



**HAL**  
open science

## What drives personnel out of public organizations?

Claire Edey Gamassou

► **To cite this version:**

Claire Edey Gamassou. What drives personnel out of public organizations?. *Public Organization Review*, 2014, 15 (3), pp.383-398. 10.1007/s11115-014-0277-8. hal-01118014

**HAL Id: hal-01118014**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01118014v1>**

Submitted on 18 Feb 2015

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# What drives personnel out of public organizations?

Author : Claire Edey Gamassou , Dr

Assistant Professor at University Paris-Est , IRG

## Abstract

In this article, including a state of the art on Public Service Motivation (PSM) and its relationships to Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC), the interface of PSM with Organizational Behavior constructs is analyzed. Data has been collected in the context of French local authorities at two points in time within one year (N1=1152, N2=81). AOC and Intention to Quit Employer (IQE) at T2 are related to several antecedent variables at T1 (Intrinsic Motivation, Perceived Superior Support, Latent Conflicts and Exhaustion) but not to PSM. The hypothesis of a causal relation between PSM and positive effects is not validated. The data does not support the idea that PSM influences commitment to, or turnover in, the organization. The influence of Age and civil service grade levels (Class) in IQE is confirmed. The analysis indicates that Exhaustion and Perceived Superior Support are strongly related to IQE, which should encourage scholars and HRM professionals to enable superiors to provide support to their employees.

Keywords: public service motivation, organizational commitment, intention to quit, perceived superior support

## Introduction

As a field of research, Public Service Motivation (PSM) was developed in the U.S. in reaction to theories of Public Choice. However, areas common to the PSM literature and other research on closely related concepts continue to be rare, and PSM itself only covers a portion of the various sources available on public officials' motivation (Emery, 2012). In addition, outside the confines of the public sector, the relation to work is generally tackled using concepts such as organizational commitment (OC). Therefore, in this article, we will analyze the interface of PSM with Organizational Behavior (OB) constructs with the aim of adding to the state of knowledge on the motivational characteristics of personnel in public organizations and their effects on the organizations and on the individuals. The present study has been developed in the context of French local authorities, where it has been demonstrated that PSM is particularly based on values and general interest orientation (Desmarais and Edey Gamassou, 2012). Data has been collected at two points in time within one year, allowing us to test the causality hypothesis.

The results of this survey should allow us to consider whether human resource management measures that include PSM in recruitment criterion or that reinforce motivational attitude at work in public organizations could be expected to prevent or lower turnover.

To do so, we will first present PSM and its relationships to the OB constructs studied in the literature especially in regards to OC. In the second chapter, we present the context of the study and propose research hypotheses. We will then address the methodology and analysis employed and, finally, present and discuss the results in the last chapter.

## **Public Service Motivation and its relationships to Organizational Behavior**

Perry and Wise's first definition for PSM (1990) positions the concept in a wider sense as an attitude vis-à-vis society and others and not vis-à-vis work and the organization. Each of Perry's four dimensions of PSM (Attraction to public policy making; Commitment to public interest/civic duty; Compassion; Self-sacrifice) fall under at least one of the three categories of motive according to Knoke and Wright-Isak (1982): rational, normative and affective. The "motives" indicate the need an individual is seeking to satisfy: rational motives produce actions founded on maximizing individual usefulness, normative needs result in efforts to conform to valued norms such as altruism or loyalty and affective needs can arouse emotional responses triggered by the social context.

As mentioned above, the first definition for PSM (Perry and Wise, 1990) as "*the individual predisposition to respond to motives brought to bear primarily, if not uniquely, by institutions and public organizations*" positions the concept in a wider sense as an attitude vis-à-vis society and others and not vis-à-vis work and the organization. In an attempt to unify the various work undertaken in this field, Hondeghem and Vandenaabeele (2005, p. 466) proposed a definition of PSM as the "*conviction, values and attitudes that go beyond personal interests, or that of the organization, to take into account a greater political entity and that, in public interaction, results in motivation to have a particular behavior*".

Perry's four dimensions are:

- The attraction for public policy or the tendency to seek opportunities to participate in the formulation of public policy (rational motives)
- Commitment to the public interest, attachment to ideas of civil duty and social justice (normative motives)
- Compassion, desire to protect citizens, attachment to the values of the political institution (affective motives)
- Personal sacrifice, or abnegation, a particularly altruistic dimension and the corresponding will to substitute consecutive intangible gratification for services rendered to others instead of tangible and monetary reward (affective and normative motives)

We will first examine the variables studied as consequences of PSM and then focus on the relationship between PSM and AOC. Finally, we will present the state of the art on AOC in the public sector.

