studied variables. Perry (1997) has reported that *Parental Modeling* is positively correlated with PSM.

Parental Modeling is defined as a process of observational learning in which the behavior of the parent acts as a stimulus for similar behavior in his or her child (Tibbs et al., 2001). Perry, Brudney, Coursey, and Littlepage (2008) have indicated that religious activities are positively correlated with PSM. *Profession* is also positively correlated with PSM(Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997).

Perry (2000) has identified *work environment* as an important factor which determines motivation in organizations. Patterson et al. (2005) have noted that organizational culture and climate are similar concepts which describe *work environment*. In organizational factors as antecedents of PSM, the most studied variables are *bureaucratic red tape*, *organizational culture or climate*, and *organizational tenure*. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) in their study have reported a negative correlation of red tape with PSM. Scott and Pandey (2005) have noted that red tape and PSM can have bidirectional relationship. They have argued that employees with high level of PSM can sometime tackle the bureaucratic red tape more easily than those who have low level of PSM.

Organizational culture or organizational climate, as Patterson et al. (2005) have called it, is one of the important antecedents of PSM. The relationship of *organizational climate* is of mixed kind with PSM. *Reform orientation* of an organization is positively correlated with PSM, while Moynihan and Pandey (2007) have reported that organizational culture is not a significant antecedent of PSM. Finally, *organizational tenure,* which is measure of time spent in the organization, is also negatively correlated with PSM (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007).

It is, however, important to note that only a modest variation (maximum 25%) in PSM can be explained with any set of antecedents. Patterson et al. (2005) have contended that organizational climate is a multidimensional construct; they have identified seventeen (17) dimensions of it. These dimensions are distributed into four groups. These groups are *Human Relations*, *Internal Processes*, *Open Systems*, and *Rational Goal*. Human relations group contains six sub-dimensions which are *Autonomy, Integration, Involvement, Supervisory Support, Training*, and *Welfare*. Internal processes group contains two sub-dimensions: *Formalization* and *Tradition*. Open systems group contains three sub-dimensions, which are *Innovation & Flexibility*, *Outward Focus*, and *Reflexivity*. Fourth group, rational goal, contains six sub-dimensions, which are *Clarity of Organizational Goals*, *Efficiency*, *Effort*, *Performance Feedback*, *Pressure to Produce*, and *Quality*. We have chosen only four sub-dimensions for our study, because these sub-dimensions seemed most pertinent to organizations from where we will collect the required data. These sub-dimensions are defined below.

- **Formalization**: It is a sub-dimension of *Internal Process* group. Hall and Tolbert (2009) have defined that "formalization concerns with formal rules and procedures" (Patterson et al., 2005).

- **Tradition**: It is also a sub-dimension of *Internal Process* group. Coch and French (1967) have defined that "tradition is the extent to which established ways of doing things are valued" (Patterson et al., 2005).

- **Supervisory support**: It is a sub-dimension of human relation group. Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002) have defined that "supervisory support is the extent to which employees experience support and understanding from their immediate supervisor" (Patterson et al., 2005).

- **Effort**: It is a sub-dimension of rational goal group. McCaul, Hinsz, and McCaul (1987) have defined that "effort is how hard people in organizations work towards achieving goals" (Patterson et al., 2005).

3. Methods

The most suitable strategy for our study was survey and a questionnaire was the most suitable instrument to collect the data. Majority of the previous studies on PSM have employed same strategy and instrument.

For this study, we decided to collect a sample comprised of a diverse group of public servants involved in the delivery of public services, because Panday and Stazyk (2008) have noted that heterogeneous sample have more external validity.

We adopted non-probabilistic sampling technique called *purposive sampling*, but made our sample size large for generalization purpose. Scholars such as Perry (1996) has used *purposive sampling* and Kim et al. (2013) have used *convenience sampling* techniques in their studies.

