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SUPPORTING INTRINSIC MOTIVATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTOR: EVALUATING THE EFFECTS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS

Erin Leah Luper

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Director: Blue E. Wooldridge, D.P.A.
Professor, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
November, 2014

This study used an electronic questionnaire to evaluate the levels of intrinsic motivation, compared to extrinsic motivation, in front-line local government employees. This research also evaluated the relationship between intrinsic motivation and public service motivation (PSM). Further, this research assessed the effects of performance appraisal systems (PAS) on intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees.

Current research suggests that public sector employees are more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated. This study found that, while the employees showed higher levels of
intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation, most of the respondents showed moderately high levels of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Additionally, the literature suggests that public sector employees place a high value on the missions and goals of public organizations, also known as PSM. This study found that, while both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation had an influence on PSM, intrinsic motivation had a greater affect on PSM for front-line local government employees.

Current research also suggests that an employee's intrinsic motivation can be diminished by exposure to an external control mechanism such as PAS. However, there are elements of the performance appraisal process, such as employee participation, that may positively influence the employee's attitude towards the management practice. This study found that the type of PAS, whether participatory or non-participatory, caused a variation in the employee's attitudes towards the PAS for intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees.
Chapter One: Introduction and Concept

Nature of the Problem

When compared to their private sector equivalents, research suggests that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards (Houston, 2006). Public servants tend to be motivated by the innate foundations of their agency’s missions and goals (Goodsell, 2006). Intrinsic motivation is viewed as an individual’s internal drive to perform well, whereas extrinsic motivation to perform is based on an external outcome (Wright & Pandey, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000). In the public sector, the promotion of intrinsic motivation is desirable as public employees, showing higher levels of intrinsic motivation, tend to place a higher value on helping others and public service over financial benefits (Wright & Pandey, 2008). Intrinsically motivated public sector employees place a high value on the intrinsic and altruistic facets of their work (Crewson, 1997).

When an external agent is evaluating an employee’s work, such as the case of performance appraisals, the individual may experience a loss of self-determination. This perception of external control may undermine any existing intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). When the performance appraisal is perceived as an external control mechanism, intrinsic motivation is then “crowded out” (Frey, 1994). Further, Kuvaas (2006) explains that most employees show positive response to performance feedback if it is perceived as supporting autonomy and employee competence. As intrinsically motivated employees place a strong value on autonomy, they tend to be more susceptible to negative perceptions of external regulation.
Oh and Lewis (2009) explain that more intrinsically motivated federal employees disagreed that performance appraisal systems were motivating in terms of job performance. Oh and Lewis (2009) also suggested that the more uniform the external intervention (performance appraisal), the more negatively it affects intrinsic motivation. Further, government institutions tend to intervene more formally (having less flexibility) than private institutions as they are bound more closely by rules and regulations (Frey, 1994).

As most research concerning performance appraisal has focused in other levels of government and sectors, there is a need for concentration on performance appraisal at the local government level (Daley, 1991). Poister and Streib (1999) explain that fewer than 40% of municipalities attempt any form of “meaningful” performance measurement system. If performance appraisals are viewed by the employees as meaningless, then performance may not link to effort due to a meaningless process (de Bruijn, 2007).

Front-line employees are a central factor in how a service organization is perceived by its customers (Wieseke, Ullrich, Christ & Van Dick, 2007). Front-line government employees, or street-level bureaucrats, are charged with the implementation element of the policy process. Front-line workers are the core of the organization and hold the direct link between the public organization and the citizen. Due to the nature of this exchange, front-line employees have a substantial amount of discretion outside of their formal authority and are harder to monitor and constrain by management (Meyers and Vorsanger, 2007). These employees tend to be over-worked and under-resourced and are the threshold between the public and government policy action. These employees harbor a great deal of job-related stress (Liskpy, 2010). Therefore, if
public employees show signs of intrinsic motivation, that are inherent in the missions and goals of public organizations, it is then important to explore their attitudes towards factors that may undermine this intrinsic motivation and to further investigate variables that may promote this intrinsic motivation.

These factors may be rooted within the organization through their attitudes towards performance appraisal systems or outside of the organization through their interaction with the public. Employee performance appraisal participation, goal setting, and feedback can influence performance appraisal acceptance and create positive outcomes concerning employee motivation and productivity (Roberts & Reed, 1996). Facets of performance appraisal systems can lead to higher employee acceptance such as employee participation in the performance appraisal process (Roberts, 2003).

