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ABSTRACT

This dissertation addresses the impact of public service motivation on the turnover intentions of federal employees. A survey measuring four types of public service motivation—attraction to policy-making, compassion, public interest, and self sacrifice—along with several traditional predictors of employee turnover was distributed to a random sample of 1,600 federal employees. The findings demonstrate significant relationships between turnover intentions and the traditional predictors of turnover but fail to demonstrate significant direct relationships between the measures of public service motivation and turnover intentions. However, the measures of public service motivation appear to indirectly affect turnover intentions through their relationship with organization commitment.

The dissertation suggests that a larger and more diverse sample of federal employees might yield different findings, as would a study that investigates the turnover intentions of state and local government workers who have more direct contact with the general public and the clientele of their public agencies.

Retention of employees will save government agencies money, resources, and knowledge talent. However, given its methodological limitations, this dissertation reveals that four popular forms of public service motivation do not predict federal employees’ intentions to turnover. Instead, organization commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit—three traditional predictors of employee turnover—are better predictors of federal employee turnover intentions.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

In the November 5, 2010 edition of the Washington Post, columnist Joe Davidson discussed the high attrition rate among new employees at many agencies in the United States government. Referring to a report released the day before from the Partnership for Public Service and Booz Allen Hamilton, the US Government “is losing too many new hires—the same talent it is working so hard to recruit and bring on board” (Partnership for Public Service, November 2010, p. 3). While Uncle Sam generally does a good job retaining employees, between 2006 and 2008, only 78.8 percent of new hires remained in their jobs in the federal government within two years of being hired (Davidson, 2010). This loss of 21.2 percent of recent hires is not only a loss of human capital but also a loss of a new generation of talent that would have otherwise helped shape the future of the federal government.

Objective

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the impact of public service motivation (PSM) on turnover intentions, while controlling for the traditional leading predictors of intent to turnover. Grounded in generativity theory public service motivation (PSM) suggests that “individuals with greater PSM are more likely (1) to be found working in government because of the opportunities it offers to provide a meaningful public service, and (2) to perform better in—and feel more satisfied with—their public sector jobs because they find this type of work intrinsically rewarding” (Wright & Grant, 2010, p. 691). Additionally, it is assumed in PSM
research that individuals with greater PSM are more likely to work in government” (Wright & Grant, 2010 p. 692) due to public service opportunities. Scholars such as Perry and Wise (1990) have “hypothesized that individuals with high levels of PSM will have significantly higher levels of job satisfaction, performance and commitment in public organizations” (Bright, 2008, p. 149). Employees high in PSM would have a more positive attitude about working for the government, and a greater commitment to their jobs as “employees display higher levels of job satisfaction, and subsequently lower turnover intentions, when the characteristics of their working environment satisfy their needs” (Bright, 2008, p. 150). However, if over one fifth of new hires in federal agencies decide to leave within two years of being hired, what is the true impact of public service motivation on intent to turnover?

**Significance**

“In most cases, staying is seen as the simple obverse of leaving” (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, & Graske, 2001, p. 97). Retention saves an organization money. Although the cost of replacing employees varies, a study by the Hay Group “found replacement costs are about 50 to 60 percent of a person’s annual salary” (Mitchell, Holtom et al., 2001, p. 97). However, these numbers vary. Seldon (2000) further asserts that through retention, public agencies can save up to two times an individual’s salary in replacement costs as well as maintain the knowledge that the individual has developed experience while on the job. Retention saves knowledge talent, the best and the brightest of the labor pool. Moreover, with Congress having enacted a two-year pay freeze and with a possible impending moratorium on the hiring of new federal employees, retaining qualified employees would assist in cutting spending and reducing the budget deficit (Partnership for Public Service & Booz Allen Hamilton, 2011).
Turnover, in turn, is associated with high costs to an organization or agency, generated from the time that an employee decides to leave. Financially, there are separation costs such as severance pay, replacement costs, which include recruiting and selecting a new employee, and training costs for the selected applicant. However, there may also be changes in production, drop in morale, and loss of customers (Tziner & Birati, 1996).

With all the research on employee turnover and retention, there is very little that explains how employees decide to remain with an organization and what variables play into that decision. Specifically, it is important to understand how public service motivation impacts this decision.

Literature Preview

Theories and Non-Empirical Accounts of the Causes of Turnover

Credited as the ancestor of all turnover theories, organizational equilibrium theory comes from the book Organizations by March and Simon (1958). Based on Bernard (1938) and Simon’s (1945) work, this theory is “essentially a theory of motivation—a statement of the conditions under which an organization can induce its members to continue their participation, and hence assure organizational survival” (March & Simon, 1958, p. 84). It emphasizes “the importance of balancing employee and organization contributions and inducements” (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008, p. 237) determined by the individual’s perceived balance of desirability and perceived ease of leaving an organization. Today, these concepts are considered job satisfaction.

Mobley (1977) polished the link between job satisfaction and eventual voluntary turnover. With his Intermediate Linkages Model, he “identified a more comprehensive
withdrawal process and shed light on the sequence of steps employees go through before turning over” (Holtom et al., 2008, p. 237). Mobley (1982) suggested the following:

Job satisfaction leads (1) to thinking about quitting, which in turnover lead (2) to evaluations for the expected utility of searching for another job and costs associated with quitting the present job. From that evaluation, (3) an intention to search for alternative job may emerge, which in turn leads to (4) the actual search for alternatives and (5) to the evaluation of the acceptability of identified alternatives. This last evaluation results in (6) comparisons of these alternatives to the present job, which in turn can lead (7) to an intention to quit and eventual turnover.

While each employee does not necessarily follow each step or complete each step in the same order, it is a “rich description of the psychological process between job satisfaction and turnover in a testable form and its elaboration of the satisfaction and alternative constructs” (Lee & Mitchell, 1994, p. 53).

Two years later, Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) “incorporated elements of the preceding models and attempted to capture the overall complexity of the turnover process” (Mobley, 1982, p. 125). The model suggested that “there are four primary determinates of the intention to quit and subsequently turnover: (1) job satisfaction-dissatisfaction; (2) expected utility of alternative internal (to the organization) work roles; (3) expected utility of external (to the organization) work roles; and (4) non-work values and contingencies” (Mobley, 1982, p. 125). The expanded very added “variables to the earlier version”; however, “job satisfaction and job alternatives remained as key constructs” (Lee & Mitchell, 1994, p. 53).

Referring to it as the Theory of Staying (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001) (Mitchell, 1982), job embeddedness “posits that the greater a person’s connections to an organization and community, the more likely it is that he or she will remain with their organization” (Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006, p. 436). The critical aspects of job embeddedness
are as follows: “(1) the extent to which people have links to other people or activities, (2) the extent to which their jobs and communities are similar to or fit with other aspects in their life spaces, and (3) the ease with which these links can be broken” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1104). “These dimensions are referred to as fit, links and sacrifice” (Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006, p. 438). Mitchell et al. (2001) and Lee et al. (1994) demonstrated that the increase of job embeddedness is likely to affect the “increase in retention… and that management should be proactive about increasing job embeddedness” (Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006, p. 446).

Maertz and Griffeth (2004) “synthesize a conceptual framework that provides a relatively comprehensive, yet parsimonious, explanation of why employees quit (and stay with) organizations” (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004, p. 668). Arguing that previous motivation process research does not “determine the employee’s level of intention to stay/quit” (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004, p. 670) they proposed eight motives or categories that guide decisions on whether to leave or stay with an organization: affective, calculative, contractual, behavioral, alternative, normative, moral/ethical, and constituent forces. As a result, Maertz and Griffeth (2004) “present a new way of looking at turnover through a lens of causal motives rather than a simplistic aggregation of significant predictors into “box and line models” (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004, p. 680).

Maertz and Griffeth’s (2004) framework included a “new direction or goal for theoretical research… to develop motive-rich decision profiles of quitting” and introduced “the first attempt to comprehensively measure turnover motives” (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004, p. 680). Their conclusions supported Hom and Griffeth’s traditional model of turnover, “summarizing, organizing, and defining the many influences of satisfaction and commitment” on turnover
(Maertz & Griffeth, 2004, p. 189) and proposed four generic turnover decision types: impulsive, comparison, preplanned, and conditional.

**Empirical Research on Turnover**

Turnover literature begins with why people leave. Despite the research, “there are few resources that effectively and comprehensively bridge scholarly evidence concerning employee retention and practitioner employee retention efforts” (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010, p. 49). Allen, Bryant and Vardaman (2010) attempted to bridge this gap by looking at the alleged reasons people leave a job: job dissatisfaction, lack of career mobility, lack of incentive, and bureaucracy (Allen et al., 2010; The Department of Civil Service & Governor's Office of Employee Relations, September 2002). Allen et al. (2010) found common misconceptions about these alleged reasons and filled the gap between science and practice by “developing an evidence-based understanding” of employee retention. They discovered that “pay level and pay satisfactions are relatively weak predictors of individual turnover decisions” (Allen et al., 2010, p. 52). Furthermore, “job dissatisfaction is the driving force in fewer than half of individual turnover decisions” (Allen et al., 2010, p. 55).

The one piece of empirical work found on turnover during initial employment is a longitudinal study of hotel room attendants. Parsons, Herold, and Leatherwood (1985) addressed early turnover and focused “on the relation between positive and negative performance outcomes, attributions of causality for performance, work satisfaction, and early turnover” (Parsons, Herold, & Leatherwood, 1985, p. 338). Using attribution theory, the authors attempted to “discover what relation, if any, there might be between an employee’s attributions and early turnover” (Parsons et al., 1985, p. 338). Attribution Theory states that “the explanation that
people tend to make to explain success or failure can be analyzed in terms of internal or external factors (we may succeed or fail because of factors that we believe have their origin within us or because of factors that originate in our environment)” (Vockell).

In a review of seven meta-analyses of employee turnover, the same explanatory variables are assessed repeatedly. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) reviewed over 120 data sets concerning turnover and indicated that twenty-six variables related to turnover, which they then classified as external correlates, work-related correlates, and personal correlates.

- External correlates included employment perceptions, unemployment rate, accession rate, and union presence. Only two of the four correlates, employment perceptions and union presence, were found to be “reliably related to turnover” (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986, p. 60).
- Work-related correlates consisted of pay, job performance, role clarity, task repetitiveness, overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with work itself, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with promotional opportunities and organizational commitment. Many of the work-related correlates were found to be highly reliable, with the weakest being role clarity, job performance, and the measures of satisfaction found to be negatively related to turnover.
- Personal correlates included age, tenure, gender, biographical information, education, marital status, number of dependents, aptitude and ability, intelligence, behavioral intentions, and met expectations. The strongest personal correlates were found to be age, tenure, education, number of dependents, biographical information, met expectations and behavioral intentions. Men and married persons were less likely to quit than women and unmarried persons.
Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) reviewed and updated their previous work (1995) and extended Cotton and Tuttle’s (1986) work in what was referred to as “a final review of turnover research conducted in the 20th century” (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000, p. 463). Searching through articles of the 1990’s for turnover, rather than quit intentions, the sample number was based on the sample found for each predictor-turnover relationship. In eleven tables, Griffeth et al. grouped the correlates into various categories: demographic, job satisfaction, organization factors and work environment, job content and external environment, other behavioral predictors, cognitions and behaviors about the withdrawal process, moderatos that refer to demographics, turnover measurement, workplace characteristics, moderatos that refer to predictor measurement properties, age-turnover and tenure-turnover relationships, pay-turnover and performance-turnover relationships, relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, and relationship between quit intentions and turnover.

According to Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski and Erez (2001), job embeddedness and organizational commitment are the two most frequently tested attitudinal constructs. Job embeddedness was a new construct developed by Mitchell et al. (2001), and differed in definition from organizational commitment. Job embeddedness aspects include “(1) the extent to which people have links to other people or activities, (2) the extent to which their jobs and communities are similar to or fit with the other aspects in their life spaces, and, (3) the ease with which links can be broken” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1104). Organizational commitment “is concerned with organizational issues” and “is more affect driven” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1106) than job embeddedness.
Mitchell et al. (2001) found initial support for job embeddedness, which predicted the “key outcomes of both intent to leave and “voluntary turnover” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1102). Four hypotheses were proven: “1) people who are embedded in their jobs have less intent to leave and do not leave as readily as those who are not embedded; 2) job embeddedness add to the prediction of turnover attributable to standard measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment; 3) job embeddedness is attributable to perceived job alternatives and job search behaviors; and 4) job embeddedness assesses new and meaningful variance in turnover that is in excess of that predicted by the major variables included in almost all major models of turnover” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1116).

The New York State Department of Civil Service 2002 Report on Employee Retention shared the sentiments of New York state public servants on what made them consider leaving. Using focus groups to gather information, the Employee Retention Workgroup surveyed New York state employees on topic such as existing retention efforts, reasons for resignation, and ideas for future retention strategies. When asked “What makes you think about leaving government?” the most common responses were low salary, career mobility issues, extensive length of time to earn a promotion, and too much bureaucracy (The Department of Civil Service & Governor's Office of Employee Relations, September 2002, p. 7).

Donnelly and Quirin (2006) extended Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) decision process-based unfolding model of voluntary turnover by sampling voluntary “quitters” and “stayers.” The results “provide evidence of important differences between these two groups that can assist future researchers investigating the concept of turnover” (Donnelly & Quirin, 2006, p. 72). Several results are particularly noteworthy economic consequences play an important role in the
decision process there is a greater likelihood of turnover when a shock event (such as death, pregnancy, layoffs, and mergers) initiates the process; and women are more likely to experience shock events (pregnancy and childbirth). The sample consisted of accountants; however, Donnelly and Quirin stated that accounts were similar to United States Naval personnel.

What appears to be one of the most comprehensive works on the past, present, and future research in turnover and retention is by Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, and Eberly (2008) in a volume of The Academy of Management Annals. Not only do Holtom et al. explain the importance of research in voluntary turnover but they also illustrate the fruition of the research and emphasize recent trends and suggestions for future research. Touching on variables that may explain why an employee may choose to leave an organization, they found that voluntary turnover has been “pretty well studied” (Holtom et al., 2008, p. 264). However, it is “less clear exactly what people are leaving and what they are choosing to stay with” (Holtom et al., 2008, p. 264).

The research on employee turnover has come a long way since Simon and March (1958), who “identified the turnover decision process as primarily attitude-driven.” However, research tends to focus on the theories, causes, and prevention of turnover. Maertz and Griffeth, Maertz and Campion, Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski and Erez, and Donnelly and Quirin are among the few that focus not only on retention but on the decision process behind it (Donnelly & Quirin, 2006) (Maertz, 2004; Maertz & Campion, 2004; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004)(Mitchell et al., 2001).

In summation, the most common findings from the empirical research indicate that pay, marital status, female gender, organization commitment, and person-organization fit are the most consistent predictors of employee intent to turnover. These variables will serve as the control
variables as this dissertation investigates the relationship between public service motivation and turnover intentions.

Theories and Non-Empirical Accounts of Public Service Motivation

Public service motivation has been the focus of Indiana University’s James Perry for several decades. Perry and Potter (1982) used a comparative framework “to assess the present understanding of the motivational context in public organizations” (Perry & Porter, 1982, p. 89). Using a classification system developed by Porter and Miles (1974), they identified “four major categories of variables that influence motivation: (1) individual characteristics, (2) job characteristics, (3) work environment characteristics, and (4) external environment characteristics” (Perry & Porter, 1982, p. 89). These four variables must be “changed or modified” if motivation is to be affected. Perry and Porter concluded that “the literature on motivation tends to concentrate too heavily on employees within industrial and business organizations” and that “with approximately 20 percent of the American work force employed in the public sector, it clearly is important to develop better insights about what accounts for motivational variance in public organizations” (Perry & Porter, 1982, p. 97).

Perry and Wise (1990) discussed the recent decline of public trust and confidence in the government to “do what is right” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 367). They “seek to clarify the nature of public service motivation and to identify and evaluate research related to its effects on public employee behavior” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368). In their words, public service motivation “may be understood as an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368). Rational motives of public service motivation consist of: participation in the process of policy
formulation, commitment to a public program because of personal identification with the
program, and advocacy for a special interest. Norm-based motives consist of: a desire to serve
the public interest, loyalty to duty and to the government as a whole, and social equity. Affective
motives consist of: commitment to a program (which may emanate) from a genuine conviction
about its social importance, and patriotism of benevolence. In the end, Perry and Wise found
that “some of the potential behavioral implications of public service motivation can be
summarized in propositional form” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 370) of which there were three:

- The greater an individual’s public service motivation, the more likely the
  individual will seek membership in a public organization.
- In public organizations, public service motivation is positively related to
  individual performance.
- Public organizations that attract members with high levels of public service
  motivation are likely to be less dependent on utilitarian incentives to manage
  individual performance effectively.