### ***Consequences of Public Service Motivation***

PSM is generally studied as an antecedent of attitudes, behavior, positive feelings about work, and, in particular, of performance. According to Moynihan and Pandey (2007, p. 41), the motivational theory supporting PSM relies on the idea of a connection between the fact of seeking the public interest and the behavior that leads those individuals endowed with strong PSM to contribute in a positive manner to their organizations. They would have higher levels of OC (Crewson, 1997), would work more in the strong belief that their work is important (Wright, 2003), are likely to be more efficient, more satisfied professionally and less likely to resign (Naff and Crum, 1999). Thus, several recent articles believe that hypotheses on the relationship between PSM and OC, between PSM and professional satisfaction and between PSM and performance (individual, organizational and task) have already been validated (Carpenter et al., 2012, p. 509, Wright and Grant, 2010, p. 691). Steen and Rutgers (2011, p. 346) went on to cite Lewis and Alonso (2001), Lewis and Frank (2002), Kim (2006), Bright (2007), Brewer (2008), Pandey, Wright and Moynihan (2008) to support the hypothesis of a causal relation between PSM and positive effects such as job commitment, OC, professional satisfaction and individual and organizational performance. They also mention (op. cit., p.354) the existence of the phenomenon of OC diminution, loss of PSM, dissatisfaction, intent to resign or the adoption of non-ethical behavior with agents who feel a conflict between their allegiance to the organization and their engagement in public interest. They rely on Buchanan's results (1974) showing civil servants disappointed by the confrontation between the agents' ideals - driven by extra-organizational social concerns that characterize PSM - and the reality of life in an organization.

## ***Public Service Motivation and Affective Organizational Commitment***

According to Allen and Meyer (1996), OC is “*a group of mental predispositions or a psychological state (feelings or beliefs) concerning the relationship of an employee with the organization*”. OC reflects a desire, need or obligation to remain a member of the organization. This conceptualization recalls the three-dimensional Knobe and Wright-Isak approach (affective, normative, and rational). Among Meyer and Allen’s three dimensions of OC (Affective, Continuance, Normative Organizational Commitment, Meyer and Allen, 2001), Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC) is defined as “*the emotional attachment to, identification with and commitment in the organization*”. Stazyk, Pandey and Wright (2011, p. 606) acknowledge that AOC’s robustness and its influence on individual and organizational outcomes allow scholars to focus on that particular dimension of OC.

According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001, p. 316) AOC’s antecedents, meaning the variables that have contributed to its development, are all those that allow an individual to be involved in an action, to be intrinsically motivated by an action, that allows the individual to recognize the value of an entity or an action, or even to perceive their identity as derived from association with an entity or work towards an objective. Thus, AOC could also have intrinsic motivation (IM) and PSM as antecedents. Nevertheless, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001, p. 308-310) also show that commitment oriented towards an objective or a specific organization, is the antecedent of the general state of mind positively directed towards an abstract notion encompassing the objective or the organization. This explanation throws light on Camilleri and Van Der Heijden’s conclusions (2007) rejecting the hypothesis that PSM is an antecedent of OC. According to these authors, PSM is a consequence of OC and not the contrary (Camilleri and Van Der Heijden, 2007, p. 258), for “*to want to remain a member of a public sector structure accentuates the predisposition to work for a public institution and not the contrary*”.

In a quantitative study of Belgian public officers, Vandebabeele (2009) demonstrated that PSM has an effect on individual performance; a direct effect as well as an effect that is mediated by professional satisfaction, AOC and normative OC.

In terms of OC consequences, Peyrat-Guillard (2002, p. 81-82) listed 4 fundamental contributions: Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982), Mathieu and Zajac (1990, p.174) who regrouped a large number of OC consequences under the generic term of “Job Performance”, Morrow (1993) and Meyer and Allen (1997) who identified 3

large categories of consequences: withdrawal, productive behavior and employees' well-being. "Withdrawal" can encompass some of the consequences listed by Mathieu and Zajac (op.cit.) such as Perceived Job Alternatives, Intention to Search, Intention to Leave, Lateness, and Turnover.

### ***Affective Organizational Commitment in the public sector***

As observed by Steijn and Leisiink (2006, p. 188) referring to Liou and Nyhan (1994) and Balfour and Wechsler (1996), OC has not often been addressed in the public sector.

However, using three secondary data sources, Crewson (1997) has shown that, between public and private sector employees, there are stable and generalizable differences in terms of motivation for reward and that *"public employees with preference for service over economic benefits are likely to be more committed to agency operations than employees with a preference for economic rewards"*.

Moon (2000) has investigated the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation with OC, as well as the relation between OC and three other types of commitment: in the sector, in the level of hierarchy and in the organizational culture. The study brings to light the absence of public manager sensitivity to extrinsic motivation (Moon, 2000, p. 190).

Castaing and Roussel (2006) conducted the first French quantitative study that included PSM. According to their study on a sample of 754 civil servants from the French state public sector (FSPS), the normative and affective dimensions of OC determine PSM more strongly than other forms of commitment or engagement. Castaing (2006) emphasizes that while Perry (1996) has the dimension "engagement in the public interest" as a normative form of PSM, in fact it more strongly influences the affective dimension of commitment than its normative dimension. He concludes that engagement in the public interest would be a question more of the desire to serve users than a perceived obligation. Steijn and Leisink (2006, p.200), whose findings differ from other studies with respect to normative commitment, raise the hypotheses that *"the meaning of normative commitment in the public sector is different from than in the private sector because of the presence of PSM"*.