A pilot study was conducted in April, 2013. For this study the initial questionnaire was prepared in English language. However, it transpired that respondents had difficulty in understanding some items. So, it was decided to translate the questionnaire into Urdu to increase the participation rate of respondents.

Survey, based on paper-questionnaire, was started in second week of June, 2013, and was completed in three weeks. Each respondent was given the questionnaire personally and queries about the survey or questionnaire were responded to remove any ambiguity or apprehension. A total of two hundred and twenty three (223) responses were collected, but only one hundred and eighty four (184) responses were considered for final analysis, because they were not deemed fit for analysis. For instance, in some cases substantial data was missing, or respondent had ticked only one choice (for instance, Strongly Agree) in all questions. Response rate of the survey was 82 %, which is quite high.

The questionnaire, given in **Appendix A**, was developed by Kim et al. (2013), which we used without any modification. This questionnaire has 28 items for studying PSM across different cultures. These items were randomly mixed and placed under the title of Public Service Motivation in our questionnaire. Sixteen (16) items (Question 29 to Question 44), used for measuring the four dimension of organizational climate, were also randomly mixed and placed under the title of Organizational Climate. A total of forty four (44) items were measured on five point Likert Scale.

Another independent variable was *Red Tape* present in respondents' organization. (Question No. 45). *Red Tape* is defined as burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's performance (DeHart-Davis & Pandey, 2005). There were seven more questions which were related to personal characteristics and organizational status of respondents (Question No.46 to Question No. 52). Every section was titled to give the respondent an idea about the questions. Moreover, an introduction and the purpose of the study were also given in the start.

Multiple-Linear-Regression (MLR) is used to find the correlation between six dependent variables (PSM, APP, CPV, CPI, COM, and SS) and twelve independent variables. In our study we have not considered any control variable, because it is an exploratory study.

3.1 Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

Cronbach Alphas for all the items measuring *PSM* and its *five dimensions* were measured. Similarly, we have also calculated the Cronbach Alpha for the four dimensions of *organizational climate*. The values are given in bold on the diagonal of Table 1.

Kim et al. (2013) have reported a good *convergent* and *discriminate validity* of the instrument we have used for measuring PSM. Similarly, Patterson et al. (2005) have reported a high *face validity* and a good *discriminant* and *concurrent* validity of the instrument used for measuring variables of *organizational climate* (*Supervisory Support, Formalization, Tradition*, and *Effort*).

4. Results

In Table 1 standard deviations of all the variables are given. Since the responses were measured on 5-point Likert Scale, a mean value closer to 4, not only for PSM but also for its five dimensions, is indication of presence of PSM in our respondents. The high value of mean, 4.04, and a low Standard Deviation, 0.707, for PSM thus answers our first research question i.e., presence of PSM in public sector employees of Pakistan.

Table 1 also shows the internal reliability parameter, *Cronbach Alpha*, for all the constructs used in our questionnaire. Exact items of each construct and their corresponding *Alpha* value can be seen in the questionnaire given in Appendix A. Although in our study the value of Alpha is below 0.8 in all the cases, except for *Supervisory Support*, yet we can claim a high internal reliability, because Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991) have argued that the value of alpha should be interpreted with respect to research question and fixing a minimum value is not appropriate. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) had a value equal to 0.67, while in our case the value of *Alpha* for PSM is 0.900; this value is far greater than the previous studies.

Regression models are given in Table **2.** These models answer our second research question: What are the antecedents of Public Service Motivation in Pakistan. These six regression models explain only a modest variation in PSM and its five dimensions (forming all our dependent variables). The variation is depicted by the value of R^2, the ***coefficient of determination***. In these models the value of R^2 ranges from 0.147 to 0.210. It is 0.177 for PSM. So, only 17.7 % of variation in PSM can be explained by the *Education* and *Supervisory Support* of an individual. Similarly, 21% variation in Self-Sacrifice can be explained by *Formalization*, *Supervisor Support*, and *Education*.