In his 2000 article, Perry acknowledged the increase of public service motivation
research in the last decade. After critiquing the research, he began “the identification of an
alternate theory of motivation by defining some foundational premises” that will direct “our
attention about motivation toward a more inclusive perspective” (Perry, 2000, p. 474). The
premises, which “help frame the possibilities for a theory of work motivation that better explains
behavior in many public and non-profit agencies” (Perry, 2000, p. 474) are:

- Premise 1. Rational, normative, and affected processes motivate humans.
- Premise 2. People are motivated by their self-concepts.
Premise 3. Preferences or values should be endogenous to any theory of motivation.

Premise 4. Preferences are learned in social processes.

Perry then presents a process theory of public service motivation, where “embedded in the logic of the exhibit is Bandura’s conception of reciprocal cause relationships among three factors—environmental influences, cognitive and other personal factors, and behaviors—that he (Bandura) calls triadic reciprocal determinism” (Perry, 2000, p. 478). In the end, Perry concludes that “formalization of a theory of public service motivation is of both practical and scholarly importance” (Perry, 2000, p. 485).

In sum, public service motivation theory has come to the consensus that those with a higher PSM are more likely to work in the public sector. These people are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, which “emphasizes pleasure and enjoyment as drivers of efforts” as well as prosocially motivated, which “emphasizes meaning and purpose as drivers of efforts” (Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010, p. 2). Therefore, these same people are more likely to be more committed to their organization and less likely to decide to leave.

**Empirical Research on Public Service Motivation**

Perry (1996) created a scale that measured public service motivation in an attempt to “translate the theory about public service motivation into a measurement scale to facilitate research” (Perry, 1996, p. 8). In designing the scale, there were several important considerations: (1) construct validity; (2) unidimensionality of the component constructs; and (3) parsimony. A five-point Likert scale, ranging from agrees to disagree was used to measure each of the six dimensions: attraction to policy making, commitment to the public interest, social
justice, civic duty, compassion, and self-sacrifice. Perry’s results “indicated that public service motivation is less complex than it is portrayed in the literature” (Perry, 1996, p. 20), and suggests “some areas for potential refinement of the public service motivation scale” (Perry, 1996, p. 20). Finally, this study “advances a means to measure public service motivation. Based on the developmental process and statistical analysis, the PSM scale presented here has a good overall face and construct validity, discriminate validity among four component dimensions, and high reliability” (Perry, 1996, p. 21).

Naff and Crum (1999) used Perry’s scale to “examine the relationship between public service motivation and federal employees’ attitudes and behavior by examining responses of nearly 10,000 federal employees to a recent survey” (Naff & Crum, 1999, p. 5). They responded to Perry and Wise’s (1990) call to “test their proposition” that there is a “positive relationship between public service motivation and public sector employees’ job performance, commitment and retention” (Naff & Crum, 1999, p. 6). Summing up the responses to the six items taken from Perry’s scale, Naff and Crum examined “the relationship between PSM and performance, job satisfaction, retention, and support for government reinventions by analyzing the responses of nearly 10,000 federal employees to the MSPB’s 1996 Merit Principles Survey” (Naff & Crum, 1999, p. 8). What they found was that their research “provided substantial evidence of construct validity for the concept of PSM” and that a “statistically significant relationship between a PSM scale… and attitudes towards employment with the federal government—namely, job satisfaction, job performance, and receptiveness to government reinvention efforts” (Naff & Crum, 1999, p. 14) was demonstrated. Most importantly, they found a significant negative relationship between PSM and thoughts about leaving the government.
Perry, Mesch, and Paarlberg (2006) “summarize what the voluminous body of social and behavioral science tells us about motivation human performance in public, private, and nonprofit organizations” (Perry, Mesch, & Parrlberg, 2006, p. 505). After their review of 2,612 research articles, they defined a conceptual model “exclusively in terms of motivational factors and programs leading to specific behavioral outcomes” as well as “identified thirteen broad propositions for practitioners to ponder and for researchers to test and further refine regarding the impact of financial incentives, job design, participation, and goal setting on employee and organizational performance in the contemporary administrative state” (Perry et al., , p. 505). Perry et al. (2006) concluded with four observations: (1) their “analysis indicates that we know more about human performance than we historically recognized, (2) we are cautiously optimistic that the generalizations about motivation derived from our review of reviews can be applied in a transformed public sector, (3) we still have a lot to learn about motivation human performance, and (4) we want to appeal to public managers and scholars to significantly contribute to the expansions of our knowledge about performance in public organizations.”

Bertelli (2007) examined the determinants of turnover intention in government service. He states that “part of public employees’ satisfaction with and attachment to their jobs seems tied to a notion of public service motivation” and “through motivation toward public service most probably contributes to turnover intention, it is also likely imbedded in the intrinsic motivation of bureaucrats toward and satisfaction with the jobs they hold” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 236). Using the Department of the Treasury, he generated “a statistical measure of functional preference…using six questions from the 2002 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) for two related concepts from organizational psychology, job involvement and intrinsic motivation (collectively JIM)”
Bertelli measured PSM as intrinsic motivation. He found that PSM is among “highly desirable traits in committed employees” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 254).

Camilleri and Van Der Heijden (2007) looked at the effects of Perry’s (1996) measures of PSM on the performance of 3,400 Maltese public offices. They found a positive association between PSM and performance measures as supervisor rating of performance, self ratings of performance, and pay and promotions as informal measures of performance.

Most recently, Perry, Hondeghem and Wise (2010) answered the question, “How has research regarding public service motivation evolved since James L. Perry and Lois Recascino Wise (1990) published their essay…twenty years ago?” After Perry et al. (2010) reviewed the “evolving definitions of public service motivation (PSM), including operational definitions used to measure the construct,” they answered the question, “What have we learned from public service motivation research?” They confirmed Crewson’s (1997) empirical link between PSM “to higher organizational commitment and lower turnover” (Perry et al., 2010, p. 683). Naff and Crum’s (1999) finding of a “positive association between PSM and intent to remain” was supported, as well as Steijn’s (2008) study which “showed that workers with high PSM fit were more satisfied and less inclined to leave their jobs and the organization” (Perry et al., 2010, p. 683).

In summation, there is little literature and research that specifically states that a person with a high level of public service motivation is less likely to leave an organization. However, research does show that part of public employees’ satisfaction with and attachment to their jobs seems tied to a notion of public service motivation, and Naff and Crum (1999) found that PSM was associated with intent to remain in agencies. Though motivation towards public service
probably contributes to turnover intention, it is also likely to be embedded in the intrinsic motivation of bureaucrats toward and satisfaction with the jobs they hold” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 236). Camilleri and Van Der Heijden’s (2007) research, however, reveals significant relationships between PSM and performance. Moreover, research demonstrates a “statistically significant relationship(s) between a PSM scale based from merely a subset of the items developed by Perry (1996) and attitudes towards employment with the federal government—namely, job satisfaction, job performance, thoughts about leaving government, and receptiveness to government reinvention efforts” (Naff & Crum, 1999).

**Proposed Theory**

This dissertation explains the relationship between public service motivation and turnover intentions through generativity theory. Introduced by Erik Erikson in 1959, generativity theory refers to the desire that many people have to contribute to the next generation. Erikson found that “aging during the midlife period is a time when humans have a strong need to expand ego interests beyond the self and to become a guider or contributor to succeeding generations” (Calo, 2007, p. 387). “The adult nurtures, teaches, leads, and promotes the next generation while generating life products and outcomes that benefit the social system and promotes the next generation while generating life products and outcomes that benefit the social system and promote its continuity from one generation to the next” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1003). Erikson also realized that people can be generative in a wide variety of life endeavors and settings such as “in work life and professional activities, volunteer endeavors, participation in religious and political organizations, neighborhood and community activism, friendships, and even one’s leisure time activities” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1003).
Various researchers have determined that “individuals with greater PSM are more likely to work in government” (Wright & Grant, 2010, p. 692), and that “individuals with high levels of PSM will have significantly higher levels of . . . [job] commitment in public organizations” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 371). This dissertation hypothesizes that people with high public service motivation have a desire for generativity that includes long-term commitments to causes that have meaningful and significant impacts on current and future generations. That is, generativity desires that are at the foundation of public service motivation inhibit employee intentions to leave worthy causes through turning over.

**Hypotheses Preview**

The preceding theory and research lead to the following hypotheses that this dissertation tests:

\[H1: \text{Public service motivation, defined as attraction to policy making, is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.}\]

\[H2: \text{Public service motivation, defined as “desire to serve the public interest” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368), is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.}\]

\[H3: \text{Public service motivation, defined as “advocacy for a special interest” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.}\]

\[H4: \text{Public service motivation, defined as “personal identification” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.}\]
H5: Public service motivation, defined as “program commitment” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368), is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H6: Public service motivation, defined as service that involves “loyalty to duty” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 369), is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H7: Public service motivation, defined as “loyalty to government as a whole” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 369), is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H8: Public service motivation, defined as “enhancing social equity” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 370) is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H9: Public service motivation, defined as “patriotism of benevolence” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 369), is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

Based on the findings from previous research, the dissertation controls for the effects on employees turnover intentions of gender, organization commitment, person-organization fit, and job satisfaction. The dissertation specifically hypothesizes that:

H10: Female gender is positively correlated with intent to turnover.

H11: Organization commitment is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H12: Person-Organization fit is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.

H13: Job-Satisfaction is negatively correlated with intent to turnover.
Methods

To test the hypotheses, data were gathered through an online survey at www.qualtrics.com. An online survey was the most cost-effective manner to obtain the data as there was no cost for postage or mailing materials. Furthermore, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, May 22, 1995) and as an attempt to streamline the process, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) uses web-based (electronic) surveys for their own data collection. Focusing on “execution, oversight, and transparency” and in an attempt to reduce “waste and inefficiency,” the federal government has increased computer usage, and e-mail is readily available to federal employees (Kundra, 2010, p. 31).

The survey was sent to a sample of 1,652 federal employees that was randomly selected from the Federal Staff Directory 2011/Winter. The survey borrows from Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire to measure organizational commitment, O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell’s (1991) Organizational Culture Profile to measure person-organization fit, Bright’s (2008, p. 156) measure of job satisfaction, and Perry’s (1996) measures for public service motivation. Variables operationalized as hypothetical constructs including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-organization fit, public service motivation, and intent to turnover were measured using a five-point Likert Scale response options. These variables were tested for reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha. Individual hypotheses were tested using Pearson Correlations and analysis of variance and explanatory value of all of the independent variables were tested through multiple regressions.
Contribution to the Field

Numerous studies over the past several decades have investigated the impact of employee turnover on the public and/or private sector, as well as the causes of employee turnover. Research has examined turnover in specific occupations, such as nurses, teachers, state government employee, and sales. Research has also examined turnover intention, why people leave a position, and the steps leading up to the decision. Little research has been found, however, that investigates the relationship between various types of public service motivation on the intent of employees to turnover. Specifically, research has not addressed the impact of the following types of public service motivation on the intent of employees to turnover: policy formulation, personal identification with program, special interest, desire to serve the public, a sense of duty, “patriotism of benevolence”, program commitment, and social equity. Moreover, it appears that no research on the impact of public service motivation on intentions of new federal employees to turnover has been conducted.

Again, there is a great deal of research explaining why people leave, and this research has been beneficial in changing or modifying the environment of the workplace, as well as management strategies, in order to lower the turnover rates. Findings from this study may reveal relationships that have not been considered in earlier research. Given that the percentage of new hire employees who leave the federal government within the first two years of employment is almost 25 percent, these findings may help in lowering that number and saving the government money that is currently lost in training, wages and replacement costs, as well as help in maintaining employee morale, production, and knowledge talent.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature presented in this chapter represents relatively recent literature, as research on turnover and intent to turnover is still fairly new in the field of public administration. This chapter presents a review of the literature on the causes of turnover, public sector turnover, and turnover intentions, the relationship between the control variables and turnover intentions, and generativity theory.

Review and Meta-Analysis of the Empirical Research on the Causes of Turnover

One of the first reviews of turnover literature, which contained literature through 1954, was conducted by Brayfield and Crockett (1955). As a way of organizing the literature, one of the schemes they adopted was based on Katz and Kahn’s (1952) suggestion to distinguish between studies involving performance on the job and studies involving withdrawal through absences, accidents, and turnover (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955). While the article focused primarily on employee attitudes and performance, a small section consisting of five articles was devoted to an analysis of withdrawal from the job in terms of “absence, tardiness, by accidents (under one assumption), and by turnover” (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955, p. 405). The authors concluded that the data was “suggestive mainly of a relation between attitudes and the two forms of withdrawal from the job—turnover and absenteeism” (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955, p. 408).

In 1957, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell wondered if attitudes of workers affect their tendency to leave jobs. It was determined that “the problems of turnover and
absenteeism may be discussed together since in some respects the small decision which is taken when the worker absents himself is a miniature version of the important decisions he makes when he quits his job” (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957, p. 103). In a review of twenty-four articles, Herzberg et al. (Herzberg et al., 1957, p. 105) found that twenty-one report that employees with positive attitudes have less avoidable severances than employees with negative attitudes. Negative attitudes that cause turnover were “identified in various studies as dissatisfaction, low morale, job monotony, a feeling that the job had a low social status, and conditions which made the formations of work groups difficult” (Herzberg et al., 1957, p. 106).

Vroom (Vroom, 1964, p. 175) reasoned that “the more satisfied a worker, the stronger the force on him to remain in his job and the less the probability of his leaving involuntarily.” He tested this hypothesis by “determining if the same conditions are associated with measures of turnover as are associated with measures of satisfaction,” . . . or determining what “measures of satisfaction are related to turnover” (Vroom, 1964, p. 175). By examining “seven studies dealing with the satisfaction-turnover relationship” (Vroom, 1964, p. 176), he found that, while four used individuals as the unit of analysis and three used groups, “all indicated the expected negative relationship between satisfaction and turnover, although the magnitude and significance of this relationship varies considerably from study to study” (Vroom, 1964, p. 176). Vroom, however, concluded the following:

It seems reasonable to assume that simultaneous measurement of the valence of one’s present positions (i.e., job satisfaction), the valence of other positions, and the expectancy that these other positions can be attained would yield a better prediction of the outcomes of an individual’s decision to stay or resign from his job than would measurements of job satisfaction alone (Vroom, 1964, p. 178).
Porter and Steers (1973, p. 151) examined “research carried out over the past 10-12 years concerning factors related to turnover and absenteeism in work situations.” It has already been determined in earlier research that “overall job satisfaction was found to be consistently and inversely related to turnover” (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 151). They proposed to provide “a review that (a) comprehensively covers the most recent research on the topic; (b) relates the research findings in a systematic fashion to the organizational and working environment; and (c) attempts to provide a basic conceptual framework for viewing the findings” (Porter and Steers, 1973, p. 152).

It was found that the more recent literature on “the impact of job satisfaction on withdrawal (especially turnover) is generally consistent with the findings as reviewed by Brayfield and Crockett (1955); Herzberg Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957); and Vroom (1964)” (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 154). The major difference was that the more recent research “increased the methodological rigor over those studies,” . . . which would “go a long way in the direction of providing increased confidence in the importance of job satisfaction” in explaining turnover (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 154). The results of their research further showed “that a multiplicity of organizational, work, and personal factors can be associated with the decision to withdraw” (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 167). Furthermore, “these trends have been demonstrated among a diversity of work group populations and in organizations of various types and sizes” (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 167). “Evidence exists to conclude that important influences on turnover can be found” in the following four general categories proposed by (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 167): Variables related to turnover that are organization-wide in their derivation, such as pay and promotion policies, which tend to be negatively related to turnover.
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- Variables related to turnover that are found in the immediate work groups, such as unit size, supervision, and co-worker relations. Unit size has either a positive impact of no impact on turnover; whereas supervision and co-worker relations tend to have a negative impact on turnover.

- Variables found in the context of the job, such as the nature of the job requirements. Job satisfaction, job autonomy, and role clarity tend to have a negative impact on turnover; task repetitiveness tends to be either positively related to or has no impact on turnover.

- Variables centered on the individual person, such as age and tenure, both of which have been shown to be positively related, negatively related, or not related to turnover.

Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979, p. 496) presented “a conceptual model of the individual-level employee turnover process that is consistent with the research literature.” While a number of articles were reviewed, many of these “dealt with only a small subset of the variables potentially relevant to turnover” (Mobley et al., 1979, p. 512). They found that personal characteristics, such as age, tenure, similarity of job with vocational interests, personality, family size and responsibility, gender, and education tended to have a negative relationship with turnover. However, gender and education were often inconclusive, and family size and responsibility were positive for women and inconclusive for men. Overall job satisfaction consistently had a negative relationship with turnover; whereas organizational and job characteristics tended to have a negative or inconclusive relationship with turnover. The results suggested that “moderating influences, especially non-work values and interests and non-work consequences of turnover behavior, call attention to the need to look
beyond the work setting for a complete understanding of the psychology of the turnover process” (Mobley et al., 1979, p. 520).

Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) critically reviewed the past fifty years of employee turnover research, which included research by Brayfield and Crockett (1955); Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957); Vroom (1964); and Porter and Steers (1973). They found the Porter and Steers (1973) research to be the “best in terms of overall quality published to date” (Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979, p. 43) but pointed out that a large number of studies had been produced in the intervening five years. First, they reduced the number of studies to a manageable level by using “five categories to summarize previous research: attitudinal (job satisfaction), biodata, personal, work-related, and test score predictors” (Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979, p. 44). After their review of approximately 150 studies, several conclusions became clear:

- Turnover is a predictable criterion.
- Organizations could reduce employee turnover by “providing prospective employees with a preview of what the job will entail in terms of tasks and responsibilities” (Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979, p. 64).
- Evidence supported “the Porter and Steers (1978) proposition for explaining individual employee turnover” . . . with “a theoretical basis for explaining turnover built upon the notion of met expectations of employees” (Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979, p. 64).

Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) suggested the following directions for future research on the causes of turnover: (1) a behavioral intention approach should be considered, as not all employee turnover is due to satisfaction at work but based on the economic or social factors of
the employee; and (2) more attention needs to be paid to the predictive capacity of demographics, such as gender or race.

A review of seven meta-analysis of employee turnover reveals that the same predictors of turnover are tested repeatedly. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) reviewed over 120 data sets concerning turnover and indicated that twenty-six variables predicted turnover, which they then categorized as external correlates, work-related correlates, and personal correlates. The predictors in these categories are as follows:

- External correlates, such as employment perceptions and union presence were found to be “reliably related to turnover” (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986, p. 60).
- The strongest work-related correlates consisted of pay, job performance, task repetitiveness, overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with work itself, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with promotional opportunities and organizational commitment. Task repetitiveness was the only correlate found to have a positive relationship with turnover.
- The strongest personal correlates were found to be age, tenure, education, number of dependents, biographical information, met expectations, and behavior intentions. Men and married persons were less likely to quit than women and unmarried persons.

Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (Griffeth et al., 2000, p. 463) reviewed and updated their previous work extending Cotton and Tuttle’s (1986) work in what was referred to as “a final review of turnover research conducted in the 20th century”. Griffeth et al. (2000) grouped the correlates of turnover into eleven categories: demographics, job satisfaction, organization factor and work environment, job content and external environment, other behavioral predictors, cognitions and behaviors about the withdrawal process, moderates that refer to demographics,
workplace characteristics, moderators that refer to predictor measurement properties, age-
turnover and tenure-turnover relationships, pay-turnover and performance relationships, the
relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, and the relationship between quit
intentions and turnover. Their major findings are as follows:

- **Personal Characteristics.** There is hardly any correlation between cognitive ability
  and turnover; women’s quit rates are similar to men’s; educated women resemble men
  in turnover rate and pattern; there is no relationship between race and turnover, but
  “racial effects on turnover may depend on the type of racial minority (minorities might
  vary in their quit propensity) and demographic composition of the work group (racial
  minorities are prone to exit when they are underrepresented in work groups” (Griffeth et

- **Satisfaction with Overall Job and Job Facets.** “Various job attitudes modestly
  predicted turnover, with overall job satisfaction being the best predictors. Work
  satisfaction displayed the highest relationship to turnover among all kinds of
  satisfaction facets” (Griffeth et al., 2000, p. 479).

- **Other Dimensions of Work Experience.** Leader-member exchange, participative
  management, promotional chances, work group cohesion, role stress, pay, pay
  satisfaction, distributive justice, and job scope maintain negative effects on turnover.

- **External Environmental Factors.** Efficacy of perceived alternatives continues to
  modestly predict turnover (Hom and Griffeth, 1995). “A complex scale assessing
  respondents subjective comparison of alternatives to their present position predicted
  turnover slightly better than did more simplistic perceived-alternative measures”
  (Griffeth et al., 2000, p. 480).
➢ **Behavioral Predictors.** There is a negative relationship in the performance-relationship, which says that “high performers are less likely to quit than low performers” (Griffeth et al., 2000, p. 480).

➢ **Cognitions and Behaviors about the Withdrawal Process.** Organizational commitment predicts turnover better than overall job satisfaction does, while quit intentions remain the best predictor, outpredicting withdrawal cognitions.

**Review of Literature on Public Sector Turnover**

Koch and Steers (1978) designed a study to “provide information pertinent to the following research needs: (1) to examine the relative predictive powers of job attachment and job satisfaction with respect to turnover among public employees; (2) to examine the major factors that influence attachment and satisfaction; and (3) based on these results, to contribute toward model building efforts concerning the process by which turnover-relevant attitudes are formed” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 119). It was assumed that job satisfaction and attachment were related to turnover, but Koch and Steers (1978) hypothesized that there was a stronger relationship with job attachment (as a behavioral intention). It was their belief that job attachment was “seen as a somewhat more stable response by employees to the overall job situation, including its perceived merits relative to other job and life opportunities” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 120).

The study was carried out by interviewing a total of 77 subjects in a diverse “sample of non-managerial, entry-level employees in three public sector agencies” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 121). Job attachment was measured using a four-item scale “concerning the extent to which they identified with and were attached to the particular jobs they held” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 122). Job satisfaction was measured using “all five facets of the Job Descriptive Index” (Koch &
Steers, 1978, p. 122) by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1996). Job characteristics were measured through an instrument designed by Turner and Lawrence (1954) that was modified for interviews by Sheppard and Herrick (1996). It included sub-measures of autonomy, variety, and responsibility, as well as questions eliciting the respondents’ age, education, gender, salary, and tenure.

A number of conclusions were “drawn that have implications for understanding vocational behavior among entry-level public sector employees” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 126). Attachment “was found to be a better predictor of turnover than overall satisfaction or any other facet of satisfaction” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 126). This may explain why many employees remain on the job when they are unhappy with their position. An explanation could be the difference between job satisfaction, which “focuses on affective responses by subjects to job stimuli” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 126), and job attachment, which “reflects both attitudinal responses to one’s job and attitudes toward remaining or seeking alternative employment” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 126). Furthermore, the “major impetus for attachment in the study stemmed from the individual’s age and education” (Koch & Steers, 1978, p. 126) and not from the job itself. The characteristics of the job strongly influenced job satisfaction.

William Boys (1980), the Director of Personnel for the Stats of Illinois, wrote a very brief article on unique turnover causes that may not exist in the private sector. After admitting that there are many common factors, such as increased costs for processing, replacement, and training, he proposed three significant factors which are “not substantial factors in the private sector” (Boys, 1980, p. 56):

- First, there is “a uniqueness of certain public sector positions” (Boys, 1980, p. 56). For example, there are positions in the public sector that have no counterpart in the private sector.
sector, such as corrections officers in state penal institutions, which are characterized by emotional and physical demands, personal risk, relatively low status, and moderate to low pay.

- Second is the continuity in organization leadership in the public sector. “Because the political process provider for the frequent change of administrations, public agency programs and priorities sometimes change rapidly and unexpectedly” (Boys, 1980, p. 57). While the effects of these changes cannot be measured, it “is certain to have destabilizing effects in some public sector environments” (Boys, 1980, p. 57). It is assumed that the private sector does not experience the instability, anxiety, inconsistency, and frequent changes of the public sector due to the political process.

- Finally is the condition of resource availability. In the public sector, resources are determined by the budget set by the legislative branch. In the private sector, the head of the organization is not restricted by such a financial limit. If found to have insufficient funds, a private entity can divert funds or enact a price increase; whereas the public sector may need to adjust benefits, salaries, and personnel accordingly, which may result in turnover.

Borjas (1982) presented an empirical analysis of labor turnover in the federal bureaucracy of the United States. The Central Personnel Data File (CPDF) complied by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) used in the research was “composed of a 1 percent random sample from personnel records in the eight largest agencies and a 10 percent random sample from all other agencies” (Borjas, 1982, p. 192). The sample was restricted to “white males classified as permanent, full-time civilian bureaucrats working in the United States” (Borjas, 1982, p. 192). He found that “in order to understand labor mobility out of the federal
government, it is crucial to know not only the individual’s wage rate in the federal agency but also his available opportunities in the private sector” (Borjas, 1982, p. 195). Moreover, it was revealed that “high wage bureaucrats in ‘politically important’ agencies do find attractive opportunities in the private sector and are therefore characterized by high turnover probabilities” (Borjas, 1982, p. 188). Finally, it was revealed that:

the quit probability declines with federal job experience (JOB). The traditional explanation of this effect is that job tenure is correlated with the volume of specific training accumulated by the worker so that, in a sense, there is a better job match between employer and employee (Borjas, 1982, p. 195).

Black, Moffitt, and Warner (1990, p. 245) developed a “multiperiod quit probability model to examine the dynamics of job separation” from the federal government. The objective was to (1) enhance the “understanding of the retention behavior of government employees” and (2) focus “on the strong negative correlation between quit rates and job tenure” (Black, Moffitt, & Warner, 1990, p. 245). They found that compensation policies, as well as labor market conditions, personal attributes, and job characteristics, have an effect on employee retention and individual quit intentions.

Kellough and Osuna (1995) examined “the relationship between agency quit rates and a number of variables identified in the literature as significant determinants of employee turnover” (Kellough & Osuna, 1995). The quit rate data was obtained from OPM for the calendar years of 1986, 1988, 1990, and 1992, which totaled 164 observations, and illustrated rates from “a minimum of 0.3 percent at the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1986 to a maximum of 26.5 percent at the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation in 1988” (Kellough & Osuna, 1995). The following five variables that were examined revealed a statistically significant relationship with agency quit rates:
➢ The proportion of an agency’s work force that is young (i.e., 31 years of age or less).
➢ The “proportion of the agency work force comprised of clerical workers.
➢ Agency Size.
➢ Union strength.
➢ Temporary employment.

Using CPDF and the 2004 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) data involving 150,000 employee responses from 67 federal sub-agencies, Choi (2008, p. 621) found “Organizational tenure has only a marginally significant effect on the relationship between age diversity and turnover intention of employees.”

Chan Su Jung (2010) expanded “the level of analysis on turnover in public administration, especially in the U.S. federal government, from the individual level to the organizational level by using organizational actual turnover rates” (Jung, 2010, p. 297). To measure actual turnover rates, he used the 2007 “Separations” data for federal employees provided on the OPM website. Based on data from 176 agencies, “the “Separations” data provided the actual number of employees leaving government service, including “transfer-outs,” “quits,” and “retirements,” that had taken place during the 2007 fiscal year. The turnover rates are calculated by dividing the total number of separations by the total number of full-time employees in an agency (Jung, 2010, p. 303).

Jung (2010, p. 309) findings “support three out of seven hypotheses” related to goal ambiguity, pay satisfaction, and diversity policy satisfaction. His findings predicted that “goal ambiguity perceptions of employees at the agency level would relate positively to organization actual turnover rate” (Jung, 2010, p. 309). This means that the goal-setting capacity of agendas influences employee’s decisions to leave their agencies. He also found a “strongly negative
relationship between the aggregated levels of employees’ pay satisfaction in federal agencies and their organizational actual turnover rates. Federal agencies with higher overall employee pay satisfaction report a lower number of actual turnovers in proportion to the number of full-time employees” (Jung, 2010, pp. 309-310). Finally, he confirmed that: organizational levels of satisfaction with diversity policy would be a significant predictor of organizational actual turnover rates. That is, federal agencies in which overall employees feel more positively about the diversity policy in the organizations report lower levels of actual turnover rates (Jung, 2010, p. 310).

Review of Literature on Turnover Intention

Maertz and Campion (2004, p. 566) acknowledge that “voluntary employee turnover” is one of the most studied management behaviors but that “little research has focused on whether different motives systematically relate to different types of decision processes.” They “proposed seven hypotheses that compare the four generic decision types to one another in terms of the likelihood that a user will have high or low levels of different motive forces at the time of a final decision to quit” (Maertz & Campion, 2004, p. 571). The four generic decisions are impulsive quitters who leave with no alternative in hand; comparison quitters who have available employment alternatives that are a central motivation factor; preplanned quitters who make definite plans in advance of leaving, such as pregnancy, family care giving, and relocation plans; and conditional quitters who have made conditional plans to quit if something bad happens.

In an attempt to develop “content-rich decision profiles which would provide a much deeper and more detailed understanding of the voluntary turnover process,” (Maertz & Campion, 2004, p. 578) approached a sample of 159 respondents from various mid-western cities and occupations for an interview. Two measurements were used. The first determined “the generic
decision type a respondent had used” (Maertz & Campion, 2004, p. 574), and second was a follow up survey. The results showed that:

Six of the seven hypotheses were at least partially supported, indicating that different turnover motive forces are systematically related to the four decision process types. Specifically, at the time they decided to quit, impulsive quitters had stronger negative effect than comparison quitters and preplanned quitters. Conditional quitters had lower contractual and constituent quitters had higher attraction to alternative jobs than preplanned quitters and impulsive quitters. Conditional quitters had lower calculative attachment than the other tree decision types. Finally, preplanned quitting was found to be less avoidable, and therefore less manageable than the other types (Maertz & Campion, 2004, p. 574).

Bertelli (2006) looked at what accounts for turnover intention. Focusing on the Department of Treasury and using six responses from the 2002 FHCS, a statistical measure of functional preference was generated, and five hypotheses were developed:

\[ H1: \text{Positive perceptions of performance enhancing rewards decreases the intent to turnover} \] (Bertelli, 2007, p. 239).

\[ H2: \text{Both friendships and production solidarity are negatively associated with turnover intentions} \] (Bertelli, 2007, p. 244).

\[ H3: \text{Dissatisfaction with pay is positively associated with turnover intentions} \] (Bertelli, 2007, p. 245).

\[ H4: \text{Employee burnout is positively associated with turnover intentions} \] (Bertelli, 2007, p. 245).

\[ H5: \text{Positive perceptions of the quality of management decreases employee intentions to turnover} \] (Bertelli, 2007, p. 246).

H1 was supported, “though it is weak in magnitude and significance level” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 249). The findings show that rewards cause a weakly significant decrease in the likelihood that employees will consider leaving their jobs. Friendship solidarity (H2) had an
impact on turnover intention. “Minimal satisfaction with the friendliness of a workgroup is associated with the likelihood of turnover intention, whereas those most satisfied are less likely to leave their jobs” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 248). Pay (H3) was found to be important as those who are satisfied with their pay are less likely to consider turnover. The burnout hypothesis (H4) also received support. “Management quality (H5) has a counterintuitive effect on turnover intention. Managerial review of organizational goals increases turnover” (Bertelli, 2007, p. 249).

Schnake, Williams, and Fredenberger (2007, p. 53) examined the link between “human resource management practices and important work related outcomes such as employee attitudes and behavior,” including intention to turnover. Two theories were offered as explanations for how “career management practices affect employee attitudes and behaviors” (Schnake, Williams, & Fredenberger, 2007, p. 55). The first is Pfeffer’s (1981) “theory of symbolic actions, which suggests that organizational practices can influence employee attitudes and behaviors through the messages that they send to employees”(Schnake et al., 2007, p. 55); and second, Blau’s social exchange theory, “provides a partial explanation of how career management programs may affect employee attitudes and behaviors, by suggesting that when one party provides a benefit to a second party, a sense of obligation is created which requires the recipient to reciprocate the benefit” (Schnake et al., 2007, p. 55). While there has been previous research on the “relationship between employee attitudes and behaviors and the presence of career management practices”(Schnake et al., 2007, p. 55), this study extends the understanding of the relationship “by assessing relationships between the frequency with which employees have used these practices in the previous 12 months, and their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job stress, job security, intention to turnover, and actual job search behaviors” (Schnake et al., 2007, pp. 55-56).
Managers within a southern state’s central offices of the auditing department, revenue
department, and department of education distributed questionnaires assessing the departments’
“human resources practices” (Schnake et al., 2007, p. 56). Participants were asked to reply to
questions regarding career management practice frequency, organizational citizenship behavior,
job satisfaction, and specific job search or turnover preparation.

The results showed that “after controlling for employee age and gender and organizational size,
the frequency use of career management practices was inversely related to turnover preparation
activities” (Schnake et al., 2007, p. 59).

Moynihan and Landuyt (2008) attempted to explain turnover intentions in the Texas state
government. Their purpose was to reach two goals: (1) to add literature, both on the public
sector and specifically state government turnover; and (2) to advance turnover theory in three
ways. First, they wanted to test the life cycle stability hypothesis “which suggests that
individuals who are older and have considerable experience with an organization will be
reluctant to change jobs, a reluctance compounded by economic and/or familial constraints for
primary wage earners and members of large households” (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008, p. 120).