In France as well, Edey Gamassou and Lourel (2008) have based their analysis of AOC on Schaufeli and Bakker's Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R, 2004), which relies on Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989, Wright and Hobfoll, 2004), one of the dominant approaches to burnout modeling within a

salutogenic perspective (Neveu, 2007, p. 22). The mobilization of this model enables the necessary reflection on HRM policy and on the mechanisms needed for the prevention of stress and burn-out and their consequences (absenteeism, staff turnover, intention to resign), as well as, the positive managerial measures to induce OC and its expected results (self-efficacy, collective performance, intention to stay, well-being). This model is based on the classification of job characteristics in two higher-order opposing categories: job demands (JD) and job resources (JR) (Giauque, Resenterra and Siggen, 2013). JR are the aspects of the work context – mainly related to social or work characteristics – that can both reduce the health-impairing impact of JD and enhance positive attitude towards the job and the organization. The JD-R model is a dual-process motivational model that includes a positive, motivational spiral relying on the professional resources available to the individual, which causes or enhances commitment and a negative, debilitating spiral linked to professional requirements potentially leading to burn-out. In their study conducted among 434 civil servants in the French local public sector (FLPS), Edey Gamassou and Lourel (Ibid) have highlighted that Organization Support is the factor explaining most OC variance and that professional interpersonal relationships (social support, latent conflicts) have no influence on OC.

Steen and Rutgers (2011, p. 354) mention the existence of the phenomenon of OC diminution, loss of PSM, dissatisfaction, intent to resign or the adoption of non-ethical behavior with agents who feel a conflict between their allegiance to the organization and their engagement for public interest. They rely on Buchanan's results (1974) showing civil servants who were attracted to the public sector by the desire to bring something to society, and were disillusioned and frustrated by the amount of activities that have nothing to do with serving the mission that interests them. It is, in fact, a disappointment born from the confrontation between the agents' ideals (driven by extra-organizational social concerns that characterize PSM) and the reality of life in an organization.

For Wright, Moynihan and Pandey (2012, p. 211), transformational leadership is an organizational factor associated with both high levels of PSM and an indirect influence on the attraction of the organization's missions for the employees. Thus, the effect of PSM on performance or satisfaction will, in fact, be linked to its effect on the employee's perception of the consistency between his/her own values and those of the organization. This perception itself would be an indirect result of transformational leadership; a type of leadership which clarifies the organization's goals, links employees' posts to the organization's missions and communicates a feeling of pride in the organization.

We will now present the variables included in the data collection and the hypotheses that we have developed.

## **Measured variables and hypotheses**

### ***Measured variables***

Self-Determination Theory (SDT, Gagné and Deci, 2005) had great success in the domains of education, sport and health before merging with theories of organizational behavior. In this theory, intrinsic motivation (IM) is the most self-determined (or autonomous) form of motivation, corresponding to the will to act for the pleasure and satisfaction that the individual finds in the activity itself. According to Deci and Ryan (2011, p.19), “*all people have the needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness*” in order to “*develop and function optimally*”. These elements themselves correspond to 3 innate psychological needs: the need to act freely and in accordance with one’s values, to feel efficient, to have enriching relationships. Satisfaction of the first need links SDT with PSM, as Compassion and Self-Sacrifice correspond to the individual’s quest for professional activity that is in accordance with his/her values. The second need can be seen in line with Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy (1986); the 3rd refers to social support.

According to Gagné and Deci’s (Ibid, p. 347, Figure 2) synthesis of research results on SDT as applied to employment, the consequences of motivation are performance (complex, creative and citizenship), psychological well-being, organizational trust and commitment and job satisfaction.

Self-Efficacy is defined as the individual’s judgment of his/ her own “*capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances*” (Bandura 1986, p.391). According to Wright (2007), self-efficacy influences motivation through its effect on the direction and persistence of behavior. Higher levels of self-efficacy are often associated with better performance as employees are more likely to expend the necessary effort and persist in the face of obstacles if they feel that their efforts will eventually be successful. Camilleri and Van Der Heijden (2007) cautiously accept the hypothesis that individual performance is a consequence of both OC and PSM.



Social Support has been widely studied as a variable that reduces stress or buffers its effects (Henderson and Argyle, 1984, p. 299). Support from one's superior has been shown to have a consistent relation with several outcomes impacting workers' welfare (Ganster, Fusilier, Mayes, 1986). According to Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003, p.264), Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS) does not influence AOC and AOC does not impact turnover (significant correlation with risk error 0.05 but <.3 in absolute value) but PSS has an indirect effect on turnover. In a study conducted among public employees, the comparison of the effects of Perceived Colleague Support and PSS on Exhaustion, with regard to cross-tabulated results, indicates a stronger relationship between PSS and Exhaustion (Mutuelle Nationale Territoriale, 2013, p. 79).

Exhaustion, according to Maslach and Leiter (2008) represents the individual strain dimension of burnout, defined as a "*psychological syndrome that involves a prolonged response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job*" (Ibid, p. 498). Burnout is composed of three dimensions: Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Reduced Accomplishment. Exhaustion is a state of emotional and physical depletion, lack of energy whereas Depersonalization refers to the response of an individual to the interpersonal context of his/her job consisting in detaching from the others. They are considered as the core of burnout. The third dimension of the syndrome, Reduced Accomplishment, refers to a feeling of inefficacy.

As we are seeking to study individual perception and not objectified reality of behavior and efficiency we can measure the variables using self-reporting scales without being subject to criticism as to their objectivity. Nevertheless, the administrated questionnaire offered the possibility for the respondent to complete his/her answer with his/her own words and four of them have completed their answer to the Intention to Quit indicator by specifying either that they were looking actively for another position, or that they haven't managed to find one after looking, or that they already have plans to leave (a month later) or to take a year-long sabbatical leave.