It is important to examine the procedural aspects of performance appraisal systems as public employees tend to be more concerned with procedural fairness and private sector employees tend to be more concerned with fairness in reward or result distribution (Kidwell & Bennett, 1994). As performance appraisal is an important management tool in the public sector, procedurally, it is important for employees to perceive an open process such as employee participation (Daley, 1992).

**Purpose**

*The purpose of this study was to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees. This study sought to find if the intrinsic motivation of front-line local government employees is associated with public service motivation*
Further, this study examined the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) are perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

The literature explains that when an individual perceives a shift in control due to external sources, this psychological process “crowds” or weakens that individual’s intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1971; Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997). When external rewards and controls are low, individuals will search for meaning in their task performance and intrinsic motivation may increase (Frey, 1994).

The work of Deci, Ryan, and Frey suggest that external control may “crowd out”, or undermine intrinsic motivation however, Kuvaas (2006) found a negative relationship between employees with low intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal satisfaction and a positive relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and employees with high levels of intrinsic motivation. Therefore, high levels of intrinsic motivation may be related to meaningful performance appraisal systems. On the other hand, Oh and Lewis (2009) found that employees with higher levels of intrinsic motivation showed more negative attitudes towards the motivational power of performance appraisal systems. Further, the employees that showed no sign of intrinsic motivational factors were three times more likely to express that performance appraisal systems motivated their job performance. Neither Kuvaas (2006) nor Oh and Lewis (2009) specifically address participation in the PAS process.
The inconsistencies in the literature and research demonstrated by Kuvaas (2006) and Oh and Lewis (2009) offered a need for more research focusing on the relationships between intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal systems (PAS). Where Kuvaas (2006) found a positive relationship between PAS and intrinsic motivation, Oh and Lewis (2009) found a negative relationship between PAS and intrinsic motivation. Therefore, this study will look at the attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees towards PAS.

In a meta-analysis of the existing research concerning performance appraisal in local governments, Lacho, Stearns, and Whelan (1991) explained the intent of performance appraisal is to improve the receptiveness, efficacy, and responsibility of local government employees. The authors also expressed a need for a set of best practices in local government performance appraisal procedures. There is a lack of time, focus, and training when implementing performance appraisal at the local level. Further, local government is sometimes known for its lack of innovation and professional complexity, which can leak into the performance evaluation processes. In light of participatory appraisal systems, municipal performance appraisal surveys are starting to show a purpose in providing feedback to employees (Lacho, Stearns, & Whelan, 1991). While the public sector may be perceived as having procedural constraints, feedback regarding job responsibilities and performance have been formerly under-utilized in the public sector (Wright, 2004).

There are notable inconsistencies in the current studies concerning intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal systems as well as an explicit call for further research of performance appraisal practices in the local government arena. These contradictions are evidence of a need
for further research in these areas. This study attempted to explain some of the current conflict in research and provide an agenda for further study regarding intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal among municipal, front-line employees. Goodsell (2004) explains the importance of taking a sharper look at these factors within bureaucracy, as this is where collective social actions are implemented. Bureaucracies are where social and political missions are carried out through laws, public resources, and institutional knowledge.

Private sector employees serve a purpose to their organization to deliver a good, they are not obligated to the fundamental aspects of the public service motivation where public employees are obligated to serve, educate, and listen to the voice of citizens. Regarding the public service motivation and intrinsic motivation of front-line public servants, it is important to understand what elements affect their intrinsic motivation in order to harbor a public service environment that breeds high levels of intrinsic motivation which in turn provide better customer service to the citizens being served (Fountain, 2001).

**Research Questions**

**Intrinsic v. Extrinsic**

Are front-line local government employees more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated?

**Public Service Motivation (PSM)**

Will intrinsic motivation have a stronger relationship than extrinsic motivation with the PSM of front-line local government employees, such as civic duty, commitment to public service, and serving the community?
Participatory v. Non-Participatory

Do intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems when they perceive them to be participatory versus non-participatory?

Relevant Literature, Research, and Theoretical Foundations

Motivation

Motivation is the energy to act toward an end. Individuals exhibit varying amounts and types of motivation based on orientation where underlying attitudes and goals provide a rise to action (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Self-determination theory differentiates forms of motivation based on the reasons behind the rise to action (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Motivation refers to the concept of how specific behavior is initiated, continued, directed, and stopped in terms of concurrent subjective reactions (Porter and Lawler, 1968).