Second, they wanted to test the traditional hypothesis that women are more likely to have
intentions to quit than men because they felt “that the reverse is true because of changing
patterns of gender labor force participation and the particular advantages that the public sector
can offer to female employees” (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008, p. 121). Third, the authors sought
“to advance the relative contributions of three sometimes overlapping concepts” that can affect
turnover intentions—organizational loyalty, voice, and empowerment (Moynihan & Landuyt,
2008, p. 121).
Even though the dependent variable for their research is turnover intention, Moynihan and Landuyt (2008, p. 129) addressed the “question of using intention as a surrogate for actual quits”

. . . researchers “can use cross-sectional models; can more easily access the perceptions of potential quits and relate them to their organizational context; can examine a large sample of employees; and can identify differences between those who wish to stay in the organization and those intent on leaving.” Furthermore, evidence suggests a lack of variation between variables that predict intent to quit and actual turnover—associations between intent to quit and actual turnover have been demonstrated (Cotton and Tuttle, 1985, p. 65; Dalton, Johnson, and Daily, 1999; Mobley et al., 1979; (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008, p. 129)).

Moynihan and Landuyt (2008, p. 127) surveyed 15,769 Texas state employees (for 2004) who had “voluntarily separated from their agencies (not including retirement).” The survey was “designed to capture the common organizational and employment concepts” (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008, p. 128). The results first supported the life cycle stability hypothesis. Age and experience were both shown to have negative effects on intent to turnover. Geography, (specifically the length of time workers had lived in the same area), economic restraints, and family size were negatively associated with turnover intentions. Second, it was found “that women are significantly less likely to state intent to quit than their male counterparts,” which is “consistent with evidence presented on the changing nature of female participation in the labor force and on the particular attraction of public work to females” (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008, p. 132). This finding contradicts previous research. The findings on turnover intention and race were mixed due to the number of Hispanics working for the state. Third, it was found that the “measure of loyalty was a significant predictor of turnover intention” (Moynihan & Landuyt,
Moreover, both empowerment and voice were negatively associated with turnover intention.

The most recent article found on turnover intention of federal employees is Pitts, Marvel, and Fernandez’s (2011) research that addresses why U.S. federal government workers choose to leave the federal service. The 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) was used to “examine how the demographic characteristics of employees, employee attitudes, and employee perception of management and coworkers influence turnover intention” (Pitts, Marvel, & Fernandez, 2011, p. 751). Variables were organized into three clusters: demographic factors, workplace satisfaction factors, and organizational/relational factors. Two measures of turnover intention reflected “those who intend to leave their agency for another position within the federal government and those who intend to leave the federal government for an outside position” (Pitts et al., 2011, p. 751). Their research shows “that a variety of factors affect whether employees intend to leave their jobs, with workplace satisfaction playing the largest role in predicting turnover intentions, followed by demographic variables and organizational/relational factors” (Pitts et al., 2011, p. 754). Age, race/ethnicity, and job satisfaction were the most relevant factors in whether an employee plans to leave the federal government, whereas job satisfaction with advancement opportunities, and age were the most relevant factors in an employee leaving his/her agency.

**Independent Variables – The Controls**

This section investigates the relationship between turnover intentions and six of the most common predictors of employee turnover and turnover intentions. These predictors include gender, job satisfaction, organization commitment, and person-organization fit.
Gender: While there is literature on gender and turnover, it is not an extensive collection. Early literature assumed that a woman would not be in the workforce continuously. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) alluded to this in their results on the relationships between working conditions and women, and wages and women. Working hours were found to be more important to married women; wages were more important to men. Vroom (1964, p. 42) concurred when he stated that “her primary function is seen as one of mother and homemaker.” When compared to Phillips and Connell (2003), who found that the gender most likely to turnover is male, one can see how far turnover research in relation to gender has come.

Cotton and Tuttle’s (1986) meta-analysis found a “strong confidence for gender (p<.005), indicating that women were more likely to leave then men.” However, one study (Stumpf and Dawley, 1981) found the reverse. It was noted that “information about the percentages of males and females in the study… are often absent” (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986, p. 86).

Light and Ureta (1990) sought to determine if there were gender differences in wages and job turnover among continuously employed workers. With a sample of 4,490 women and 4,600 men who were followed from 1966 to 1985, they found that “the postwar influx of women into the labor force consisted of a significant number of women who work (more or less) continuously” (Light & Ureta, 1990, p. 295). The focus was on women who were “not quitting their jobs to leave the labor force” in order to ascertain “whether these women use the early parts of the careers to lock into good jobs, as men typically do” (Light & Ureta, 1990, p. 295). The result was that the rate of “separation probabilities decline with tenure, regardless of cohort and race” (Light & Ureta, 1990, p. 296).
Weisberg and Kirschenbaum (1993) “hypothesized that actual turnover behavior and intent to leave would be gender specific, as well as influenced by differing sets of labor market and work environment factors” (Weisberg & Kirschenbaum, 1993, p. 987). A sample of 506 textile workers located at fifteen separate Israeli worksites was interviewed with “a series of questions covering varying aspects of the turnover process” (Weisberg & Kirschenbaum, 1993, p. 993). The results demonstrated a significant difference between men and women in their actual turnover, with women more likely to leave than men.

Summary: Although the research on gender and turnover demonstrates mixed results, the majority of studies show a positive relationship between being female and turning over.

Job Satisfaction: Vroom (1964, p. 175) assumed that if “the measures of job satisfaction reflect the valence of the job to its occupant, then it follows that job satisfaction should be related to the strength of the force on a person to remain in his job.” In other words, the more satisfied a worker is on the job, the less likely the worker will voluntarily leave. Vroom (1964, p. 176) reviewed seven studies on the satisfaction-turnover relationship, and “all studies indicated the expected negative relationship between these variables, although the magnitude and significance of this relationship varied considerably from study to study.”

Atchinson and Lefferts (1972) used Herzberg’s factors and techniques to measure job satisfaction, even though Herzberg’s techniques emphasized work performance rather than turnover. The consensus (Atchinson and Lefferts, 1972, p.53; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957; March and Simon, 1958) “indicated that attitudes toward the job should be a major variable affecting this decision to participate . . . attitudes toward the job should affect the decision to participate more than does performance on the job.” Air Force pilots were surveyed using three instruments: (1) “the Herzberg interview (1959) which provided information on the
motivation and hygiene factors” (Atchison & Lefferts, 1972, p. 55); (2) the Job Reaction survey to measure job features; and (3) McClelland’s (1961) projective technique to obtain N achievement scores. It was “found that positive events were related to positive feelings of performance, and the negative events were related to career intentions of leaving the Air Force” (Atchison & Lefferts, 1972, p. 63).

Mobley (1982) found that the “relationship between job satisfaction and turnover, although not particularly strong, is consistent,” as well as consistent with Vroom’s (1964) assertion that dissatisfied employees are more likely to leave than satisfied employees. He recommended that satisfaction be measured in order to “effectively predict and understand turnover” (Mobley, 1982).

Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, and Sablynski (2007) examined the P-O fit relationship with job mobility and intent to turnover. A field survey of 205 full-time employed adults in two geographic areas of the United States was completed in order to determine if “job satisfaction mediates the relationship between P-O fit and intent to turnover, such that high-levels of P-O fit will decrease participant intent to turnover in so far as levels of participant job satisfaction are high” (Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, & Sablynski, 2007, p. 208). This hypothesis was supported as participant job satisfaction increased, the intent to turnover decreased.

Bright (2008) “explored whether the relationship among public service motivation (PSM, job satisfaction, and the turnover intentions of public employees were mediated by person-organization (P-O) fit” (Bright, 2008, p. 149). He hypothesized that the “P-O fit literature strongly suggests that individuals who are compatible with characteristics of their organizations will have higher job satisfaction and lower turner intentions when compared with individuals who are less compatible” (Bright, 2008, p. 152). A diverse sample of 205 randomly selected
public employees from three states was surveyed. While there was no guarantee as to a perfect fit between individuals and public organizations or to favorable levels of job satisfaction and turnover intent, the results confirmed that “high levels of PSM are congruent with the characteristics of public organizations, and will have favorable levels of job satisfaction and turnover intentions” (Bright, 2008, p. 163).

**Summary:** Employees with high levels of job satisfaction are less likely to intend to turnover or actually turnover.

**Organizational Commitment:** Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979, p. 226) defined organizational commitment as:

the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization, which can be characterized by at least three related goals: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Because organizational commitment is an attitude, it differs from job satisfaction and should be more stable. Mowday et al. (1979) developed the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) as a tool to measure an employee’s commitment to a work organization. Studies consisting of 2,563 employees in nine different organizations were completed and analyzed.

The results “presented reasonable strong evidence” (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979, p. 243) as to the reliability and validity of the OCQ. Moderate correlations were “found between organizational commitment and other measures of both similar attitude constructs (e.g., sources of organizational attachment) and one of the component parts of the definition or organizational commitment (e.g., motivational force to perform)” (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 243). Additionally, “evidence for the predictive validity of the OCQ was demonstrated by relatively consistent
relationships in the predicted direction between commitment and measures of employee turnover” (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 243).

Tett and Meyer (1993) conducted a meta-analytic study of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover. They hypothesized that three perspectives would be identified: (1) “commitment to the company develops from job satisfaction such that commitment mediates the effects of satisfaction on withdrawal variables (the satisfaction-to-commitment mediation model); (2) the direction of influence between satisfaction and commitment is the reverse of the first perspective; and (3) both satisfaction and commitment contribute uniquely to the turnover process (the independent-effects model)” (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Psychological abstracts from 1968 to 1992 were searched, with a result of 178 samples. The “results supported the view that satisfaction and commitment each contribute uniquely to the turnover process” (Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Cohen (1993) also carried out a meta-analytic review on organizational commitment and turnover the same year as Tett and Meyer (1993). Cohen’s purpose was “to examine the moderating effect of the interval between the measurement of an individual’s organizational commitment and the occurrence of organizational departure” (Cohen, 1993, p. 1140). He hypothesized that there would be a stronger relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, the shorter the time frame between the measurement of the two variables. Studies published between 1967 and 1991 that dealt with this relationship were identified, resulting in thirty-four studies. This hypothesis was supported “when age served as the career stage indicator but was not when tenure did” (Cohen, 1993, p. 1151), which would lead to the conclusion that
“both methodological and theoretical moderators strongly affect that relationship” between organization commitment and turnover (Cohen, 1993, p. 1151).

Chang (1999) investigated “the moderating role of career commitment on the relationships between employees’ perception of company practices and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and turnover intention” (Chang, 1999, p. 1257). He reiterated earlier research, stating that “individuals committed to organizations show less intention to leave either because they want to stay (affective commitment), or because they need to remain (continuance commitment)” (Chang, 1999, p. 1263). Furthermore, if employees are not that committed to an organization, they are more likely to leave. “If an employee is committed to their current career, they would attempt to seek other opportunities in a similar area that better satisfied their career needs” (Chang, 1999, p. 1263). Using a sample of 227 researchers from eight business or research institutes in Korea, the study results showed that: “employees’ continuance commitment . . . is increased when they believe that the company is doing its best to prevent layoffs” (Chang, 1999, p. 1272).

Perryer, Jordan, Firns, and Travaglione (2010) examined the relationship between organizational commitment, perceived organizational support (POS), and turnover intentions. Their hypothesis was that retention could be assured by “providing a work environment that is positive and supportive” as the “environment can have a strong influence on an employee’s organizational commitment, which in turn has a strong influence on employee turnover” (Perryer, Jordan, Firns, & Travaglione, 2010, p. 912). They surveyed a sample of “all Western Australian and South Australian employees of a Federal Government organization” (Perryer et al., 2010, p. 915). The results supported previous research, which had “found a significant relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention” and “provided further
validation of the powerful relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention” (Perryer et al., 2010, p. 920).

**Summary:** Research has found a significant relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions, as well as actual turnover.

**Person-Organization (P-O) Fit:** Chatman (1991, p. 459) investigated “how the fit of an employee with his or her organization as a whole is established and maintained and what the consequences are in organizations.” In 1989, Chatman had defined person-organization (P-O) fit as “the congruence between patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values, defined here as what an individual values in an organization, such as being team-oriented or innovative” (Chatman, 1991, p. 459). Additionally, P-O fit is “influenced by the organizational values existing at the time of membership and by changes in individual values following membership and tenure” (Chatman, 1991, p. 460). Chatman proposed several hypotheses, two of which pertain to intent to turnover. First, she proposed that high person-organization fit will be negatively associated with intent to leave the organization. Second, she proposed that increases in person-organization fit after one year of membership will be negatively associated with intent to leave and departures. Eight of the largest U.S. accounting firms participated in the study. The results confirmed that (1) “high P-O fit at entry is negatively associated with the intent to leave” (Chatman, 1991, p. 474), and (2) “increases in P-O fit after one year of membership are negatively associated with intent to leave” (Chatman, 1991, p. 475).

Kristof (1996, p. 1) presented a “comprehensive definition and conceptual model of person-organization (P-O) fit that incorporated supplementary as well as complementary perspectives on fit.” Basically, P-O fit research involved the “antecedents and consequences of compatibility between people and the organization in which they work” (Kristof, 1996, p. 1). In
a review of previous research (Vancouver et al., 1994; Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991; Chatman, 1991; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Bretz and Judge, 1994), Kristof found that not only did P-O fit significantly predict satisfaction and commitment but also the intention to quit. More specifically, “high levels of supervisor-subordinate and peer goal congruence (individual level), as well as within constituency congruence (group level), are negatively related to intentions to quit” (Kristof, 1996, p. 28).

Verquer, Beehr, and Wagner (2002) presented a “meta-analytic review of twenty-one studies on relations of P-O fit with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to turnover” (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003, p. 473). They traced the use of P-O fit theories to “Argyris’ theoretical work in job enlargement and participatory management” (Verquer et al., 2003, p. 474), which alleges that an individual’s behavior resulted from the interaction between the person and the organization. Argyris did not argue with fitting the individual to the organization but instead preferred fitting the organization to the individual. The results of the review found that “P-O fit relationships with intent to turnover were strongly moderated by the use of the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP)” (Verquer et al., 2003, p. 485).

Westerman and Cyr (2004, p. 252) provided “an integrative analysis of three approaches to P-O fit theory and measurement.” Measures were obtained from 105 employees in six organizations in the western United States. One hypothesis was that “employee satisfaction and commitment mediate the relationship between value, personality, and work environment congruence, and employee intention to remain with an organization” (Westerman & Cyr, 2004, p. 254). The results “indicate that satisfaction and commitment fully mediate the relationship between work environment congruence and intention to remain, and partially mediate the
relationship between values congruence and intention to remain” (Westerman & Cyr, 2004, p. 254).

**Summary:** The research on P-O fit has concluded that the more an employee fits with the organization, the greater the chance of job satisfaction, and the lower the chance of turnover intentions or actual turnover.

**Generativity Theory**

The theoretical framework that will be used to explain the relationship between public service motivation and turnover intentions is generativity theory. Introduced by Erik Erikson in 1950, generativity theory initially referred to “the context of the life-span theory of personality development” and could be expressed in the “bearing and raising of children” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1003). However, generativity was found not to be limited to parenthood. Erikson’s writings “attempted to articulate ways in which people contributed to the next generation” (Peterson & Stewart, 1996, p. 21) and found that “aging during the midlife period is a time when humans have a strong need to expand ego interests beyond the self and to become a guider or contributor to succeeding generations” (Calo, 2007, p. 387). “One may be generative in a wide variety of life pursuits and in a vast array of life settings, as in work life and professional activities, volunteer endeavors, participation in religious and political organizations, neighborhood and community activism, friendships, and even one’s leisure time activities” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1003). In generativity, “the adult nurtures, teaches, leads, and promotes the next generation while generating life products and outcomes that benefit the social system and promote its continuity from one generation to the next” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1003). This dissertation assumes that people with strong public service
motivations have a high need for generativity that causes them to make long-term commitments to worthy causes that will affect current and future generations. In other words, the generativity desires underlying public service motivation prevent employees from abandoning worthy causes through turnover.

Peterson and Stewart (1993) believed that “generativity concerns feelings of community and the desire to contribute to its welfare” (Peterson & Stewart, 1993, p. 187). They also constructed a measure of generativity and examined its “antecedents and correlates in a longitudinal sample of college-educated women” (Peterson & Stewart, 1996, p. 22). This measure was designed to “assess the motivational aspects of generativity” (Peterson & Stewart, 1996, p. 22). They explored how women in their sample demonstrated generativity in their lives. As was predicted, women who had scored “high on generativity motivation who were working in careers found gratification in a sense of productive mastery and helping others through their work,” (Peterson & Stewart, 1996, p. 29) such as in public service.

Peterson and Stewart (1996, p. 26) surveyed Radcliffe women at the age of forty-three, who were considered on the “career clock.” It was found that the most gratifying aspects of work were learning new things, challenges and opportunities, personal mastery, and “aiding and assisting other people through their work” . . . such as “working in a field that deals with social concerns and needs of people” (Peterson & Stewart, 1996, p. 26). Peterson and Duncan (1999) reported findings of a “tentative relationship between generativity and interest in politics” (Peterson & Duncan, 1999, p. 26). An example of this was observed in research on “men and women who came of age during the politically charged 1960s” who had “demonstrated how
political activism—or attempts to correct perceived social injustice—could be viewed as manifestations of generativity and altruism” (Peterson & Duncan, 1999, p. 106).