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Inter Scale Correlation

S.N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	4.0435	.767	**.90**																	
2	4.0924	.801	687**	**.703**																
3	4.1093	.883	697**	458**	**.647**															
4	4.1413	.811	711**	552**	507**	**.630**														
5	3.8043	.833	672**	470**	481**	438**	**.672**													
6	3.5707	1.124	757**	475**	440**	523**	546**	**.798**												
7	3.2186	1.102	049	103	-119	-107	043	118	**.725**											
8	3.1374	1.045	019	044	013	-069	036	017	458**	**.683**										
9	3.7845	.852	066	109	073	059	-018	035	-185*	-141	**.684**									
10	3.1639	1.225	126	158*	-014	048	063	162*	679**	366**	-150*	**.836**								
11	6.93	2.035	008	047	008	111	020	-009	-155	-172*	151	-223**	1							
12	8.59	8.33	234**	103	136	165*	128	231**	163	210**	010	156*	-214**	1						
13	2.59	1.5	-136	014	-003	053	-214**	-246**	-166*	-277**	033	-088	055	-025	1					
14	34.07	8.413	202**	146*	148*	104	111	156*	093	134	014	106	-193*	746**	122	1				
15	15.71	3.2	-288**	-121	-108	-076	-333**	-362**	-283**	-367**	042	-164*	170*	-415**	624**	-276**	1			
16	-	-	082	-054	-042	-106	162*	223**	231**	296**	030	165*	-150	266**	-457**	243**	-558**	1		
17	1.44	.5	-007	-116	064	-101	064	-012	-055	-033	045	-093	119	-130	-260**	-229**	-155*	095	1	
18	1.22	.417	-218**	-160*	-261**	-255**	-173*	-156*	132	-046	013	207**	-131	-232**	-018	-216**	175*	057	078	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Decimals are omitted in correlations.

Reliabilities (Cronbach Alpha) are given at the diagonal.

1. PSM, **2.** APP, **3.** CPV, **4.** CPI **5.**COM, **6.** SS, **7.** Effort, **8.** Formalization, **10.** Supervisory Support, **11.** Red Tape, **12.** Length of Service, **13.** Income, **14.** Age **15.** Education, **16.** Education Type, **17.** Do You Supervise?(i.e., Manager/Non-manager), **18.** Gender

Table 2: Regression Models

	Independent Variable	PSM	APP	CPV	CPI	COM	SS
		Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta
Organizational Factors	Effort	-.069	.004	-.180	-.190*	-.057	-.032
	Formalization	-.092	-.027	.026	-.066	-.086	-.223*
	Tradition	.068	.137	.072	.040	-.019	.055
	Supervisory Support	.154*	.145*	.132	.199**	.093	.206*
	Red Tape	.075	.107	-.016	.182	.088	.122
	Supervisory Status	-.021	-.150	.191	-.152	.026	-.151
Demographic Factors	Education	-.146*	-.124	-.073	-.111	-.190*	-.207*
	Age	.074	.131	.119	-.072	.062	-.025
	Income	-.030	.016	.008	.027	-.026	-.087
	Gender	-.311	-.260	-.481*	-.385*	-.261	-.356
	Length of Service	.055	-.119	-.016	.181	-.071	.160
	Type of Education	-.047	-.089	-.064	-.073	-.002	.034
	Constant	4.595	4.067	4.522	4.885	4.873	4.612
	R^2	.177	.134	.130	.177	.147	.210
	F	2.417	1.741	1.681	2.427	1.944	2.998
	Sig	.007	.065	.077	.007	.034	.001

$p < 0.01$ significant at the 0.01 level

$p < 0.05$ significant at the 0.05 level

5. Discussion

5.1. Organizational Antecedents

As we have seen in our literature review that organizational culture has mixed correlation with PSM(Moynihan & Pandey, 2007).