## ***Hypotheses***

According to our review on PSM's consequences, the following hypotheses are employed:

H1a, b, c: PSM will be positively related to AOC and Self-Efficacy and negatively to Intent to Quit

H1d, e, f: AOC will be positively related to Self-Efficacy and negatively to Intent to Quit

According to Bakker et al. (2003) and Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), it would be expected that OC would play a mediating role among resources and absence frequency, health problems and the intention to resign and also that AOC and Exhaustion relate negatively to another. Therefore we develop the following hypotheses:

H2a, b, c, d: IM and PSS will be positively related to AOC and negatively related to Exhaustion and to Intention to Quit

H2'b: PSS will not be related to AOC

H2e: AOC will be negatively related to Exhaustion and to Intention to Quit

H2'e: AOC will not be related to Intention to Quit

Despite general acknowledgment that OC is not influenced by demographic variables, we will control the influence of gender, age, tenure, type of structure, hierarchical and managerial positions. Moynihan and Pandey (2007, p. 44) mentioned Crewson (1997, Exhibit3, Source: the 1979 Federal Employee Attitude Survey) to support the idea of a positive relationship of seniority and pay grade to OC. From the previous hypotheses and from the latest findings, we draw the following:

H3a, b, c: Age, Tenure and Position in the organization will be negatively related to Intention to Quit

## **Data, measurement and analysis**

### ***Sample and measures***

A questionnaire was administered online (Time 1, T1: Sept-Oct 2012) through selective channels targeting the FLPS. The questionnaire included mostly 7-degree Likert scales, four validated scales and three adapted scales: Kim et al.'s PSM scale (2012), a four-dimension scale validated across 12 national samples on 4 different continents, an IM subscale from the MAWS (Gagné et al., 2010), a short version of the Exhaustion subscale from the SMBM (Shirom and Melamed Burnout Measure, Shirom and Melamed, 2006, French version: Sassi and Neveu, 2010), a short version of Meyer and Allen's AOC scale (5 items, Meyer & Allen, 1991), a work oriented Self-Efficacy scale (4-items, *I am capable of doing what I am asked to do, I feel I am efficient, I often feel satisfied about the quality of my work, I feel I satisfy my superiors' expectations*), a 2-item Latent Conflicts scale (*There are people who make my life difficult at work, There are people with whom I have difficulties working*), a 3-item PSS scale (adapted from Scheck, Kinicki and Davy, 1995, pp. 1488-1489: Providing a separate rating for colleagues and superiors: *How much can each of the following people be relied upon when things get tough? How at ease are you when you talk with each of the following people? How much do each of*

*the following people go out of their way to make your life easier for you?*, 4-degree frequency scale), and a mono-item scale of Intention to Quit Employer (IQE, *Do you intend to change employers?*, three possible responses : *No, Yes but later, Yes soon*). Demographic data include Age, Sex, Job Tenure, Type of Community (municipalities, departments, regions), Class (civil service grade levels), and Managerial Role (whether the respondent plays a managerial role as team manager).

The resulting usable sample of 1152 respondents is characterized by good geographical distribution (only five out of the possible 101 French departments are not represented in the sample), is representative of FLPS with respect to the General Directorate of Administration and Civil Service (data 2012) in terms of age (mean of 44 years), gender (66% of women) and types of communities. It has, however, an overrepresentation of the two higher civil service grade levels, Class A (coded 1) and Class B (coded 2) as only 37% of respondents belong to the third grade level, Class C (coded 3), instead of the 76% represented in the general population.

A second data collection took place ten months later (Time 2, T2: Jul-Aug 2013). Among the 125 respondents who had given their e-mail addresses at the end of the T1 questionnaire. 81 respondents completed the second questionnaire that included the complete AOC scale (Meyer and Allen, 1991, 6 items) and the same scales of IQE, Exhaustion and Self-Efficacy as in T1. No significant demographic differences were observed between the two samples ( $N_1=1152$  at T1,  $N_2 = 81$  at T2).

We used principal component analysis to examine the structure of the constructs and then tested the reliability of emerged dimensions with Cronbach's  $\alpha$ . The PSM scale in four dimensions presents, in this sample, a structure in three dimensions (cumulative variance explained: 63.18%). In effect, the dimensions APP and CPV (Attraction for Public Policy and Commitment to Public Values) represent one axis explaining 40.57% of the variance. This dimension of "Attraction for Public Policy and Commitment to Public Values" (APPCPV), which comes under rational and normative motives, is the first dimension of PSM. The other two dimensions, Compassion and Sacrifice, coming under affective and normative motives are confirmed in the structure of four items. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of all constructs presented are higher than 0.8 (see Tables 2 and 3 in the Appendix).

As the short version of AOC at T1 presented a low alpha (0.495 with 5 items, 0.662, with 4 items), we decided to use a mono-item measure by including the item that loaded the most on the unique dimension, as did Steijn and Leisink (2006, p. 192). At T2, the aggregate complete version of AOC has been used.

## ***Analysis***

The results presented below are intended to provide additional elements of reflection on those variables looked at in the literature review including the relationships among them in a large sample of territorial agents.