Peterson and Duncan (1999) examined the implication of psychosocial generativity on the understanding of contemporary politics. Kotre (1984) had “introduced the concept of cultural generativity—a concern with passing on societal traditions, mores, and ideologies”—while Peterson, Smirles, and Wentworth (1997) and Peterson and Steward (1996) had “argued that one precursor to cultural generativity would be a demonstrated interest in contemporary politics” (Peterson & Duncan, 1999, p. 106). Other studies (Cole and Stewart, 1996; Franz and McClelland, 1994; Stewart and Gold-Steinberg, 1990) had touched on a “tentative relationship between generativity and an interest in politics” (Peterson & Duncan, 1999, p. 106).

The public service motivation reflected in generativity theory was also revealed in Peterson, Smirles, and Wentworth (1997) research. They completed a study that hypothesized and found that “generative parents were more likely than less generative parents to contribute actively to both national- and local-level politics” which included “signing petitions, writing letters to public officials, donating money, joining organizations, and attending rallies” (Peterson, Smirles, & Wentworth, 1997, p. 1209). This supported Kotre’s (1984) suspicion which suggested that “political differences notwithstanding, generative people on either end of a conservative-liberal spectrum share the goal of preserving the welfare of society through political activity” and “that generativity can be manifested at a cultural level when individuals attend to current ideologies and show an interest in broad social issues” (Peterson et al., 1997, p. 1213).

Another point of discussion would be the role of age in generativity and public service motivation. The research on generativity refers to age many times. Erikson’s life-span theory
“alerts the reader to the fact that generativity is an issue for adults, not for children” (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1004). One of the reasons “generativity emerges as a psychosocial issue in the adult years is that society comes to demand that adults take responsibility for the next generation, in their roles as parents, teachers, mentors, leaders, organizers, “creative ritualizers” (Browning, 1975) (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992, p. 1005).

As one can see in the following definitions, generativity theorists are capturing much of what public administrationists are defining as public service motivation. PSM is

- “A concept, an attitude, a sense of duty and a sense of public morality” (Staats, 1988, p. 601).
- “The desire to serve the public” (Rainey, 1997, p. 266), or “a general altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation or humanity” (Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999, p. 23).
- “The beliefs, 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” (Vandenabeele, 2007, p. 547).

The definitions of generativity and public service motivation appear to be similar in their interest in social issues, selflessness, and serving social systems. The connections between generativity and public service motivation also include common concerns for contributions to society, volunteerism and activism, preservation of society’s welfare, altruistic motivation, commitment to social causes, and motivation by inner desire.
Peterson and Duncan (1999) “argue that some adults manifest generativity by transforming their political interest into an active commitment to the advancement of important social causes or organizations… that are based on the belief that such support had the potential to enhance the well-being of people in U.S. society.” Erikson’s (1968) earlier work also references the commitment dimension of generative theory in noting that “the most personally efficacious, psychologically fulfilling, and socially valuable behavioral expressions are often the products of the adults reasoned commitments to generative endeavors and goals.” As one can see, beyond identifying the public service dimension of generativity theory, Peterson and Duncan and Erikson identify the commitment dimension of generativity that leads this dissertation to assert that federal employees with high public service motivation will have weaker turnover intentions because of their strong generative desires and commitments to make a difference in the meaningful causes that they serve.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In order to test the research hypotheses 1,652 United States federal employees were surveyed. This chapter addresses four aspects of this methodology: the hypotheses, the measures, the sample, the data collection procedures, and data analysis.

The Hypotheses

Based on the generativity theory, several hypotheses were developed. Questions were designed to ascertain the relationship between certain variables and intent to turnover. These questions will be answered by advancing thirteen hypotheses.

H1: Public service motivation, defined as attraction to policy making, is negatively associated with intent to turnover (Perry, 1996, p. 10).

H2: Public service motivation, defined as “desire to serve the public interest” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) (Perry, 1996, p. 10) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H3: Public service motivation, defined as “advocacy for a special interest” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H4: Public service motivation, defined as “personal identification” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.
H5: Public service motivation, defined as “program commitment” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368).

H6: Public service motivation, defined as “loyalty to duty” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H7: Public service motivation, defined as “loyalty to government as a whole” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H8: Public service motivation, defined as “enhancing social equity” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H9: Public service motivation, defined as “patriotism of benevolence” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368) is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H10: Female gender is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H11: Job satisfaction is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H12: Organizational-commitment is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

H13: Person-organization fit is negatively associated with intent to turnover.

Measures of the Variables and Unit of Analysis

A survey consisting of seventy-one questions was created to measure the variables in the hypotheses. The unit of analysis was the individual employee who responded to the survey. Items comprising the independent and dependent variables operationalized as hypothetical constructs including intent to turnover, public service motivation, job satisfaction, organizational
commitment, and person-organization fit (P-O fit) were measured using a five-point Likert scale. The items comprising the dependent and independent variables were operationalized on the basis of the definitions found in Table 1.

Table 3.1
Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Motivation</td>
<td>Often used as a synonym for government service embracing all those who work in the public sector (Perry &amp; Wise, 1990, p. 368); divided into three typologies of motives: rational, norm-based, and affective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Motives</td>
<td>Motives “grounded in individual utility maximization” (Perry &amp; Wise, 1990, p. 368). Includes participation in the process of policy formulation, program commitment, and advocacy for a special interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm-Based Motives</td>
<td>Motives in which “idealism, rather than careerism, are used as a guide bureaucratic behavior” (Frederickson &amp; Hart, 1985, p. 548). Includes desire to serve the public interest, loyalty to duty and to the government as a whole, and social equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Motives</td>
<td>How individual define themselves. Includes commitment to a program, conviction of a program’s social importance, and benevolence of patriotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>“The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter &amp; Crampon, 1976, p. 1); representation of “something beyond mere passive loyalty to an organization” (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 226).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>“Pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300); an attitudinal response to one’s job that is characterized by a congruence between one’s real and ideal jobs, an identification with one’s chose occupation and a reluctance to seek alternate employment” (Koch &amp; Steers, 1978, p. 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>“Compatibility between individuals and organizations which occurs when an organization satisfies individuals’ needs, desires, or preferences” (Kristof, 1996, p. 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>A “conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization” (Tett &amp; Meyer, 1993, p. 262).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The measures of the different types of PSM were designed by Perry (1996). Respondents indicated their degree of agreement on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (See Appendix I for the version of the survey on the web). The items designed to measure the different types of public service motivation (PSM) follow:

Attraction to Policy Making Public Service Motivation

1. Politics is a dirty word.
2. The compromises that are involved in public policy making don’t appeal to me.
3. I don’t care much for politicians.
4. I respect public officials who can turn a good idea into law.
5. Ethical behavior is as important as competence.

Public Interest Public Service Motivation

1. People may talk about the public interest, but they are really concerned only about self-interest.
2. It is hard for me to get intensely interested in what is going on in my community.
3. I unselfishly contribute to my community.
4. Meaningful public interest is very important to me.
5. I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
6. An official’s obligation to the public should always come before loyalty to superiors.
7. I consider public service my civic duty.

Compassion Public Service Motivation

1. I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged.
2. Most social programs are too vital to do without.
3. It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.
4. To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.
5. I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don’t know personally.
6. I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another.
7. I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves.
8. There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support.

Self Sacrifice Public Service Motivation

1. Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.
2. I believe in putting duty before self.
3. Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds.
4. Much of what I do is bigger than myself.
5. Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.
6. I feel people should give back to society more than they get from it.
7. I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else.
8. I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.

Statements from Mowday, Steers and Porter’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) were used to measure organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was measured by a response format employing “a 7-point Likert scale with the following anchors: strongly agree, moderately agree, slightly agree, neither agree nor disagree,
slightly disagree, moderately disagree, strongly disagree” (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 227). The items operationalizing the measures are as follows:

1. My values and goals are very similar to the values and goals of my organization.
2. I am not very comfortable within the culture of my organization.
3. I feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.
4. What this organization stands for is important to me.

Job satisfaction was measured using “a multi-item scale that was developed from a review of the public administration job satisfaction literature” (Bright, 2008, p. 156). The respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with the statements that follow:

1. I am satisfied with my opportunities for achievement.
2. I am satisfied with my recognition opportunities.
3. I am satisfied with the level of responsibility in my job.
4. I am satisfied with the meaningfulness of my job.
5. I am satisfied with my advancement opportunities.
6. I am satisfied with my pay in this job.

Person-Organization Fit measures “the congruence between the respondents and their organization” (Bright, 2008, p. 154). It was operationalized with questions developed by Bright (2008) that evolved from his investigation of research done by Kristof (1996), O’Reilly and Chatman (1986), and others. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement on a seven-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items are as follows:

1. My values are compatible to this organization.
2. My values are compatible to the federal government.
3. I like the members of my work group.
4. My co-workers are similar to me.
5. I feel I am a good match for this organization.
6. I do not fit with this organization’s culture.
7. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
8. I fit in with the organization’s culture.
9. I only work for the federal government because I am basically guaranteed a job, a paycheck and benefits.

Turnover intention was measured through two items borrowed from Bright (2008) and two items borrowed from Moynihan and Landuyt (2008). The remaining questions were developed by this researcher based on items used by Lee and Mitchell (1994); Michaels and Spector (1982); Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001); Bertelli (2006); Hom and Kinicki (2001); and Maertz and Campion (2004). Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with the following items on a scale of one to five:

1. I have a desire to leave or quit my job.
2. Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my current organization for a job in another public organization.
3. Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my position with the federal government for a position in the private sector.
4. In the past two years, I have considered leaving my current organization for a job in another public agency organization.
5. In the past two years, I have considered leaving my position in the federal government for a position in the private sector.
6. It is likely that I will be working for this organization this time next year.

7. It is likely that I will probably look for a job at another agency or organization in the next year.

8. I will be working for this organization five years from now.

To determine the measures of the variables measured as hypothetical constructs, the item scores for each variable were added together and averaged. If a respondent failed to respond to more than half of the items comprising a construct, the variable measure for that respondent was treated as missing data.

**Population and Sample**

The survey was administered to a random sample of 1,652 employees of the federal government. The sample was drawn from the whole population of civilian federal employees who had an e-mail address that ended with .gov. This excluded any military employees, or e-mail addresses that ended with .mil, indicating that the person worked for one the Armed Forces as either a military representative or a civilian.

The sampling frame used to select the participants was the Federal Staff Directory 2010/Summer and the Federal Staff Directory 2011/Winter, which are available at the Amelia Gorgas Library located on the campus of the University of Alabama. An online random number generator was first used to select a page in the Federal Directory, and then used to select a specific person on each page who was e-mailed the survey. One thousand federal employees were initially selected but due to undeliverable e-mails that bounced back, participant refusal, or no response, 652 more employees were identified and sent a survey.

**Data Collection Procedures**
To test the hypotheses, an online survey was conducted through the online survey site, www.qualtrics.com. The online survey is considered the most cost-effective manner in which to obtain the data as there is no cost for postage or mailing materials. Furthermore, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, May 22, 1995) and as an attempt to streamline the process, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) uses web-based (electronic) surveys for their own data collection. Focusing on “execution, oversight, and transparency” and attempting to reduce “waste and inefficiency” the federal government has increased computer usage, and email is readily available to federal employees (Kundra, 2010, p. 31). While online surveys are more advantageous in regards to ease, time, data collection and storage, and ability to produce reports faster, they tend to “elicit lower response rates” (Bennett & Nair, 2010, p. 358). Dillman (2010) has shown in his research that response rates for online surveys should be between twenty percent and forty percent.

The survey was administered through Qualtrics. The purpose of the site is to assist with the creation and implementation of online surveys and the collection and tabulation of the resulting data. It allows the researcher to generate a survey with questions of his/her own or from the site’s library. Various options are available for responses, as well as the look of the survey. Emails containing survey links can be transmitted directly from the site, as well as appreciation and reminder messages. Additionally, the site collects the responses and formulates the data into statistical reports. Qualtrics is also designed to protect the confidentiality of the respondents and all the data.

A priming letter was sent a week before the survey was distributed. The purpose of this letter was to inform the recipients that a survey would follow, allowing the chance to decline, as
well as to eliminate any obsolete e-mail addresses. The sample was randomly selected from the 2010/Summer Federal Staff Directory and the 2011/Winter Federal Staff Directory available at the Amelia Gorgas Library located on the campus of the University of Alabama.

An e-mail from www.qualtrics.com containing the link to the survey was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix II) which explained the survey invitation. Each member of the sample was informed that the reason for the survey was for a study by Jennifer Morrison on the impact of public service motivation on the intent to turnover of new hire federal employees. The letter explained that the survey would only require between ten and twenty minutes to complete. The confidentiality provisions were described as being through the Qualtrics website. The benefits to the participant and how the data would be used were also presented. Finally, in the event of questions, participants were directed to contact Jennifer Morrison, Principal Investigator, Dr. J. Norman Baldwin, Dissertation Chair, or the Institutional Review Board at the University of Alabama. Two weeks into the survey, a reminder e-mail was sent to participants who had not responded. Participants were asked again to assist this research, and a link was included in the e-mail. The survey link remained active for three weeks. A second reminder letter was sent, with the link to be active for week. This was the final communication with the participants.

**Data Analysis**

*Packages for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) software was used to conduct the data analysis. To guard against data entry mistakes, such as impossible responses to survey items (e.g., a six response to an item that used a five-point scale), the frequency of responses to each survey item was calculated. Variables measured by more than one item were next constructed and tested for
reliability with Cronbach’s Alpha. Individual hypotheses were then tested through Pearson Correlations or analysis of variance depending upon the nature of data used to measure the independent variables (i.e., interval, ordinal, or nominal).

Prior to testing for the cumulative relationship between the independent variables and intentions to turnover, all of the independent variables were correlated with each other in order to detect possible multicollinearity. Variables correlated with each other with an r of .70 or above were removed from further analysis (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006, p. 181). Finally, the cumulative relationship between the independent variables and intentions to turnover was tested through multiple regressions. Multicolinearity diagnostics in SPSS were run during the regressions to further identify independent variables high associated with other independent variables. Variables with variance inflation factors above 2.5 were withdrawn from the regression analysis and the regressions were re-run (Meyers et al., 2006, p. 182).

The second preliminary phase of analysis involved a factor analysis of the scales used to measure turnover intentions and job satisfaction. The questions measuring public service motivation (attraction to policy making, compassion, public interest and self-sacrifice) were taken from Perry (1996). He had performed a factor analysis on his initial measures of PSM, which pared the original six-dimension model down to the four dimensions uses in this analysis. Person-organization fit and organization commitment were taken directly from Bright (2008), and Mowday et al. (1979). The turnover intention and job satisfaction questions were developed by the researcher, yet based on previous works by Bright (2008), Lee and Mitchell, (1994), Michaels and Spector (1982), Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez (2001), Bertelli (2006), Hom and Kinicki (2001), Maertz and Campion (2004), and Moynihan and Landuyt (2008).
The objectives of the factor analysis were to identify clusters of items that epitomized the underlying concepts of the operationalized variables, and to reduce the data.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH RESULTS

The first section of this chapter reports the rate of return for the survey. The next five sections report an analysis of the demographics, frequencies of responses for each of the survey questions, the results of a factor analysis of the items comprising two of the new measures of variables, the results of reliability tests of the survey scales, and tests of the hypotheses. The last two sections of this chapter present the findings.

Rates of Return for the Surveys

The rate of return for the Impact of Public Service Motivation on Turnover Intention Survey is reported in Table 4.1. As indicated, the overall rate of return for the survey was 184 responses out of 1,652 surveys sent for a total of 11%. The total number of e-mails that were either automatically returned or refused by the recipient was 468. By eliminating these from the total number of survey, 1184 surveys were received by federal workers.

The fact that a greater rate of return was not achieved leaves room for speculation concerning possible systematic biasing of the data caused by the non-response. Individuals in the sample were sent a priming e-mail making them aware of the survey, the survey, and two reminder e-mails. The researcher has several ideas concerning the reasons for non-response. The first reason is that the e-mails were chosen from the Summer/2010 and the Winter /2011
Federal Directory, and many people had left either the agency or the federal government, making the e-mail address useless. Second, it appeared that certain agencies, such as the State Department, may have blocked such unsolicited e-mails, causing them to be returned to sender as undeliverable. Third, in many of the returned e-mails, the addressee stated that either their agency/department or the federal government did not permit its employees to respond to unsolicited surveys. The remainder of those who responded to the e-mail simply stated that they would not participate. If one eliminates from the sample the number of respondents who never received the survey because it was blocked or the potential respondents were not permitted to respond, the rate of return rises from 11.1 percent to 15.5 percent.