A positive correlation between *Supervisory Support* and PSM along with three of its dimensions APP, CPI, and SS is an important result. *Supervisory Support* is a sub-dimension of *Human Relation* dimension of organizational climate. *Human Relation Model* emphasizes on building trust and cohesion amongst employees. It nurtures norms and values such as belonging and ownership through trainings and *Human Resource Development*. Empowerment and participation are means to achieve control and coordination. *Supervisory Support* maintains that the important characteristics of a supervisor should be empathy, support, accessibility, and confidence in his subordinates. These characteristics are the essence of all the items which were used in our questionnaire to measure the *Supervisory Support*.

If employees in public sector organizations experience a supportive and trusting relationship with their seniors in the organization, they will be motivated to sacrifice and serve the masses. In addition, the employees will also be attracted and committed to broader organizational goals, like public interest and good public policies. Contrary to this, present power culture in public sector organizations of Pakistan is nurturing sycophancy and apathy, as Islam (2004) has pointed out.

Second organizational variable is *Formalization,* which has significant negative correlation with *Self-Sacrifice. Formalization* is a sub-dimension of *Internal Process* dimension of organizational climate. *Internal Process Model* focuses on stability. Formal rules and procedures are means to achieve control and coordination. *Formalization* is characterized by strict implementation of rules and procedures. It allows minimal discretion, innovation, and stifles the human relation aspect. Thus results into weakening of *self-sacrifice* motivation of employees.

The last organizational variable is *Effort*, which has significant negative correlation with CPI. *Effort* is characterized by different employee behaviors, for instance, to perform to the best of their ability, to make a special effort to do a good job and to be enthusiastic about their work. If an employee perceives that these are prevalent behaviors of his colleagues, he/she is likely to be motivated to perform well to achieve the organizational goals. Crewson (1997) has observed that public service

motivation is positively related to *organizational commitment*, which in turn enhances employees' performance. For instance, it may reduce *turnover*, *absenteeism* and can increase the *effort* put out by the employees. However, the negative correlation in our study is counter intuitive. It seems that the relationship between *Effort* and PSM is moderated by some other variable. For instance, if an employee perceives that those who put best effort in their work are still not treated well, then the PSM of the employee will be reduced. However, the relationship can be investigated further.

5.2. Demographic Antecedents

Interestingly two of the demographic variables *Education* and *Gender*, which are significant in our study, are also significant in most of the other studies. However, the relationship of these variables with the dependent variables is of special importance.

In most of the earlier studies, which were conducted mainly in US, Europe, and some Asian countries, *Education* is positively correlated with PSM and all of its dimensions, except in DeHart-Davis et al. (2006) where *education* is negatively correlated with *compassion*. In our models *Education* is negatively correlated with PSM and two of its dimensions: *Compassion* and *Self-Sacrifice*.

This correlation can be explained by different ways. For instance, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) have recommended examining the educational process to know the reasons which inculcates or nurtures the values associated with PSM, in spite of simply measuring the level of education. Some educationists in Pakistan have also pointed out this thing. For instance, Aly (2007) has noted that Pakistan has not adopted a countrywide uniform education policy. Education system is mostly driven to serve the government of the day, thus has weakened the national cohesion. According to Hoodbhoy (2011), in Pakistani education system 'objective such as social responsibility is unnecessary'. Thus, due to peculiar nature of educational system in Pakistan, the education is not inculcating or nurturing public service values. Consequently, the level of education is negatively correlated with PSM and with two of its dimensions. In order to address this apathy in society, a workshop was held in 2012 in a local University, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS). During the conference it was emphasized by most of the scholars that currently Pakistani education system is not inculcating the values which are necessary for society.

Our finding about *Gender* is also not far from normal; *Gender* is negatively correlated with CPV and CPI. Regression Model for CPV is not significant though, however, the model of CPI is significant.