As a first step, we will observe correlations among measured attitudinal and organizational variables at T1. Given the size of this first sample, the absence of significant correlations between two variables, or a low coefficient (inferior to .2) will allow us to exclude the hypothesis of an influence between those variables.

In a second step, we will observe correlations in T1 as well as in T2. Despite the modest size of the T2 sample ( $N_2=81$ ), significant correlations between measures of dependent variables (IQE, AOC and Exhaustion) at T2 and measures of antecedent variables at T1 will bring support to the causality hypothesis. We will therefore pay attention to the antecedent variables that show significant coefficients superior to .3 especially with IQE.

In a third step, we will use hierarchical multiple regression based on T1 cross-sectional data in order to compare the antecedent variables that most influence IQE with those identified through correlations in T1 and T2. The first model included only demographic data as antecedent variables, including both age and job tenure (their correlation is inferior to 0.7 and even to 0.5  $-+.482$ , risk error  $< 0.01$ -, therefore we acknowledge that these two variables contain different individual information). The attitudinal and relational antecedent variables were included in the second model. All these variables were regressed on IQE.

## **Results**

### ***Correlations at T1 ( $N_1=1152$ )***

The analysis of cross-sectional data of T1 ( $N_1=1152$ , see Table 1 in Appendix) shows significant correlation superior to 0.1 between IM and two dimensions of PSM: APPCPV (+.114) and Self-Sacrifice (+.126). AOC and

Self-Efficacy are significantly (at a 2-tailed risk error  $<0.01$ -level) but very weakly ( $<.1$  in absolute value) correlated to two dimensions of PSM (Compassion and Self-Sacrifice).

IM being significantly correlated to two dimensions of PSM brings support to the idea that PSM is, at least partly, an intrinsic task motivation oriented construct. The link between IM and PSS appears to be strong, as well as the relationship between Latent Conflicts and Exhaustion.

Exhaustion and Latent Conflicts are significantly and positively correlated with IQE whereas PSS, Intrinsic Motivation and AOC, and in a weaker manner, Self-Efficacy, are negatively correlated with IQE.

### ***Correlations at T1 ( $N_2 = 1152$ ) and T2 ( $N_2 = 81$ )***

T2, being based on self-reported measurements, may introduce a method bias that could have increased several coefficients (between AOC2, IQE2, Exhaustion2,  $N_2 = 81$ , see Table 2 in Appendix). Yet, the high level of coefficient between the same variables measured at T1 and T2 can be seen as an additional indicator of the internal consistency of the scales (IQE1 and IQE2, Exhaustion1 and Exhaustion2). The weak level of the coefficient between AOC1 (mono-item) and AOC2 (complete 6 items scale) can be explained by the use of a mono-item scale at T1. AOC at T1 is significantly correlated only with two of the six items of the complete AOC scale used at T2 (+.261 and +.289, at a 2-tailed risk error  $< 0.05$ ).

Focusing on AOC2, Exhaustion2 and IQE2, we observe that none of these dependent variables have significant correlations with PSM, nor with Self-Efficacy (Table 2 in Appendix). AOC1 is not significantly correlated to IQE2. Therefore, hypotheses H1 are not validated. PSS is the only antecedent that significantly influences IQE2 (-.294, at a 2-tailed risk error  $< 0.05$ ). PSS, Intrinsic Motivation and Latent Conflicts significantly influence both AOC2 and Exhaustion2 (see Summary of the significant correlations in Table 2 in Appendix). Hypotheses H2a,b,c,d,e are validated; H2'b,e are not.

### ***Hierarchical Multiple Regression analysis at T1 ( $N_1=1152$ )***

The increase of explained variance from 5.7% for Model 1 to 27.2% for Model 2 underlines the importance of attitudinal and relational variables in the IQE attitude (see Table 3 in Appendix). Except from Age and Class as

demographic variables, only three variables show a significant influence with a risk error inferior to 0.001: IM, PSS and Exhaustion (see Table 3 in Appendix).

Considering that the study is based on self-reported measurements and that the latest analysis was conducted on single source cross-sectional data, we focus only on convergent results based on theoretical grounds and on our three-step process of analysis. In addition to this limitation, there is a statistical reason for not giving too much credit to the effect of IM on IQE appearing in Model 2: IM being related to two variables (PSS and Exhaustion, see Table 2 in Appendix) that are both related to IQE may create the influence observed in Model 2 (Table 3 in Appendix). Main result of our research is that Exhaustion and PSS are both strongly related to IQE, meaning that respondents willing to get out of their organizations are those who do not feel supported by their hierarchy and who feel drained of their energy, bringing additional support to Schaufeli and Bakker's model (op.cit.).

The influence of Age and Class has been confirmed by complementary analysis on the T1 sample. The Chi-Square Tests on the influence of Class show, with a risk error inferior to 0.05, that Class may have an influence on IQE (see in Appendix Table 4). The correlation between Age and IQE at T2 is significant and superior to .3 (-.390, risk error < 0.01) and also superior to the correlation between Age and IQE measured at T1 (-.205), meaning that the intensity of the relationship between Age and IQE has increased from T1 to T2: younger employees may be willing to diversify their professional experiences more than older, more experienced employees, and their differences of attitude towards the organization becomes stronger after a few months, meaning that younger employees express a stronger will to quit at T2 (Yes soon, instead of, Yes but later) than at T1. Hypotheses H3 are partially validated.