A review of the number of respondents from each federal department or agency (see Tables 4.2 and 4.3) fails to reveal strong meaningful patterns. However, three loose associations emerge. Two of the seven organizations with the highest response rates--the National Institute of Health and the Environmental Protection Agency--address issues associated with the health of individuals and the environment. Three departments with the highest response rates--the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, and State Department--have a common concern with international relations and national security. Finally, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation have a common interest in assisting people during a time of need; HUD in protecting homeowners during a period of economic turmoil, and DOT ensuring the safety of people moving from one place to another. Although these small patterns exist, they do not lead the researcher to believe that they caused a response bias that affected the findings in any meaningful way.
### TABLE 4.1

Number of Surveys Circulated and Number of Types of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total emailed</th>
<th>% of total emailed minus bounce backs &amp; refusals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Emailed</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Bounced Back or Refused</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys received by sample members</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Surveys</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned Surveys</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned Surveys of those received</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics of Survey Results

According to the demographics (see Table 4.4), 58.9 percent of those who responded to the survey were male. A majority of the respondents were white (79.9 percent), followed by African American (12.7 percent). The remaining 8.1 percent consisted of Hispanics, Asians, and other. The sample appeared to be very educated, with only 3.1 percent having less than four years of college or only a high school degree. Over 29 percent of those responding to the survey had a Master’s degree, with 20.9 percent achieving graduate school work beyond a Master’s degree, and 17.1 percent obtaining a Ph.D. A majority of the respondents were not political appointees.
These demographics may not portray an accurate picture of the United States Federal Government workforce, though the percentages from this sample do resemble the percentages available through the Office of Personnel Management for the 2011 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2011). The federal survey was conducted between May 2, 2011 and May 31, 2011, so the two surveys were performed less than a year apart. Both surveys show that the workforce is predominately male and white, and the largest age group is 50-59 years old. The most prevalent pay grade is between GS13-15, with the greatest concentration of employees working with the federal government for 20 years or more.

**Frequencies of Response to Items and Descriptive Statistics**

The initial step in analyzing the data involved a review of the frequency of responses to each question. This step served as a means of verifying that the data had been recorded properly by Qualtrics, and downloaded correctly by the researcher. The frequency function can be performed by SPSS. No irregularities were found in the data, and it was not necessary to exclude any questions because respondents failed to answer or due to inappropriateness. The descriptive statistics—means, standard deviations, minimal measures, and maximum measures for the variables measured by interval level data were then determined and are present in Table 4.5.

**Results of the Factor Analysis**

The results of the factor analyses appear in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. Items which correlated with their principal factors with an r of .50 or above served at the scales for the variables. As a
result, all of the items designed to measure the turnover intentions and job satisfaction were utilized to test the hypotheses.

**Results of the Reliability Tests**

In order to test the survey scales for reliability Cronbach’s Alphas were computed. For the purpose of this research, the reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered “acceptable.” As Table 4.8 indicates, self-sacrifice PSM and job satisfaction are sufficiently reliable to be considered scales, while attraction to policy-making PSM might be considered marginally adequate.

**Tests of the Hypotheses**

To test the research hypotheses concerning the impact on turnover of public service motivation and the control variables, correlation coefficients were initially generated for the relationship between each independent variable and turnover intentions. None of the measures of public service motivation are significantly related to turnover intentions (see Table 4.9). Moreover, the insignificant findings for public interest PSM and self-sacrifice PSM are not in the predicted direction. By contrast, Table 4.9 indicates that the three control variables—job satisfaction, organization commitment, and person-organization fit—are significantly correlated with turnover intention. Their correlations are also in the directions predicted by the hypotheses. An analysis of variance, in turn, shows that gender is significantly related to turnover intention. Being male decreases the likelihood that a federal employee has intentions to turnover.

**Results of the Regressions between Turnover Intentions And the Independent Variables**
To test for the combined effects of the various forms of PSM on turnover intentions, a multiple regression was executed. However, in conducting the regression, multicollinearity diagnostics was also run in order to determine whether any of the independent variables should be removed from the analysis (see Table 4.10). Given that none of the independent variables revealed a variance inflation factor (VIF) above 2.5 or a tolerance level below .40, all of the measures of PSM were regressed with turnover intentions (Mayer, Gamst, and Guarino, 2006). The regression demonstrated that attraction to policy-making PSM is significantly related (p<.05) to turnover intentions when controlling for the other PSM measures (See Table 4.11). The regression coefficient for the attraction to policy-making PSM is also moderately small and the regression explains a small amount of variation (r²=.032) in turnover intentions. Compassion PSM, public interest PSM, and self-sacrifice PSM are not significantly related to turnover intentions.

A multiple regression between turnover intentions and the measures of PSM and the controls was run next. Multicollinearity statistics were also determined (see Table 4.12) and indicated that none of the variables have a variance inflation factor (VIF) of 2.5 or above, nor any of the tolerance levels below .40 (Meyer, Gamst, and Guarino, 2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health (NIH)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security (DHS)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation (DOT)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Treasury</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Management and Budget (OMB)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Bureau of Governors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Bureau</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Industry and Security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maritime Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Standards and Technology (NIST)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Housing Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration (SBA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Patent and Trademark Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3</td>
<td>Federal Agencies with One Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Marketing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archive (National Archives and Records Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armed Forces Retirement Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of the Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Policy Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Research Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Communications Commission (FCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Housing Finance Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Trade Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, National Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Service Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Capital Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Institute of Food and Agriculture
National Transportation Safety Board
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC)
Public and Indian Housing
### TABLE 4.4
Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Graduate High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years of College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Work beyond Master’s</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political Appointment**

| Yes | 8 | 4.3 |

N = 185
## TABLE 4.5
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>8.050</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Grade (GS8 – GS15)</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity (years)</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>9.063</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185
### TABLE 4.6

**Results of the Principle Component Factor Analysis of the Items Comprising Turnover Intentions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r with Principle Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a desire to quit or leave my job.</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my current organization for a job in another public organization.</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my position with the federal government for a position in the private sector.</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have considered leaving my current organization for a job in another public organization.</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In the past two years, I have considered leaving my position in the federal government for a position in the private sector.</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is likely that I will be at this job one year from now.</td>
<td>-.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is likely that I will be working for this organization this time next year.</td>
<td>-.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is likely I will probably look for a job at another agency or organization in the next year.</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I will be working for this organization five years from now.</td>
<td>-.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7
Results of the Principle Component Factor Analysis of the Items Comprising Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r with Principle Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am satisfied with my opportunity for achievement.</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am satisfied with my recognition opportunities.</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the level of responsibility in my job</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with the meaningfulness of my job</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am satisfied with my advancement opportunities.</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am satisfied with my pay in this job.</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.8  
Cronbach’s Alphas for the Research Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185
### TABLE 4.9

Pearson’s Correlations between Turnover Intentions And the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>-.296**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization fit</td>
<td>-.263**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 185**

**p<.01 level (2-tailed).**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 185</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of a regression between turnover intention, the PSMs, organization commitment, job satisfaction, person-organization fit, and gender are shown in Table 4.13. The model reveals that organization commitment and job satisfaction have significant negative associations with turnover intentions. The regression coefficients for these variables are also moderately large and the regression explains a moderate amount of variance ($r^2=.204$) in turnover intentions.

### The Relationship between Public Service Motivation And Organization Commitment

Given the absence of a relationship between the various measures of PSM and turnover intentions, the relationship between PSM and organization commitment was explored to determine whether organization commitment mediated the relationship between PSM and
turnover intention. This seemed like a logical direction to explore in light of generativity theory’s implication that PSM is associated with a need to affect future generations through commitment to worthwhile causes such as those championed by public organizations.

Pearson’s correlations indicated that all the independent variables are significantly correlated with organization commitment (see Table 4.14). Furthermore, all of the significant correlations are in the predicted direction – the measures of PSM, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit have positive relationships with organization commitment. Analysis of variance also reveals that gender is significantly related to organization commitment with men more likely to be committed to organizations than women.

A regression between PSM measures and organization commitment were run next. The SPSS diagnostics indicated an absence of multicollinearity among the PSM variables (see Table 4.15). The regression in Table 4.16 shows a predicted positive relationship between organization commitment and attraction to policy-making PSM, compassion PSM, and self-sacrifice PSM. The regression coefficients for attraction to policy-making PSM and self-sacrifice PSM are also fairly substantial. The results of the regression indicate that the measures of PSM explain a modest ($r^2=.132$) amount of the variance in organization commitment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185
Finally, a regression was run between organization commitment and the various independent variables used to explain turnover intentions. Multicollinearity diagnostics, again, indicate the absence of problems (see Table 4.17). The regression indicates that compassion PSM and self-sacrifice PSM are positively and significantly related to organization commitment with moderately large regression coefficients (see Table 4.18). Person-organization fit, in turn, demonstrates an even stronger significant positive association with organization commitment.
The overall model explains over half the amount of variation in organization commitment ($r^2 = .539$).

**Summary**

As an initial test of the hypotheses, correlations between the various measures of PSM and turnover intentions were generated. The results indicated that none of the measures of public service motivation – attraction to policy-making, compassion, public interest, and self-sacrifice – are significantly related to turnover intentions. Multiple regressions were next conducted to test for the combined effects of various forms of PSM on turnover intentions. The regression reveals that attraction to policy-making is the only form of PSM significantly related to turnover intention when controlling for the other measures of PSM. Pearson correlations also reveal that three control variables – job satisfaction, organization commitment, and person-organization fit – are significantly correlated to turnover intentions. Moreover, an analysis of variance shows that gender is significantly related to turnover intentions.
TABLE 4.14

Pearson’s Correlations between Organization Commitment and the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.255**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.171*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.272**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.343**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.494**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185

*p<.05 (2-tailed), ** p<.01 level (2-tailed).
TABLE 4.15
Collinearity Diagnostics for the Regression between Organization Commitment and PSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Constants)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185
### TABLE 4.16

Multiple Regressions between Organization Commitment and PSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185

R² = .132
### TABLE 4.17

Collinearity Diagnostics for the Regression between Organization Commitment and the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 185**
### TABLE 4.18
Multiple Regressions between Organization Commitment and the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 185

R² = .291

When turnover is regressed with the PSMs and the control variables, the results show that organization commitment has a fairly substantial significant negative association with turnover intentions, while job satisfaction has a moderately strong significant negative association with turnover intention.

Pearson’s correlations further indicate that all the independent variables are significantly correlated with organization commitment in a positive direction. An analysis of variance also shows that gender is significantly related to organization commitment. As with turnover intentions, all of the independent variables were regressed with organization commitment.
Compassion PSM, self-sacrifice PSM, and person-organization fit were found to have moderately strong to strong significant positive relationships with organization commitment.

In conclusion, the findings generally do not demonstrate relationships between the various measures of public service motivation and turnover intentions. Instead, the traditional predictors of turnover intentions used as controls are more consistently associated with turnover intentions in this study. However, exploratory data analysis reveals that the various measures of PSM investigated in this study are more likely to be associated with organization commitment than turnover intentions.
This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section reviews the findings relative to the hypotheses and non-empirical and empirical literature. The second section discusses the research results with a particular focus on explanations as to why various hypotheses were not supported. The third section provides suggestions for future research. The fourth section reviews the major implications of the research, followed by the conclusions.

**Review of the Findings**

The correlations between turnover intention and attraction to policy-making, compassion, public interest, and self-sacrifice revealed no significant relationships. Regression results, in turn, demonstrate that attraction to policy-making PSM is significantly related to turnover intentions when controlling for the other PSM variables. Compassion PSM, public interest PSM, and self-sacrifice PSM were not significantly related to turnover intentions. Therefore, the findings do not support the hypotheses asserting a negative relationship between public service motivation and intent to turnover.

The correlation between turnover intention and the control variables–job satisfaction, person-organization fit, and organization commitment–demonstrated significant negative
associations. An analysis of variance between gender and turnover intentions, in turn, did not yield a statistically significant relationship. A regression between all of the independent variables and turnover intentions further reveals significant negative associations between turnover intentions and job satisfaction, as well as organization commitment. The findings therefore support hypotheses 11 and 13, and provide partial support for hypotheses 10 and 12.

That the intent to turnover is impacted by the control variables—job satisfaction, person-organization fit, organization commitment, and gender—support the body of empirical research on the general causes of turnover. As early as Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957), Vroom (1964), and Porter and Steers (1973), job satisfaction has been a primary predictor of intent to turnover. The research also results support Mobley (1982), Kristof (1996) and Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, and Sablynski (2007), who found that as job satisfaction increased, the intent to turnover decreased.

The analysis of variance also supports the research of Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979), Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979), and Cotton and Tuttle (1986) who had found men are less likely to quit than women. It also supports Cotton and Tuttle’s (1986) findings that women were more likely to leave than men. Weisberg and Kirschenbaum (1993) also demonstrated that women were more likely to leave than men. However, Light and Ureta’s (1990) research is not supported as they found tenure, cohort, and race to be stronger determinants of turnover than gender.

This research demonstrates that organization commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions, which supports Cotton and Tuttle (1986), and Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000), as well as Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) research. This result also supports the
findings of Cohen (1993), Chang (1999), and Perryer, Jordan, Firns, and Travaglione (2010). Chang (1999) also found that if employees are not committed to their current career, they are more likely to leave. The negative relationship between turnover intentions and organization commitment, as well as job satisfaction, in turn, is consistent with Tett and Meyers’ (1993) work. Finally, the results are consistent with those of Porter and Steers (1973), Cotton and Tuttle (1985), Chapman (1991), and Kristof (1996) who each found negative associations between person-organization fit and intent to turnover.

Discussion of the Results

This section addresses reasons why the PSM variables did not produce statistical significance relationships with turnover intention. The absence of support for the hypothesized relationship between public service motivation and turnover intention leaves room for speculation. Perhaps the logical reason for the lack of support is that there is no direct relationship between public service motivation and turnover intention. Instead, the relationship may be more indirect as suggested by exploratory analysis that shows that PSM affects organization commitment that affects turnover intention (see Figure1). People with higher PSM are more likely to work in the public sector. These people are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, which “emphasizes pleasures and enjoyment as drivers of efforts” as well as prosocially motivated, which “emphasizes meaning and purpose as drivers of efforts” (Perry et al., 2010p. 2). Therefore, these same people are more likely to be more committed to their organization and less likely to decide to leave.
On the other hand, perhaps PSM does matter, but is primarily salient for younger/new employees. It may be that by mid- to late- career, a person is more set in their ways or “established in a given field” (Hellman, 1997p. 672), are more satisfied in their job and are less likely to turnover. Furthermore, while research demonstrates that PSM is “negatively related to public employees’ preferences for monetary incentives” (Bright, 2005p. 149), there is the possibility that employees in mid- to late-career are less likely to turnover due to incentives, such as pension and retirement benefits.

The second reason that public service motivation did not have an impact on turnover intention may have been the survey sample. The majority of respondents were white males, over the age of 50, who hold at least a Master’s degree. Almost 72 percent of the respondents are at the GS-14 pay grade or above, with just over half of the total respondents working for the government twenty years or more. It if were possible to secure a more representative sample of federal government personnel, the results may have been different.

The response rate was low given the number of surveys distributed. While online surveys are more advantageous in regards to ease, time, data collection and storage, and ability to produce reports faster, they tend to “elicit lower response rates” (Bennett & Nair, 2010, p. 358). Dillman (2010) has shown in his research that response rates for online surveys should be between twenty percent and forty percent. The survey rate for this research was 15.5 percent, whereas the percentage of surveys that bounced back or were refused was over 28 percent.

Another possible reason that there were not more significant findings is that the sample does not include respondents with a military e-mail address (an e-mail ending in .mil). Not only were military members excluded, but any civilian personnel with a military e-mail address were
excluded. Military members may join the military to “serve their country” or as their “civic duty.” These are, based on Perry’s definitions, considered public service motivation. It is possible that adding the military might have modified the results somewhat. Moreover, perhaps a separate survey for the military would have shown more direct relationships between PSM and turnover intentions.

Finally, the findings could have been affected by the following:

- Political corruption and a cynicism that is a function of the recent difficult economic times.
- The global measure of turnover intention that may be masking relationships between specific types of turnover, such as turnover to leave for the private sector or turnover to leave for a job in another public agency.
- A lack of variation in the measures of PSM because all of the survey respondents have a high level of public service motivation.
- Perhaps employees are employees wherever they work, and there is no PSM difference between public and private sector employees.

Implications

The findings from this research reinforce that the broader body of research that demonstrates that organization commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization are leading predictors of turnover intentions. At first blush, effort to reduce turnover in federal agencies should focus on these variables in contrast to efforts to hire job applicants with high PSM or to enhance the PSM of employees. Agencies should focus on choosing employees who most closely fit the job and agency. The second solution would be to redesign jobs of the current
employees to make the job a better fit. Finally, moving people into jobs where they are a better fit would benefit.