In earlier studies *Gender* has mixed response with PSM and all of its dimensions, except for *Compassion* i.e., female are more *compassionate* than male. In our study an absence of significant correlation of *Gender* with *Compassion* can be attributed to low number of female respondents in our sample(22.3%). If both CPI and CPV are considered as values which belong to public sphere, then the negative correlation of *Gender* with two dimensions of PSM can be easily explained. The participation of Pakistani women in public sphere has traditionally been of a low order. Only recently women have started participating in the public sphere when special quotas are allocated for women in different jobs and in the Parliament. Therefore Pakistani women may be expected to have high CPV or CPI. However, if these values are considered as gender neutral, as DeHart-Davis et al. (2006) have proposed to investigate, then a balance sample should be taken to verify the phenomenon.

6. Recommendations and Policy Implications

The recommendations about five antecedents of PSM found in this study are given below:

First is about *Supervisory Support*; as we have seen that in organizational factors *Supervisory Support* is positively correlated with PSM and with three of its dimensions: APP, CPI, and SS. This relationship deserves the attention of public sector leadership. The relationship shows that by providing a supportive and empathic environment for the public sector workforce, leadership can easily motivate them to work efficiently for providing public services. This would require a critical revisit of Pakistani public sector administrative culture, and bringing human relation aspect into every reform effort. Emphasis should be laid not only on new rules and procedures, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), and infrastructure, but also on training and development of employees, promoting supportive climate in organizations, and character building of employees.

Second is about *Formalization*; in public sector organizations, there is always an emphasis on formal rules and procedures. These rules and procedures are necessary to achieve transparency, however, too much emphasis on rules and procedures and ignoring of human relation aspect altogether engender apathy, detachment, selfishness, and stifles innovation. Human beings are not machines. In order to motivate them and to capitalize on their full potential, an organizational climate must be developed where core emphasis should be on values such as trust.

Third is about *Effort*; *Effort* had counter intuitive relationship with PSM or its dimensions. The relationship between *Effort* and PSM can be explored in future studies by considering the moderating effect of other variables.

Fourth is about *Gender*. During at least last two decades, the successive governments in Pakistan have encouraged women, by allocating quotas, to participate in every walk of life: government jobs, civil service, police, military, and parliament. However, it would be a naïve approach to expect that these women, who were traditionally limited to private sphere of life, will be ready to serve the country and society similar to their male counter parts. Special training and Human Resource Development effort should be made to inculcate the responsibilities of public sphere amongst the working women. Otherwise, it would be counterproductive. Further evidence about the difference of behavior in public life on the basis of gender can be collected from organizations where women were traditionally not involved, for instance, Parliament of Pakistan. A comparative study can be conducted to see the difference of involvement in parliamentary affairs between men and women parliamentarians.

Fifth is about *Education*; a negative correlation of education with PSM is an alarming situation for the political, administrative, and military leadership. Current education system is not promoting the values highly desired in a country which is amongst the top twenty five fragile states of the world. Fortunately, National Accountability Bureau(NAB) has recently directed all public sector universities to establish a body that should focus to promote ethical values and character building of students.

This study has addressed only a limited set of antecedents. Similar studies may be conducted in future in which more variables are tested, for example, family, religion, and other organizational factors. For instance, organizational structure may be one of the important factors which could be studied. However, in future, before conducting a survey, it would be better to conduct a qualitative study in the form of focus groups, as conducted by some scholars. These focus groups will help identify the relevance of certain dimensions in Pakistani context, or may also identify new dimensions of PSM.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire with Internal Reliability Statistic, Coefficient Alpha