## **Conclusion**

Our analysis gives support to Camilleri and Van Der Heijden's hypothesis of the primacy of organizational determinants on PSM (op.cit.). According to this small sample of longitudinal data, it appears that PSM does not make a difference, as we have observed that AOC and IQE are strongly and significantly related to antecedent variables (IM, PSS, Latent Conflicts and Exhaustion) but not to PSM dimensions. Therefore the data does not support the idea that PSM influences commitment to, or turnover in, the organization.

There may be elements that can be used to develop an hypothesis of an indirect effect of PSM on AOC or IQE through its possible influence on these four variables (IM, PSS, Latent Conflicts and Exhaustion). PSM may influence the way employees and managers, working for local authorities, perceive the quality of their relationships at work (Latent Conflicts and PSS) as well as their tendency to feel satisfied by the content of their task in a public organization (IM).

According to the correlations observed on both samples, IM seems a strong deterrent to Exhaustion (-.454, risk error<0.001), as does PSS. IM and PSS are also strongly related to one another (+.440, risk error<0.001). Given the fact that these results are based on cross-sectional data, we cannot draw a definite conclusion on the importance of the managerial environment in creating working conditions that protect employees from burnout and boost their motivation for the tasks. One may argue that IM can be considered a personality trait that influences an individual's perception of the work environment and professional relationships. However, the strong influence of PSS on IQE demonstrated in our study should encourage scholars and HRM professionals to pay attention to this dimension of the working environment: helping superiors in providing support to their employees may help retain them in the organization.

Acknowledgment : This research was supported by the Observatoire Social Territorial of the Mutuelle Nationale Territoriale.

## Bibliography

Allen N.J. & Meyer J.P., 1996, Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49: 252-76.

Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, D., de Boer, E., and Schaufeli, W.B., 2003, Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62: 341-356.

Balfour, D.L. & Wechsler, B. (1996), Organizational Commitment: Antecedents and Outcomes in Public Organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 19(3): 256-77

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.

Brewer, G.A., 2008, Employee and Organizational Performance, in Perry & Hondeghem (eds) *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bright, L., 2007, Does Person-Organization Fit Mediate the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Performance of Public Employees?. *Review of Public Personnel administration*, 27(4): 361-79.

Buchanan, B. 1974, Government Management, Business Executives, and Organizational Commitment. *Public Administration Review*, 35: 339-47.

Camilleri, E., & Van Der Heijden, B.I.J.M., 2007, Organizational Commitment, Public Service Motivation, and Performance within the Public Sector, *Public Performance and Management Review*, Vol. 31(2): 241-274.

Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P. Jr, Harrison R.U., Pinneau, S.R., 1975, Job Demands and Worker Health, U.S. Department Health, Education and Welfare Publication (NIOSH) N°75-160, U.S. Government Printing Office, The Institute for Social Research, Washington, D.C.

Carpenter, J., Doverspike, D., Rosanna F., & Miguel, R., 2012, Public service motivation as a predictor of attraction to the public sector, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 80: 509-523.

Castaing, S., 2006, The Effects of Psychological Contract Fulfillment and Public Service Motivation on Organizational Commitment in the French Civil Service, *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(1): 84-98.

Castaing, S. & Roussel, P., 2006, L'effet de l'évaluation du contrat psychologique sur l'implication affective dans la fonction publique: le rôle modérateur de la motivation à l'égard du service public, Congrès de l'AGRH.



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

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M., 2011, Levels of Analysis, Regnant Causes of Behavior and Well-Being: The Role of Psychological Needs, *Psychological Inquiry*, 22: 17-22.

Desmarais, C. & Edey Gamassou, C., 2012, La motivation de service public à l'aune du "service public à la française", *Politiques et Management Public*, 29(3): 393-411.

Edey Gamassou, C. & Lourel, M., 2008, Epuisement professionnel, implication and sentiment d'efficacité: un modèle fondé sur les ressources, in Chasseigne G., Berjot S., Grebot E. & Lassarre D. (dir.), *Cognition, Santé et Vie Quotidienne, vol. 2, Stress: conceptions, mesures, implications professionnelles*, Eds Publibook Université, p. 95-123.

Emery, Y., 2012, La diversité des motivations des employés publics. Recherche exploratoire dans un contexte post-bureaucratique en Suisse, *Revue française d'administration publique*, Vol.2, N°142, p. 491-515

Gagné, M. & Deci, E.L., 2005, Self-determination theory and work motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362.

Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M.-H., Aubé, C., Morin, E. M., & Malorni, A. (In press). The Motivation at Work Scale: Validation evidence in two languages, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(4): 628–646.

Ganster, D., Fusilier, M., Mayes, B., 1986, Role of Social Support in the Experience of Stress at Work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1): 102-110.

General Directorate of Administration and Civil Service (Direction Générale de l'Administration et la Fonction Publique), 2012, *Rapport annuel sur l'état de la fonction publique. Politiques et pratiques de ressources humaines. Faits et chiffres*, Documentation Française

Giauque, D., Resenterra, F., Siggen, M., 2013, Antecedents of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Stress in Public Hospital: a P-E Fit Perspective, *Public Organization Review* (January)

Henderson, M. & Argyle, M., 1984, Social support of four categories of work colleagues: Relationships between activities, stress and satisfaction, *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, Vol. 6: 229-239

Hobfoll, S.E. (1989), Conservation of Resources, A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress, *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524

Hondeghem, A. & Vandenabeele, W., 2005, Valeurs et Motivations dans le service public, Perspective comparative, *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, n°115, p 463-480

Kim, S., 2006, Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(8): 722-40.