When referring to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the main distinction can be found in taking action because something is self-pleasing (intrinsic) or because something leads to an independent outcome (extrinsic) (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is also explained that the suggestion of extrinsic rewards can weaken intrinsic motivation in an individual (Deci, 1971). Pay, as tied to motivating job performance, is described by Lawler (1971) as undermining the individual employee. The employees perceive the merit pay as devaluing them individually. In terms of work motivation, Amabile (1993) explains intrinsically motivated employees to “seek enjoyment, interest, satisfaction of curiosity, self-expression, or personal challenge” in their
work. In turn, extrinsically motivated employees “engage in the work in order to obtain some goal that is apart from the work itself.”

Deci and Ryan (1980) explain that while extrinsic rewards may promote change in an individual’s perception of control and causality, other mechanisms of external control structures, such as performance appraisal systems, may have the same effect. Organizational processes that include forms of surveillance, such as billing hours or accounting for time, influence how individuals perceive their time in relation to money. For example, a person may be less likely to volunteer time when that time is controlled and accounted for in relation to monetary rewards. When “economic evaluation” is triggered, an individual’s thought process for willingness to volunteer is influenced (Pfeffer & Devoe, 2009; DeVoe & Pfeffer, 2010).

Internal and external controls are distinguished by an individual based on the expectancy that a certain outcome is due to their own behavior versus the control of an external source. In other words, the locus of control is the degree that and individual thinks that they can control external sources (Rotter, 1966, 1990). The locus of control shifts when the individual feels a transfer in internal (personal) causation due to an external source (Deci, 1971). Building on Rotter’s (1966) idea of “locus of control”, Frey (1994) explains that when control shifts from within the individual to being imposed from outside the individual, the individual feels that their behavior is being externally forced. The individual will feel a loss of justification and control and intrinsic motivation will be diminished (Frey, 1994).
When an employee feels that they have less control over their work and their environment, Dwyer and Ganster (1991) found that the result is a higher level of tardiness due to psychological demands. This provides evidence that job stress may be directly linked to measurable employee outcomes. The contrasting approaches of control and commitment shape employee behavior and attitudes in two very different ways. Human resource strategies that focus on control aim to improve efficiency through employee regulation based on rewards and measurable output. Strategies that focus on employee commitment use the psychological links to shape employee attitudes and behavior to align with the organization’s goals. Commitment-focused personnel management practices show higher levels of employee involvement and participation, socialization, and group problem solving (Arthur, 1994).

**Motivation: Intrinsic v. Extrinsic**

Intrinsic motivation can be viewed as a greater internal need for performance satisfaction (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Motivation, in terms of performance, is based on the choice of the worker to rise to action in order to achieve an outcome. Further, a number of possible outcomes are evaluated by the worker’s expectations, towards production or effectiveness (Vroom, 1964).

Frey (1994) explained the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic preferences as not only reactions to external intervention of reward or regulation but also a differentiation in mode of behavior. However, it is important to distinguish intrinsic motivation from job involvement and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction relates to the agreement between the individual and the job design where job involvement relates to an individual’s self-esteem or their psychological identification with their job. Further, intrinsic motivation relates to the individual’s performance as a factor in the satisfaction of the worker’s higher order needs (Lawler & Hall, 1970).
The role of intrinsic motivation in the public sector can be viewed through the lens of public service motivation (PSM) and job rewards. Intrinsic job rewards are considered to be the individual’s attainment of self-satisfaction received when performing an action. On the other hand, extrinsic rewards are acquired independently by an individual, such as a pay increase or promotion. When compared to private sector employees, it has been suggested that public employees place a higher value on these intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards (Houston, 2006, pg. 69). Crewson (1997) empirically provided that public-sector employees are less interested in economic rewards and more likely to consider intrinsic rewards of public service important when compared to private-sector employees.

Further, Amabile et al.’s (1994) research indicated that individuals could concurrently be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Although much of the research implies that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are mutually exclusive, there is little support for this matter. Amabile et al. (1994) show data that suggests intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as two “unipolar constructs.” Therefore, indicating one type of motivation does not imply the absence of the other type of motivation. This concept is similar to Herzberg’s (1968) breakdown of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction where the “opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but no job dissatisfaction.” Similarly, the opposite of intrinsic motivation is not extrinsic motivation. An employee may indicate one, the other, both, or neither which will be evaluated in the study.