DEPENDENT VARIABLE (PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION)	Coefficient Alpha
1. COMPASSION	
1. It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress (COM1) 2. I feel sympathetic to the plight of the underprivileged (COM2) 3. I empathize with other people who face difficulties (COM3) 4. I get very upset when I see other people being treated unfairly (COM4) 5. Considering the welfare of others is very important (COM5)	0.672
2. SELF SACRIFICE	
1. Making a difference to society means more to me than personal achievements (SS1) 2. I am prepared to make sacrifices for the good of society (SS2) 3. I believe in putting civic duty before self (SS3) 4. I am willing to risk personal loss to help society (SS4) 5. People should give back to society more than they get from it (SS5) 6. Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it (SS6) 7. I would agree to a good plan to make a better life for the poor, even if it costs me money (SS7)	0.798
3. ATTRACTION TO PUBLIC POLICY	
1. I am interested in helping to improve public service (APP1) 2. I like to discuss topics regarding public programs and policies with others (APP2) 3. I believe that public sector activities contribute to our general welfare (APP3) 4. I admire people who initiate or are involved in activities to aid my community (APP4) 5. Contributing to public programs and policies helps me realize myself (APP5) 6. It is important to contribute to activities that tackle social problems (APP6)	0.703
4. COMMITMENT FOR PUBLIC VALUES	
1. I think equal opportunities for citizens are very important (CPV1) 2. It is important that citizens can rely on the continuous provision of public services (CPV2) 3. It is fundamental that public services respond to the needs of the citizens (CPV3) 4. Everybody is entitled to a good service, even if it costs a lot of money (CPV4) 5. It is fundamental that the interests of future generations are taken into account when developing public policies (CPV5) 6. To act ethically is essential for public servants (CPV6) 7. I believe that public employees must always be aware of the legitimacy of their activities (CPV7)	0.647
5. COMMITMENT FOR PUBLIC INTEREST	
1. Meaningful public service is very important to me (CPI 1) 2. It is important for me to contribute to the common good (CPI 2) 3. I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community, even if it harmed my interests (CPI 3)	0.630

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE (ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS)

1. EFFORT

1. People here don't put more effort into their work than they have to (negatively worded)(EFF1) 2. People here always want to perform to the best of their ability(EFF2) 3. People are prepared to make a special effort to do a good job(EFF3) 4. People are enthusiastic about their work (EFF4)	0.725

2. TRADITION

1. Management are not interested in trying out new ideas(TRAD1) 2. Senior management like to keep to established, traditional ways of doing things(TRAD2) 3. The way this organization does things has never changed very much (TRAD3) 4. Changes in the way things are done here happen very slowly(TRAD4)	0.684

3. FORMALIZATION

1. Nobody gets too upset if people break the rules around here (negatively worded)(FORM1) 2. It's not necessary to follow procedures to the letter around here (negatively worded) (FORM2) 3. It is considered extremely important here to follow the rules(FORM3) 4. Everything has to be done by the book(FORM4)	0.683

4. SUPERVISORY SUPPORT

1. Supervisors here are really good at understanding peoples' problems(SUPS1) 2. Supervisors can be relied upon to give good guidance to people(SUPS2) 3. Supervisors show that they have confidence in those they manage(SUPS3) 4. Supervisors show an understanding of the people who work for them(SUPS4)	0.836

5. RED TAPE

If red tape is defined as burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's performance please assess the level of red tape in your organization. Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying no red tape and 10 signifying the highest level of red tape:_____	

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (PERSONAL & JOB CHARACTERISTICS)

Are you male or female?	

Which year were you born in? 19_____.	

How long have you studied in schools? _____ years Primary school = 5 years, Middle = 8 years Matric = 10 years F.A/F.Sc. = 12 years B.A/B.Sc. = 14 years B.E /Bachelor's degree/M.A/M.Sc./MBA = 16 years MS/M.Phil. = 18 years Ph.D. = 21 years	

What type of education you have acquired? _____

- Engineering

- Medical
- Natural Sciences
- Business Studies
- Humanities
- Social Sciences

Which of the following categories best describes your income from this organization in the previous year_____ Rupees

- Up to Rs 20,000
- More than Rs 20,000 and Up to Rs 45,000
- More than Rs 45,000 and Up to Rs 85,000
- More than Rs 85,000 and Up to Rs 125,000
- Over Rs 125,000

How many years you have worked for this organization?_____ years

Do you supervise employees?   No_____Yes_____

Acknowledgement

References

Aly, J. H. (2007). *Education in Pakistan: A white paper*. Islamabad.