Kim S., Vandenabeele W., Andersen L.B., Cerase F.P., Christensen R. K., Desmarais C., Koumenta M., Leisink P., Palidauskaite J., Pedersen L. H., Perry J. L., Ritz A., Taylor J., DeVivo P., & Wright B. E., 2012, 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.

Knocke D. & Wright-Isak C., 1982, Individual Motives and Organizational Incentive Systems. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 1:209-54.

Lewis, G.E. & Alonso, P., 2001, Public Service Motivation and Job Performance: Evidence from the Federal Sector. *American Review of Public Administration*, 31(4): 363-80.

Lewis, G.E. & Frank, S.A., 2002, Who wants to work for the Government?. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4): 395-404.

Liou, K.T., & Nyhan, R.C., 1994, Dimensions of Organizational Commitment in the Public Sector: An Empirical Assessment. *Public Administrative Quarterly*, 18(1): 99-118.

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M.P., 2008, Early Predictors of Job Burnout and Engagement, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2): 498-512.

Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D., 1990, A Review and Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organizational Commitment, *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 171-194.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J., 1991, A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1: 61-98

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J., 1997, *Commitment in the workplace - Theory, research and application*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Meyer J.P. & Allen, N.J., 2001, A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1): 61-89.

Meyer, J.P. & Herscovitch, L., 2001, Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11: 299-326.

Moon, J., 2000, Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management. Motivation, Organizational Culture, Sector, and Managerial Level, *Public Performance & Management Review*, Vol. 24(2), p. 177-194

Morrow, P.C., 1993, *The theory and measurement of work commitment*, Greenwich J.A.I Press

Moynihan, D.P., & Pandey, S.K., 2007, The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, p. 40-53.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. & Steers, R., 1982, *Employee-Organization linkages: the psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Mutuelle Nationale Territoriale, 2013, L'impact des TNIC sur le travail des agents territoriaux, Les Cahiers de l'Observatoire Social Territorial, N°7.

[http://www.mnt.fr/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Cahier\\_n7\\_OST\\_Impact\\_des\\_TNIC\\_sur\\_le\\_travail\\_des\\_agents\\_territoriaux\\_Aout\\_2013.pdf](http://www.mnt.fr/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Cahier_n7_OST_Impact_des_TNIC_sur_le_travail_des_agents_territoriaux_Aout_2013.pdf)

Naff, K.C. & Crum, J., 1999, Working for America: does public service motivation make a difference?, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(4): 5-16.

Neveu, J.-P., 2007, Jailed Resources: Conservation of resources theory as applied to burnout among prison guards, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 28: 21-42

Pandey, S. K., Wright, B.E. & Moynihan, D.P., 2008, Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Testing a Preliminary Model. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1): 89-108.

Park, Sung Min & Rainey, Hal G., 2007, Antecedents, Mediators, and Consequences of Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment. Empirical Tests of Commitment Effects in Federal Agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(3): 197-226.

Perry, J., & Wise, L., 1990, The motivational basis of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50: 367-373.

Perry, J., 1996, Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol.6(1): 5-22

Peyrat-Guillard, D., 2002, Chapitre 4: Les antécédents and les conséquences de l'implication au travail, in Neveu, J.-P. & Thévenet, M., *L'implication au travail*, Eds Vuibert, Collection Entreprendre, Série Vital Roux, p. 71-96.

Sassi, N., Neveu, J.P., 2010, Traduction et validation d'une nouvelle mesure d'épuisement professionnel: le Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure. *Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 42(3): 177-184.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker A. B., 2004, Job demands, job resources, and their relationships with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25: 293-315.

Scheck, C.L. Kinicki, A.J., Davy, J.A., 1995, A Longitudinal Study of Multivariate Model of the Stress Process Using Structural Equations Modeling, *Human Relations*, 48(12): 1481-1510.

Shirom, A., & Melamed, S., 2006, A comparison of the construct validity of two burnout measures in two groups of professionals. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13: 176–200

Stazyk, Edmund C., Pandey, Sanjay K. & Wright, Bradley E., 2011, Understanding Affective Organizational Commitment: The Importance of Institutional Context. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(6): 603-624.

Steijn, B. & Leisink, P., 2006, Organizational commitment among Dutch public sector employees. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 72(2): 187-201.

Steen, T.P.S., & Rutgers, M.R., 2011, The Double-Egged Sword, Public Service motivation, the oath of office and the backlash of an instrumental approach. *Public Management Review*, 13(3): 343-361.

Stinglhamber, F. & Vandenberghe, C., 2003, Organizations and supervisors as sources of support and targets of commitment: a longitudinal study, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24: 251-270.

Vandenabeele, W., 2009, The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance: more robust evidence of the PSM- performance relationship. *International review of administrative science*, 75(1): 11-37.

Wright, B.E., 2003, The role of work context in work motivation: A public sector application of goal and social cognitive theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 41(1): 59-78.