**Crowding out**

The concept of “crowding out” refers to the psychological process where an individual’s intrinsic task motivation is diminished when an external control mechanism is detected (Frey &
Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 1985). When considering the economic approach to crowding out, where monetary rewards are expected to increase motivation, types of motivation are not distinguished (intrinsic and extrinsic). When either monetary rewards or regulations intervene from outside of an individual’s perceived nature (self-perception) of the performed task, intrinsic motivation may be affected (Frey and Jegen, 2001). In other words, the incentive, in terms of reward or regulation, undermines intrinsic motivation (Frey, 1994). On the other hand, Kwon (2014) suggests that incentive pay for strong performance, combined with increased discretion, can increase public service efforts, productivity, and reduce corruption.

The work of Deci, Ryan, and Frey have explained that external control may “crowd out”, or undermine intrinsic motivation however, Kuvaas (2006) found a negative relationship between employees with low intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal satisfaction and a positive relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and employees with high levels of intrinsic motivation. Subsequently, high levels of intrinsic motivation may be directly related to effective performance appraisal systems.

**Expectancy Theory**

Vroom (1964) explains expectancy through an action-outcome concept where a specific action will be followed by a specific outcome. When valence is combined with expectancy, a motivational behavior will lead to the outcome. In other words, job performance is a role of the “want” to perform along with motivation and aptitude (Heneman and Schwab, 1972).

Expectancy theory relies on the concept that expectations depend on the possibility of a specific outcome being the product of a specific action. The conception is cognitive in that it is
subjective to the probability and not objective to the probability (Porter and Lawler, 1968). When one is comparing outcomes in order to choose between specific action alternatives, the probability of certain outcomes is also an affecting factor. According to expectancy theory, an individual will choose an action in terms of the probability of the outcome (Vroom, 1964).

Lawler and Hall (1970) offer that intrinsic motivation is rooted directly in the framework of the expectancy theory as related to performance. Porter and Lawler (1968) explain that any theory concerning attitudes as related to performance must be directly included within a theory of motivation, such as the expectancy theory.

**Public Service Motivation (PSM)**

Through the theory of PSM, public employees are viewed to place a high value on commitment to public organizations (Houston, 2006). Perry and Wise (1990) explain that these public employees place a high value on civic duty and the inherent mission of public organizations. Rainey (1982) suggests that public employees exhibit a stronger sense of altruism and they find their work valuable to the community.

Perry (2000) explains that there exists an attraction to policy making, compassion, commitment to civic interest, and self-sacrifice. There is an individual self-conceptualizing process where identity and values are formed and can be found in the logic of motivation. Crewson (1997) found that public employees with service preferences (intrinsic) versus economic benefit (extrinsic) tend to have a higher level of commitment to their organization where employees who favor economic or extrinsic rewards are more likely to be disaffected.
Performance Appraisal and Intrinsic Motivation

“Performance’ refers to a person’s accomplishments on tasks that comprise his job. It can be evaluated by objective measures such as physical output, or by subjective measures such as ratings made by others or ratings made by the individual himself” (Porter and Lawler, 1968, p. 28). The goal of a performance appraisal system is to communicate information regarding performance between a rater and a ratee. This communication process is usually between the rater as a supervisor and the ratee as a subordinate (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). A performance appraisal system may be used to address multiple aspects of the organization including individual performance, providing feedback, motivation, recognition, promotion and pay raises, needs assessments, etc. Performance appraisals may also be referred to in the literature as reviews, evaluations, ratings, and management objectives (Law, 2007).

Performance appraisals may be perceived as a form of external control whether the outcome is positive or negative for the individual being evaluated (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Law, 2007). Elements that are inherent in performance appraisal systems feed into the perception of control (Law, 2007). Therefore, when an individual perceives their loss of internal control caused by performance appraisal, the necessary conditions that harbor intrinsic motivation are compromised (Deci, 1975). When an “external agent” is evaluating an employee’s work, the individual may experience a loss of self-determination. Further, evaluations can be linked to perceptions of external control, as the fundamental goal is to measure compliance with external demands. This perception of external control may undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It is then important to address whether the employee views the performance appraisal system as participatory or non-participatory (Roberts, 1995).
Poister and Streib (1999) explain that fewer than 40% of municipalities attempt any form of “meaningful” performance measurement system. The researchers found that of the local governments that attempt effective performance measurement, the purpose was lost in the goal of accountability to citizens. Service quality measurement was found to be a problem with the local governments that attempt to produce meaningful performance appraisal (Poister & Streib, 1999). In order to assess the elements of performance appraisal in public organizations, organizational culture, commitment, and accountability must be taken into account (Ammons & Condrey, 1991).