Efforts should also focus on what satisfies employees, as well as what causes them to be committed to their agencies. Meta-analyses reveal that job satisfaction can be enhanced through variables, “which include both employee personality and work environment” (Bowling, Eschleman, Qiang, Kirkendall, & Alacron, 2010p. 602). Research shows that, to help ensure that employees experience job satisfaction that leads to reduced turnover intentions, public agencies, preferably, need to hire employees with high self esteem, high self-efficacy, and high emotional stability or develop these qualities in their employees (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham, 1989). Variable associated with the work environment that would enhance job satisfaction include enhanced job complexity, enhanced job autonomy, social and organizational support, positive interpersonal relationships, effective leader behaviors, psychological ownership (i.e., feelings of possession of the job), and high salaries (Baumeister, 1999; Brockner, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Korman, 1070, 1976; Pierce & Gardner, 2004).

To enhance organization commitment that might lead to reducing turnover, one might turn to Morrow (2011, p. 20) who searched several hundred studies for directions on how “organizations can elevate their affective organizational commitment levels among their members.” Fifty-eight articles were analyzed, and six broad categories of antecedents of affective organizational commitment (AOC) were identified: socialization (fostering commitment at pre-entry and as a newcomer); organizational changes (teams and mentoring); human resource practices (group based bonuses and involvement in pay system change);
interpersonal relations (spiritual leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors); employee/organization relations (general support and emotional support for employees’ families); and other antecedents. However, the research presented here also suggests that organization commitment can be increased through hiring people with high attraction to policy-making PSM, compassion PSM, public interest PSM, and self-sacrifice PSM.
FIGURE 5.1

Path Model for the Relationship between PSM and Turnover Intention, with Organization Commitment Intervening
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Future Directions

Since lack of participation may have affected the results, it may be wise to repeat this research with a strategy to enhance survey responses. Of the refused surveys, most were because the participant did not want to respond. However, many participants stated that the federal government or their agency did not allow participation in unsolicited surveys. Many participants questioned whether permission had been received from the federal government or agency to distribute the survey. Several participants demanded to know how their e-mail address had been obtained. To increase the survey response rate, future researchers might obtain permission and endorsements from agency officials, and the survey might be distributed by agency officials in exchange for the data on their agency.

Utilizing a more diverse sample may also be prudent. This research contains a sample which consists of higher level managers and executives in the federal government. One option would be to develop a sample consisting of lower level employees that may be more in line with the demographics of the federal government. A second option would be to sample and survey employees from state and local government. Comparing the impact of PSM on turnover intention across various state or local governments would be another option.

Along the same lines of sampling local government employees, research on “grass-roots” service providers might reveal a stronger relationship between PSM and turnover intentions. Research could be developed at all three levels of government to analyze the impact that PSM has on the turnover intentions of the government workers that come into direct contact with clients and citizens. With a need to help and to serve others, there are people who enter into government positions that will have greater interaction with the people they want to benefit. At
the federal level, there are FBI agents, immigration officers, park rangers, medical personnel, social workers, and safety inspectors. At the state level, one can find correctional officers, licensing officers, state police and bureau investigators who have regular interaction with the client. At the local level, government employees are much closer to the community, and are more likely to see the outcome of PSM or the job. These workers include the mayor, local police and firefighters, sanitation workers, and teachers.

A fourth option for future investigation would be to include variables that measure the degree to which employees’ jobs help them fulfill their public service motivation. Although employees may have high public service motivation, they may not be working in positions that permit them to demonstrate their attraction to policy PSM, compassion PSM, public interest PSM, and self sacrifice PSM. Investigating the impact of the interaction between the nature of employees’ jobs and their PSM might reveal stronger relationships between PSM and employee turnover intentions.

The items comprising the measure of intent to turnover were developed by others Bright, 2008; Moynihan and Landuyt, 2008; Lee and Mitchell, 1994; Michaels and Spector, 1982; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez, 2001; Bertelli, 2006; Hom and Kinicki (2001); and Maertz and Campion, 2004. Refining the measure of intent to turnover in order to produce more acceptable reliability statistics is another project for future research. Moreover, a future study that investigates the relationship between PSM and subcomponent measures of turnover intentions--specifically, intent to turnover for a job in the private sector or for a job in another public agency—might be revealing. A study comparing currently employed federal employees with federal employees who have actually left their jobs (turned over) would also be of value.
Harder measures may reveal stronger relationships between turnover and public service motivation. Additionally, even though PSM may not affect turnover intentions, there may be other important organizational outcomes or problems that are associated with PSM. Future research might examine the relationship between PSM and absenteeism, productivity, and employee morale. People articulate a variety of reasons for wanting to work in public service and the federal government. Research that assesses why people joined the government may ascertain better measures of PSM and stronger relationships between PSM and turnover intentions.

Finally, the survey did ask questions on turnover intentions and the economic climate in 2012, and the responses were not used in the final research. Further research may consider determining the impact of an economic crisis with turnover intentions of government workers. As previously mentioned, this can be done at any level of government, or in a comparison of the different levels. Results of this research may be significant at the federal level because 2012 is an election year. A relationship between turnover intentions, public service motivation, an economic crisis, and an election year may produce findings that are unique and noteworthy.

Conclusions

Turnover research is viewed as more than an employee leaving an organization, since Brayfield and Crockett’s (1955) research in the middle of the 20th century. In this era of government transparency and economic difficulties punctuated with demands to reduce government spending during a Presidential re-election year, the federal government must find innovative ways to reduce personnel costs and retain qualified employees. As public opinion
demands that government officials spend tax dollars more efficiently, discovering predictors of turnover is a step in reducing the costs of turnover.

People make a big deal over public service motivation. However, this research reveals a limitation to the positive effects of PSM. Taking PSM into account when considering a new government employee is not a waste of time, but it does not appear to impact the turnover intentions of mid to high level civil servants in the federal government. If reducing turnover is a priority of a federal agency, there are more important qualities to test for than public service motivation, such as person-organization fit, as well as one’s propensity to commit to organizations and employee satisfaction.
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APPENDIX I

Survey As Posted on www.qualtrics.com

Please indicate your satisfaction with your current position by choosing a response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am satisfied with my opportunities for achievement.

I am satisfied with my recognition opportunities.

I am satisfied with the level of responsibility in my job.

I am satisfied with the meaningfulness of my job.

I am satisfied with my advancement opportunities.

I am satisfied with my pay in this job.
Please indicate your opinion on defining government employment as “self-sacrifice,” by choosing a response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.

I believe in putting duty before self.

Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds.

Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself.

Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.

I feel people should give back to society more than they get from it.

I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else.

I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.
Please indicate your opinion on defining government employment as social justice by choosing a response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe that there are many public causes worth championing.

I do not believe that government can do much to make society fairer.

If any group does not share in the prosperity of our society, then we are all worse off.

I am willing to use every ounce of my energy to make the work a more just place.

I am not afraid to go to bat for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.
Please indicate your opinions of defining government employment in terms of attraction to policy making by choosing a response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Politics is a dirty word.

The compromises that are involved in public policy making don’t appeal to me.

I don’t care much for politicians.

I respect public officials who can turn a good idea into a law.

Ethical behavior of public officials is as important as competence.
Please indicate your opinion on defining government in terms of compassion by choosing a response to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most social programs are too vital to do without.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don’t know personally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first steps to help themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your opinion on defining government employment in terms of public interest pub
choosing a response to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is hard for me to get intensely interested in what is going on in my community.

I unselfishly contribute to my community.

Meaningful public service is very important to me.

I consider public service my civic duty.

I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interest.
Please indicate your opinion on defining government employment in terms of civic duty by choosing a response to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When public officials take an oath of office, I believe that they accept obligations not expected of other citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to go to great lengths to fulfill my obligations to my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service is one of the highest forms of citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe everyone has a moral commitment to civic affairs no matter how busy they are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, the phrase “duty, honor, and country” stirs deeply felt emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my obligation to look after those less well off.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to help solve problems arising from interdependencies among people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your degree of agreement with each of the following statements on person-organization fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My values are compatible to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values are compatible to the federal government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the members of my work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers are similar to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am a good match for this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not fit with this organization’s culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fit in with the organization’s culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I only work for the federal government because I am basically guaranteed a job, a paycheck, and benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your degree of agreement with each of the following statements about organizational commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

My values and goals are very similar to the values and goals of my organization.

I am not very comfortable within the culture of my organization.

I feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.

What this organization stands for is important to me.
Please indicate your current and future work plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have a desire to leave or quit my job.

Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my current organization for a job in another public organization.

Within the next two years, I am likely to leave my position with the federal government for a position in the private sector.

In the past two years, I have considered leaving my current organization for a job in another public organization.

In the past two years, I have considered leaving my position in the federal government for a position in the private sector.

It is likely that I will be at this job one year from now.

It is likely that I will be working for this organization this time next year.

It is likely I will probably look for a job at another public agency or organization in the next year.

I will be working for this
organization five years from now.
Thinking about the economic situation in the United States from 2008 through 2011, please choose a response to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Now is a good time to find a quality job in the private sector.

Now is a good time to find a job in the public sector.

If offered, I would consider taking a job in the private sector.

If the budget was to be cut, and there was the possibility that my job would be cut, I would consider leaving for a private sector job.

If offered a job in the private sector with a substantial pay increase, I would take the job.

If offered a job in the private sector with a substantial pay increase, I would take the job only if the values and goals of the organization were similar to mine.
And finally, some simple demographic questions….

What is your gender?
What is your age?
What is your education level?
The Federal Agency or Department I work for is:
What is your race?
My base pay grade is:
How long have you been employed by the Federal Government?
Is your position with the Federal Government considered a political appointment?
APPENDIX II

PRIMING E-MAIL

Greetings!

Because of your employment with the federal government, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on public service motivation and turnover intentions. My name is Jennifer Morrison. I am a Political Science/Public Administration doctoral student at the University of Alabama. I wish to gather information on attitudes of federal government employees on both these topics. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Within the next couple of days, you will be receiving a link to participate in a survey for my dissertation research. You are under no obligation to participate. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

Please reply to this email to indicate your willingness to participate in this research.

I thank you in advance for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Morrison, Doctoral Candidate
jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com or (205) 331-6761
The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404

J. Norman Baldwin, Ph.D., Professor
jbaladin@bama.ua.edu or (205) 348-3813
The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404
INITIAL E-MAIL INVITATION

The University of Alabama
Human Research Protections Program

RE: Research Invitation

Jennifer C. Morrison, Principal Investigator from the University of Alabama is conducting a study called **The Impact of Public Service Motivation on the Intent to Turnover By New Hire Federal Employees**. She wishes to determine the impact of public service motivation on new hire federal employees in their decision as to whether or not they want to leave the government within the first two years of being hired.

Taking part in this study involves completing a web survey that will take between 10 and 20 minutes. This survey contains questions on public service motivation, organization commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

We will protect your confidentiality by using a survey website, qualtrics.com, which has advanced security and firewall protection. Only Jennifer Morrison (the investigator) and Dr. J. Norman Baldwin (Dissertation Chair) will have access to the data. The data are password protected. Only summarized, or aggregate, data will be presented at meetings or in publications - your individual survey responses will not be reported.

There will be no direct benefits to you. The findings will be useful to researchers for the purpose of further academic studies.

The chief risk is that some of the questions make may you uncomfortable. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Jennifer Morrison, investigator, at (205) 331-6761 or by email at jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com. Or you may contact Dr. J. Norman Baldwin at (205) 348-3813 or jbaldwin@bama.ua.edu

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY. You are free not to participate or stop participating any time before you submit your answers. **Should you not wish to participate**, please hit “reply” and place the word “No” in the subject field. Your e-mail address will be removed from the database. Otherwise, please expect another e-mail within the next few days with a link to the survey.

Thank you so much for your time and assistance with this research!

{Link to be added through Qualtrics.com}
I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer at The University of Alabama, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.
Greetings!!

This is a follow-up reminder that you are invited to participate in a study on risk to the researcher. This study is undertaken as partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree requirements for the department of political science at The University of Alabama. My name is Jennifer Morrison, and I am the doctoral student in charge of this study. Please, feel free to contact me with any questions regarding this research.

Because of your employment with the federal government, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on public service motivation and turnover intentions. The survey will require approximately 10 to 20 minutes of your time. If you do choose to participate in the following survey, please click the survey link and you will be directed to the survey. You may withdraw at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no penalty to you for withdrawal from the study. If your decision is to not participate in the study, please send an e-mail to me at jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com with the word “No” in the subject line. You will then be removed from the survey database.

{Link to be added through Qualtrics.com}

I thank you in advance for participating in this study.

Jennifer Morrison, Doctoral Candidate
jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com

The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404

Dr. J. Norman Baldwin, Dissertation Chair
Department of Political Science
The University of Alabama
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404

I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.
If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer at The University of Alabama, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.
Good Day!!

I am once again asking for your assistance by completing the attached survey. In order to finish the work for my PhD, I need these survey results for my dissertation. As of now, I do not have enough results, and the date I must turn the final product in, is right around the corner.

This is why I need your help.

I am asking that you click on the link below and take a survey on the impact of public service motivation on turnover. Currently, there is very little research on this topic, and I hope that my work will add to the academic literature on employee turnover.

Let me assure you:

* This survey is **completely anonymous!** A third party research organization (Qualtrics.com) will aggregate your input with responses from other employees in the federal government. Your responses will **not** be viewed individually.
* You will not be solicited for any products or services as the result of this survey.
* Your email address will not be distributed to another party.
* The survey should only take about **10 minutes** of your time.

The survey will close on Friday, March 9th.

I have no way of knowing if you have already completed the survey. If you have, I **greatly** appreciate your time and assistance. If you haven’t, could you please just take a few minutes to complete it?

Thank you in advance for your time and contribution to this important work.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Morrison, Doctoral Candidate
jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com
The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL  35404

Dr. J. Norman Baldwin, Dissertation Chair
Department of Political Science
The University of Alabama
Follow this link to the Survey:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}
APPENDIX III

Kendall’s tau-b Correlations between Turnover Intention and PSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kendall’s tau-b Correlations between Turnover Intention and the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Policy-Making PSM</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion PSM</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest PSM</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice PSM</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.341**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>-.222**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>-.212**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01 level (2-tailed).
December 19, 2011

Institutional Review Board
The University of Alabama
358 Rose Administration Building
PO Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

RE: Expedited Decision for Dissertation Research (Edited Version)

Dear Respected Members of the IRB:

Enclosed, please find the edited version of my request for IRB approval, per your requested revisions. I have made all the corrections except for number 1 and number 12.

**Number 1:** I am asking for approval pending my completion of the online training requirements. I will have these completed, and the certificates e-mailed to you by January 2, 2012. With this approval, I can have my priming letters and survey ready to go with your approval upon receipt of that information.

**Number 12:** My chair and I have taken the survey, and have asked three other people to take it and time themselves. We have found that it is taking between 5 and 11 minutes to complete the survey. The person who took 11 minutes was multi-tasking at the time. Therefore, we have changed the time to “between 10 and 20 minutes.”

Again, I ask for an expedited decision.

Thank you again.

Jennifer Morrison
jc.morrison1@bama.ua.edu
(205)242-0377
Jennifer C. Morrison  
11460 Alton Drive  
Northport, AL 35475  
(205) 242-0377  
Jcmorrison1@bama.ua.edu

Institutional Review Board  
The University of Alabama  
358 Rose Administration Building  
PO Box 870127  
Tuscaloosa, AL 35405  

RE: Expedited Decision for Dissertation Research

Dear Respected Members of the IRB,

I am requesting an expedited decision in order to do the research needed for my dissertation.

My research, The Impact of Public Service Motivation on the Turnover Intentions of New Hire Federal Employees, will require that I send out an e-mail survey to 1000 randomly chosen federal employees. While the survey will be sent out using qualtrics.com, I will be randomly choosing and then entering the e-mail address. Qualtrics is an online survey site, similar to surveymonkey.com. I received a random e-mail from another student using Qualtrics, which is how I discovered the site.

As I am under very tight time restraints, I am requesting that a decision be made prior to the Christmas holiday, which begins on December 22, 2011. With your approval, I will then be able to send out the survey immediately after the New Year.

Enclosed, please find my application, with a copy of my priming letter, my invitation letter, and my follow-up letter. I have also enclosed a copy of my survey.

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (205) 242-0377 or jen.morrison.ua@gmail.com.