Anderson, J. E. (2014). *Public policymaking*: Cengage Learning.

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 8*(3), 413-440.

Brewer, G. A., Selden, S. C., Facer, I., & Rex, L. (2002). Individual conceptions of public service motivation. *Public administration review, 60*(3), 254-264.

Bright, L. (2005). Public Employees With High Levels of Public Service Motivation Who are They, Where are They, and What Do They Want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 25*(2), 138-154.

Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel review, 36*(3), 356-377.

Coch, L., & French, J. R. (1967). *Overcoming resistance to change*: Bobbs-Merrill.

Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*(4), 499-518.

DeHart-Davis, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2005). Red tape and public employees: Does perceived rule dysfunction alienate managers? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 15*(1), 133-148.

DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J., & Pandey, S. K. (2006). Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public administration review, 66*(6), 873-887.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 565-573.

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

Grand, J. L. (2003). *Motivation, Agency, and Public PolicyOf Knights and Knaves, Pawns and Queens*. ": 'Oxford University Press'.

Hall, R. H., & Tolbert, P. S. (2009). *Organizations: structures, processes, and outcomes*: Prentice Hall (Upper Saddle River, NJ).

Hoodbhoy, P. (2011). *Education Reform In Pakistan : Challenges and Prospects*.

Horton, S. (2008). History and Persistance of an Idea and an Ideal. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 17-32). New York: Oxford University Press, USA.

Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(4), 713-728.

Houston, D. J. (2006). "Walking the Walk" of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood, and Money. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 16*(1), 67-86. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mui028

Islam, N. (2004). Sifarish, sycophants, power and collectivism: administrative culture in Pakistan. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 70*(2), 311-330.

Kilpatrick, F. P., Cummings, M. C., & Jennings, M. K. (1964). *The image of the federal service*: Brookings Institution Washington, DC.

Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Wright, B. E., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R. K., . . . De Vivo, P. (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*(1), 79-102. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mus027

Leisink, P., & Steijn, B. (2009). Public service motivation and job performance of public sector employees in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 75*(1), 35-52. doi: 10.1177/0020852308099505

McCaul, K. D., Hinsz, V. B., & McCaul, H. S. (1987). The Effects of Commitment to Performance Goals on Effort1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17*(5), 437-452. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1987.tb00323.x

Mirza, I. (2012). Transparency International and Pakistan Retrieved February 26, 2013, from http://www.thefrontierpost.com/article/196034/

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

Panday, S. K., & Stazyk, E. C. (2008). Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 101-117). New York: Oxford University Press, USA.

Park, J. (2013). *Exploratory Study on the Applicability of Public Service Motivation Concept to South Korea.* Ph.D, University of Pittsburgh.

Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., . . . Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of organizational behavior, 26*(4), 379-408.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach (student ed.).

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

Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*(2), 181-197.

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

Perry, J. L., Brudney, J. L., Coursey, D., & Littlepage, L. (2008). What drives morally committed citizens? A study of the antecedents of public service motivation. *Public administration review, 68*(3), 445-458.

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

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public administration review, 50*(3), 367-373.

Rainey, H. G. (1982). Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic. *The American Review of Public Administration, 16*(4), 288-302.

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

Scott, P. G., & Pandey, S. K. (2005). Red Tape and Public Service Motivation Findings from a National Survey of Managers in State Health and Human Services Agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 25*(2), 155-180.

Tibbs, T., Haire-Joshu, D., Schechtman, K. B., Brownson, R. C., Nanney, M. S., Houston, C., & Auslander, W. (2001). The relationship between parental modeling, eating patterns, and dietary intake among African-American parents. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 101*(5), 535-541.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a public administration theory of public service motivation. *Public management review, 9*(4), 545-556.

Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument. *International public management journal, 11*(1), 143-167. doi: 10.1080/10967490801887970