Wright, B.E., 2007, Public Service Motivation: Does Mission Matter?, *Public Administration Review*, p. 54-64.

Wright, B.E., & Grant, A.M., 2010, Unanswered Questions about Public Service Motivation: Designing Research to Address Key Issues of Emergence and Effects. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5): 691-700.

Wright, T. A. & Hobfoll, S. E. (2004). Commitment, psychological well being and job performance: An examination of conservation of resources (COR) theory and job burnout. *Journal of Business and Management* , 9(4): 389-406

Wright, B.E., Moynihan, D.P. & Pandey, 2012, Pulling the Levers: Transformational Leadership, Public Service Motivation, and Mission Valence, *Public Administrative Review*, Vol. 72(2): 206-215

# Appendix

**Table 1: Variables at T1 (N<sub>1</sub>=1152), number of items, reliability and correlations**

<i>Number of items, (Cronbach's α)</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. APPCPV	8, (.853)								
2. Compassion	<b>.543**</b>	4, (.832)							
3. Self-Sacrifice	<b>.440**</b>	<b>.428**</b>	4, (.892)						
4. IM	.114**	-0.018	.126**	3, (.868)					
5. Exhaustion	0.023	.183**	-0.039	<b>-.454**</b>	6, (.948)				
6. PSS	0.005	-.108**	.074*	<b>.440**</b>	<b>.462**</b>	3, (.895)			
7. Latent Conflicts	.093**	.138**	0.006	-.266**	<b>.377**</b>	<b>-.320**</b>	2, (.817)		
8. Self-Efficacy	0.052	.092**	-.093**	.196**	.164**	.107**	-.077*	4, (.836)	
9. AOC	-0.011	-.081**	.084**	.283**	.237**	.254**	-.176**	.064*	1
10. IQE	0.033	0.045	0.008	-.274**	<b>.342**</b>	-.290**	.246**	-.147**	-.204**
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05-level (2-tailed).									
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01-level (2-tailed).									

**Table 2: Variables at T1 (N<sub>1</sub>=1152) and T2 (N<sub>2</sub>=81), number of items, reliability of variables at T2 and correlations**

<i>Number of items, (Cronbach's α)</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. AOC1	1					
2. AOC2	.279*	6, (.881)				
3. Exhaustion1	-0.142	<b>-.395**</b>	6, (.948)			
4. Exhaustion2	-0.155	<b>-.475**</b>	<b>.689**</b>	6, (.938)		
5. IQE1	-0.180	<b>-.547**</b>	<b>.304**</b>	<b>.311**</b>	1	
6. IQE2	-0.132	<b>-.640**</b>	.286*	<b>.431**</b>	<b>.688**</b>	1
APPCPV	-0.020	-0.026	-0.062	0.076	0.015	0.084
Compassion	0.047	0.028	0.019	0.099	0.067	-0.006
Self-Sacrifice	0.089	0.079	-.255*	-0.201	-0.032	0.113
IM	<b>.368**</b>	<b>.472**</b>	<b>-.481**</b>	<b>-.450**</b>	<b>-.300**</b>	-0.216
PSS	.297**	<b>.352**</b>	<b>-.454**</b>	<b>-.356**</b>	<b>-.452**</b>	-.294*
Latent Conflicts	<b>-.324**</b>	-.299**	<b>.551**</b>	<b>.388**</b>	<b>.304**</b>	0.185
Self-Efficacy	-0.041	-0.016	-0.218	-0.092	0.04	-0.047
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05-level (2-tailed).						
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01-level (2-tailed).						

**Table 3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results: Antecedents of Intention to Quit Employer**

Dependent variable : Intention to Quit Employer						
N <sub>1</sub> =1152	Model 1 (Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : 5.7%)			Model 2 (Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = 27.2%)		
	Standardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		
	β	T	Sig.	β	t	Sig.
(Constante)		10.367	0.000		7.188	0.000
Sex	0.010	0.318	0.750	0.014	0.465	0.642
<b>Age</b>	<b>-0.214</b>	<b>-5.768</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>-0.257</b>	<b>-7.723</b>	<b>0.000</b>
Job Tenure	-0.033	-0.894	0.372	-0.056	-1.702	0.089
Type of Community	-0.090	-2.686	0.007	-0.079	-2.639	0.008
<b>Class</b>	<b>-0.090</b>	<b>-2.607</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>-0.126</b>	<b>-3.898</b>	<b>0.000</b>
Team Manager	0.022	0.639	0.523	0.041	1.356	0.175
APPCPV				0.038	1.063	0.288
Compassion				-0.013	-0.344	0.731
Self-Sacrifice				0.020	0.580	0.562
Self-Efficacy				-0.009	-0.286	0.775
<b>Exhaustion</b>				<b>0.173</b>	<b>4.801</b>	<b>0.000</b>
AOC				-0.098	-3.211	0.001
<b>IM</b>				<b>-0.143</b>	<b>-4.037</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>PSS</b>				<b>-0.171</b>	<b>-4.856</b>	<b>0.000</b>
Latent Conflicts				0.089	2.756	0.006

**Table 4: Chi-Square Tests with IQE as Dependent variable and Class as Independent variable at T1**

	Value	ddl	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.282 <sup>a</sup>	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	15.524	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.872	1	.015
N of Valid Cases	1120		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.88.