Thank you

Jennifer C. Morrison
IRB Project #:

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA  
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS  
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

I. Identifying information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Second Investigator</th>
<th>Third Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Jennifer C. Morrison</td>
<td>Dr. J. Norman Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Department of Political Science</td>
<td>Department of Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>205-242-0377</td>
<td>205-348-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX:</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:jbmorrison1@ua.edu">jbmorrison1@ua.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title of Research Project: The Impact of Public Service Motivation in the Turnover Intentions of New Hire Federal Employees

Date Submitted: 12/12/11

Funding Source:

Type of Proposal: ☒ New  [ ] Revision  [ ] Renewal  [ ] Completed  [ ] Exempt

Please attach a renewal application

Please attach a continuing review of studies form

Please enter the original IRB # at the top of the page

UA faculty or staff member signature: ________________________________

II. NOTIFICATION OF IRB ACTION (to be completed by IRB):

Type of Review: ______ Full board ______ Expedited

IRB Action:

___ Rejected  Date: _______

___ Tabled Pending Revisions  Date: _______

___ Approved Pending Revisions  Date: _______

___ Approved—this proposal complies with University and federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

Approval is effective until the following date:

Items approved:  ___ Research protocol  (dated_______)

___ Informed consent  (dated_______)

___ Recruitment materials  (dated_______)

___ Other  (dated_______)

Approval signature ________________________________ Date ___________________
### Study Personnel and Study Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Degree(s) or student status (e.g., master’s student)</th>
<th>Study Position Title (PI, Interviewer, Data Analyst, etc.)</th>
<th>Study Responsibilities</th>
<th>Date of Certificate of Investigator / staff Human Subjects Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer C. Morrison Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Primary Investigator</td>
<td>Obtain and analyze data. Write all research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Norman Baldwin, PhD Dissertation Committee Chair Department of Political Science</td>
<td>Secondary Investigator, Dissertation Chair</td>
<td>Monitor and verify all research and work pertaining to the study.</td>
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</tr>
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</table>
Directions: The Principal Investigator (PI) and one other person (Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervising Professor, or departmental designee must sign and submit before application can be reviewed by IRB.

Principal Investigator’s Assurance Statement (Student investigators may sign as PI):

I understand the University of Alabama’s policies concerning research involving human subjects and I agree:
1. To comply with all IRB policies, decisions, conditions, and requirements;
2. To accept responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of this research study;
3. To obtain prior approval from the Institutional Review Board before amending or altering the research protocol or implementing changes in the approved consent/assent form;
4. To report to the IRB in accord with federal, sponsor, university, and IRB policies, any adverse event(s) and/or unanticipated problem(s) involving risks to subjects;
5. To complete continuation, modification, and closure forms on time and to collaborate with IRB monitoring of studies for quality improvement or cause;
6. To notify the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and/or the IRB (when applicable) of the development of any financial interest not already disclosed;
7. To ensure that individuals listed as study personnel have received the mandatory human research protections education;
8. To ensure that individuals listed as study personnel possess the necessary experience for conducting research activities in the role described for this research study.

My signature below also means that I have appropriate facilities and resources for conducting the study.

PI SIGNATURE ___________________________________________ DATE December 12, 2011

NAME TYPED __________________________________________

STUDY TITLE _______The Impact of Public Service Motivation on the Turnover Intentions of New Hire Federal Employees_____________________________________________

**ALL STUDENT RESEARCH: Supervising Professor’s Assurance Statement:**

I certify that I have reviewed this research protocol. I attest to the scientific merit of this study; to the competency of the investigator(s) to conduct the project; that facilities, equipment, and personnel are adequate to conduct the research; that continued guidance will be provided as appropriate, and the study will be closed before student graduation.

SIGNATURE ___________________________________________ DATE __December 12, 2011

NAME TYPED __________________________________________

*Department Chairperson’s/Department Designee’s Assurance Statement:
I certify that I have reviewed this research protocol. I attest to the scientific validity and importance of this study; to the competency of the investigator(s) to conduct the project and their time available for the project; that facilities, equipment, and personnel are adequate to conduct the research; and that continued guidance will be provided as appropriate. When the principal investigator assumes a sponsor function, the investigator is knowledgeable of the additional regulatory requirements of the sponsor and can comply with them.
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NAME TYPED ___ Dr. Richard Fording __________ TITLE __ Chair, Department of Political Science 

*If the PI is also the department chair, dean, associate dean for research, or equivalent, another research-qualified person should sign the Signature Assurance Sheet.
Research Description

Purpose, Objective, Design

The purpose of this research is to study what is the impact of public service motivation on the turnover intentions of new hire federal employees. The study will be done by an on-line survey of federal government employees about their attitudes on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-organization fit and various definitions of public service motivation. It is hoped to determine what the role of public service motivation is the considering whether or not to leave the federal government. Additionally, there is little to no research on this topic, whether the specific definitions of public service motivation, or public service motivation in general.

Study Procedures

One thousand (1000) randomly chosen federal employees will be sent an e-mail about the survey with a link to the survey at qualtrics.com. The survey should take between 10 and 20 minutes to complete, and once submitted back to Qualtrics, there will be no markers identifying who took the survey.

The data will only be available to two people, Jennifer Morrison, doctoral student and principle investigator, and Dr. J. Norman Baldwin of the Department of Political Science at The University of Alabama, who is the dissertation chair and the secondary investigator. Data and e-mail addresses of those surveyed will be password protected in the Qualtrics database. In the event of any questions or concerns from the participants, the telephone number and e-mail address of both Ms. Morrison and Dr. Baldwin will be available in the priming letter as well as the letter that accompanies the survey. Furthermore, the telephone number to The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board will also be available to participants in both of those documents.

Supervision and training for this research is not necessary beyond what has already been taught in academic courses. There will be no deception used in this survey.

Study Background

In the November 5, 2010 edition of the Washington Post, columnist Joe Davidson discussed the high attrition rate among new employees at many agencies in the United States government. Referring to a report released the day before from the Partnership for Public Service and Booz Allen Hamilton, the U.S. government “is losing too many new hires – the same talent it is working so hard to recruit and bring on board.” While Uncle Sam generally does a good job retaining employees, between 2006 and 2008, 78.8 percent of new hires remained in their jobs in the federal government within two years of being hired (Davidson ). This loss of 21.2 percent of recent hires is not only a loss of human capital but also a loss of a
new generation of talent that would have otherwise helped shape the brightness of the future of the federal government.

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the impact of public service motivation (PSM) on turnover intentions, while controlling for the traditional leading predictors of intent to turnover. The theory of public service motivation (PSM) suggests that “individuals with greater PSM are more likely (1) to be found working in government because of the opportunities it offers to provide meaningful public service, and (2) to perform better in – and feel more satisfied with – their public sector jobs because they find this type of work intrinsically rewarding” (Wright and Grant 691). Additionally, it is assumed in PSM research that “individuals with greater PSM are more likely to work in government” (Wright and Grant 691) due to public service opportunities. Scholars, such as Perry and Wise (1990) have “hypothesized that individuals with high levels of PSM will have significantly higher levels of job satisfaction, performance and commitment in public organizations” (Bright 49). Employees high in PSM would have a more positive attitude about working for the government, and a greater commitment to their jobs as “employees display higher levels of job satisfaction, and subsequently lower turnover intentions, when the characteristics of their working environment satisfy their needs” (Bright 49). However, if over a fifth of new hires in federal agencies decide to leave within two years of being hired, what is the impact of public service motivation on intent to turnover?

Jennifer Morrison is a doctoral student at the University of Alabama. She has a Master’s in Public Administration from Troy State University – Montgomery, and has been a student at UA since Fall 2004. She has completed all her coursework and passed her comprehensive exams in Public Administration, American Politics and Criminal Justice. Public Administration is her major field, and has taken three of her PA courses with Dr. Baldwin; American Politics and Criminal Justice are her minor fields. As this study is Ms. Morrison’s dissertation for her PhD in Political Science, this is her first study of this caliber. However, with the results of this survey, there is the potential for at least three additional studies.

**Subject Population**

The population in this study will consist of 1000 current federal employees, with valid federal e-mail addresses. A data bank of no more than 1500 e-mail addresses will be created to account for e-mails that bounce back, or for potential participants who decline to take the survey. At the time the survey is sent to the participants, age, race, gender, pay class, education, and ethnicity will not matter. These characteristics will be determined through demographic questions, and may be used in research at some further time.

The only population being excluded in the survey e-mail is any government e-mail address that ends in .mil, which is a military address. Research has already addressed the
turnover intentions of the military, and it is believed that their responses would skew the results. This study concentrates on non-military government employees.

**Subject Recruitment Methods**

Government e-mail addresses have been randomly chosen from the Winter 2011 Federal Staff Directory, which can be found at the Gorgas Library at the University of Alabama, or purchased through Amazon.com. As it is anticipated to have 1000 surveys completed, no more than 1500 e-mail addresses will be chosen. A “priming” letter will be sent out as an e-mail to 1000 potential participants before the survey is sent out. E-mails that bounce back will be disregarded and those will be replaced by the surplus e-mails in the data bank. Also, any participants that respond back and decline to participate will be disregarded, and another e-mail sent out to replace them.

The purpose of the priming letter is to prepare the potential participants for receipt of the survey. As is stated in the letter, the research is being conducted for dissertation purposes, and that their e-mail address has been selected randomly to participate. A statement has been placed in the e-mail giving instructions on how to refuse participation in the survey:

**Should you not wish to participate**, please hit “reply” and place the word “No” in the subject field. Your e-mail address will be removed from the database. Otherwise, please expect another e-mail within the next few days with a link to the survey.

Furthermore, through Qualtrics, there is a link that auto-populates in the survey invitation message an opt-out link. Members of the panel that are receiving the invitation will have the chance to Opt-Out of future mailings to that panel by clicking on the link.

I will use the Qualtrics Mailer to send my survey to a list of contacts, also referred to as a panel. When using the Mailer, an email invitation is generated for each panel member containing a unique link that can be clicked on to take the survey.

**Risks**

There are minimal to no risks anticipated in this research. Qualtrics maintains a secure website with a firewall, so all e-mail addresses, responses and data should be very safe.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

The only information that the researchers will have on the participants is their e-mail address. There will be no other identifying factors. The e-mail addresses have been randomly chosen and added to the data-base in no particular order. The e-mail database is accessible only by the primary investigator, and upon approval of the final dissertation in March 2012, will be
destroyed. Should a randomly chosen participant decline participation, their e-mail will be deleted from the database forthwith. The survey results may be shared with other social scientists, but no specific information will be given or shared with another entity. As there will be no subject identifiers, there is no concern about that information being given out.

The survey information will be retained through the Qualtrics website, which advertises “advanced security and confidentiality for your results will be password protected, secured and firewall protected” http://www.qualtrics.com/university/researchsuite/common-survey-design-questions/why-use-online-surveys

We have no way of tracing specific responses to a particular person. As the e-mail addresses are so random, it would be difficult to contact a particular employer about the results of one particular person.

Special Precautions and Safeguards

There is no concern about the safety of the participants.

Benefits

The participants will imply their consent by clicking on the link and completing the survey.

There will be no direct benefits to the participants. Should the research uncover elements that the federal government and the Office of Personnel Management decide to incorporate into the federal policies, then the participants may be indirectly benefited.

In general, this is a topic, public service motivation and intention to turnover together, has little to no research available. This particular research will bring this topic to light, and may help with personnel retention in the federal government. Furthermore, it will add to research on both public service motivation and intention to turnover separately.

A waiver of written documentation is being requested since this is an online survey.
Formats: Request for Waiver of Written Documentation of Informed Consent

Directions: Address the criteria listed below and attach this form to your application. Also, state in your application that you are requesting a waiver of written documentation of informed consent and describe what you will do to obtain consent in the procedure section of your application. The IRB often requires investigators to provide participants with a written information statement about the research when written documentation is waived; you may wish to include one in your initial application.

NOTE that the UA IRB does not allow passive consent and that waivers may not be granted for FDA-regulated research. You are welcome to call Research Compliance staff at 205-348-8461 to discuss your need for a waiver in advance of application submission.

(1) The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality; or

(2) The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

There is no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context. Participants will have the opportunity to decline participation in a priming letter sent prior to the survey:

Should you not wish to participate, please hit “reply” and place the word “No” in the subject field. Your e-mail address will be removed from the database. Otherwise, please expect another e-mail within the next few days with a link to the survey.

Participants will imply their consent by clicking on the link provided in Survey Request letter.
Greetings!

Because of your employment with the federal government, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on public service motivation and turnover intentions. My name is Jennifer Morrison. I am a Political Science/Public Administration doctoral student at the University of Alabama. I wish to gather information on attitudes of federal government employees on both these topics. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Within the next couple of days, you will be receiving a link to participate in a survey for my dissertation research. You are under no obligation to participate. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

Please reply to this email to indicate your willingness to participate in this research.

I thank you in advance for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Morrison, Doctoral Candidate
jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com or (205) 331-6761
The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL  35404

J. Norman Baldwin, Ph.D., Professor
jbaldrwin@bama.ua.edu or (205) 348-3813
The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL  35404
INITIAL E-MAIL INVITATION

The University of Alabama
Human Research Protections Program

RE: Research Invitation

Jennifer C. Morrison, Principal Investigator from the University of Alabama is conducting a study called **The Impact of Public Service Motivation on the Intent to Turnover By New Hire Federal Employees**. She wishes to determine the impact of public service motivation on new hire federal employees in their decision as to whether or not they want to leave the government within the first two years of being hired.

Taking part in this study involves completing a web survey that will take between 10 and 20 minutes. This survey contains questions on public service motivation, organization commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

We will protect your confidentiality by using a survey website, qualtrics.com, which has advanced security and firewall protection. Only Jennifer Morrison (the investigator) and Dr. J. Norman Baldwin (Dissertation Chair) will have access to the data. The data are password protected. Only summarized, or aggregate, data will be presented at meetings or in publications - your individual survey responses will not be reported.

There will be no direct benefits to you. The findings will be useful to researchers for the purpose of further academic studies.

The chief risk is that some of the questions may make you uncomfortable. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Jennifer Morrison, investigator, at (205) 331-6761 or by email at jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com. Or you may contact Dr. J. Norman Baldwin at (205) 348-3813 or jbaldwin@bama.ua.edu

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY. You are free not to participate or stop participating any time before you submit your answers. **Should you not wish to participate**, please hit “reply” and place the word “No” in the subject field. Your e-mail address will be removed from the database. Otherwise, please expect another e-mail within the next few days with a link to the survey.

Thank you so much for your time and assistance with this research!

{Link to be added through Qualtrics.com}
I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer at The University of Alabama, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.
Greetings!!

This is a follow-up reminder that you are invited to participate in a study on risk to the researcher. This study is undertaken as partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree requirements for the department of political science at The University of Alabama. My name is Jennifer Morrison, and I am the doctoral student in charge of this study. Please, feel free to contact me with any questions regarding this research.

Because of your employment with the federal government, I am reaching out to you for assistance with my dissertation research on public service motivation and turnover intentions. The survey will require approximately 10 to 20 minutes of your time. If you do choose to participate in the following survey, please click the survey link and you will be directed to the survey. You may withdraw at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no penalty to you for withdrawal from the study. If your decision is to not participate in the study, please send an e-mail to me at jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com with the word “No” in the subject line. You will then be removed from the survey database.

{Link to be added through Qualtrics.com}

I thank you in advance for participating in this study.

Jennifer Morrison, Doctoral Candidate
jc.morrison.bama@gmail.com

The University of Alabama
Department of Political Science
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL  35404

Dr. J. Norman Baldwin, Dissertation Chair
Department of Political Science
The University of Alabama
PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL  35404

I have read and understand the information presented and I consent to volunteer to be a participant in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I may withdraw at any time. Completion of this survey implies my consent to participate.
If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer at The University of Alabama, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.
January 13, 2012

Jennifer C. Morrison
Department of Political Science
College of Arts & Sciences
Box 870213


Dear Ms. Morrison,

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on January 12, 2012. If the study continues beyond that date, you must complete the IRB Renewal Application. If you modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this application, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpentaro T. Myles, MSM, CRM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

I. Identifying information

Principal Investigator: Jennifer C. Morrison
Second Investigator: Dr. J. Norman Baldwin
Third Investigator: 

Department: Department of Political Science
College: College of Arts and Sciences
University: The University of Alabama
Address: PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404
Telephone: 205-242-0377
FAX: 
E-mail: jmorrison1@ua.edu

Principal Investigator: 
Second Investigator: 
Third Investigator: 

Department: Department of Political Science
College: College of Arts and Sciences
University: The University of Alabama
Address: PO Box 870213
Tuscaloosa, AL 35404
Telephone: 205-348-513
FAX: 
E-mail: jbaladin@bama.ua.edu

Title of Research Project: The Impact of Public Service Motivation in the Turnover Intentions of New Hire Federal Employees

Date Submitted: 12/12/11
Funding Source: 

Type of Proposal: ☑ New  ☐ Revision  ☐ Renewal  ☐ Completed  ☐ Exempt

Please attach a renewal application
Please attach a continuing review of studies form
Please enter the original IRB # at the top of the page

UA faculty or staff member signature: 

II. NOTIFICATION OF IRB ACTION (to be completed by IRB):

Type of Review: ☑ Full board  ☐ Expedited

IRB Action: 
☐ Rejected
☐ Tabled Pending Revisions
☐ Approved Pending Revisions

Date: 

☐ Approved—this proposal complies with University and federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

Approval is effective until the following date: 1/12/2013

Items approved: ☑ Research protocol  ☑ Informed consent  ☑ Recruitment materials

(dated)  (dated)  (dated)

Approval signature: 

Please sign on the line below.

Signature: 

Date: 