**Performance Management in Public Organizations (Participatory v. Non-Participatory)**

Roberts (2003) explains the importance of participation in performance appraisals for intrinsically motivated employees. If the employee is intrinsically motivated and does not feel that the performance appraisal system is participatory then the employee will not reap the cognitive and effective benefits of organizational and individual growth and development. If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system as participatory and valid, the employee is more likely to accept and learn from feedback even if the feedback is negative to the employee’s performance (Roberts, 2003).

Through a meta-analysis, Cawley, Keeping, & Levy (1998) found that employee participation was positively related to the employee’s satisfaction in the performance appraisal process. The researchers identified “participation” as allowing the employee to voice their opinion, allowing their voiced opinion to influence the appraisal, allowing participation in the development of the appraisal system, self-appraisal, and participation in the goal-setting process (Cawley, Keeping,
& Levy, 1998). This study will focus on the employee’s perception of being able to voice their opinion during the performance appraisal.

In a study conducted by Roberts and Reed (1996), employees being rated by a supervisor perceived the performance appraisal where the supervisor encouraged participation, goal setting, and feedback to be more effective as an administrative process. Kovaas (2007) explains a positive relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal and intrinsic motivation where less intrinsically motivated employees have a negative perception of performance appraisal as well. Further, the employee perceptions of developmental such as clear goals, relevance, and understandable feedback may increase intrinsic motivation.

**Front-Line Government Employees**

The focal point in organizational literature has taken a sidetrack from focusing on the organization as a whole to focusing on the front-line employees as well. These employees carry out the responsibility that is held by public organizations (Prottas, 1978). Especially at the street-level, the motivation of public employees who actually deal with the public personally should be examined. Maynard-Moody and Mosheno (2003) explain the importance of examining front-line government workers where a strong relationship exists between the employee and the public.

**Methodology and Research Design**

A web-based questionnaire was used to collect data that addressed the suggested hypotheses based on employee access. In order to reduce biasing error, the questionnaire was distributed through county email addresses using departmental resources. This helped increase confidentiality and promoted accurate responses (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000).
Confidentiality was important as the questionnaire controlled for demographic and income information such as sex, race, and household income level. The web-based survey ensured equal probability of response (Creswell, 2003).

Creswell (2003) explains that survey design can provide a quantitative depiction of perceptions by studying a sample of the intended population. This enables the researcher to make generalizable conclusions towards the phenomenon within a given population. County administrators sent the internet-based survey as a link through county email addresses. Once data was gathered, the internet-based survey results were indistinguishable. Only the general findings were provided to county administrators not to include any collected data or identifiable information.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Motivation** - Motivation is the energy to act toward an end. Individuals exhibit varying amounts and types of motivation based on orientation where underlying attitudes and goals provide a rise to action (54) (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Intrinsic Motivation** - Intrinsic motivation is driven by and internal enjoyment for a task or goal (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). Intrinsic motivation is achieved through the inherent satisfaction of an action (Ryan & Deci, 2003).

**Extrinsic Motivation** - Extrinsic motivation is acquired externally to the individual (Deci, Benware, & Landy, 1974). It is motivation to attain a separate external outcome (Deci & Ryan, 2003).
Performance Appraisal System - The goal of a performance appraisal system is to communicate information regarding performance between a rater (supervisory position) and a ratee (subordinate position) (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Performance appraisal systems are used to address multiple aspects of the organization including individual performance, providing feedback, motivation, recognition, promotion and pay raises, needs assessments, etc. Performance appraisals may also be referred to in the literature as reviews, evaluations, ratings, and management objectives (Law, 2007).

Street-Level Bureaucrat/ Front-Line Employee – A front-line or street-level municipal employee is an individual that works in the local government sector and directly and personally interacts with the public as a service provider. These employees are responsible for implementing the goals and missions of the organization (Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2003; Prottas, 1978).

Organization of Study

This study contains five chapters, each addressing an important aspect of the research design. The first chapter provides a background to the research questions, the purpose of the current study, an introduction to the prominent literature, the research questions, and hypotheses with corresponding theoretical foundations, and the methodology that will be followed.

The second chapter provides a detailed literature review. This review includes all relevant literature for each research question and hypothesis as well as background literature on each aspect of the study to include: motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), public service motivation, performance appraisal systems, municipal government, and front-line employees.
The third chapter includes a detailed view of the research design and methodology used for the study. This covered the survey instrument, data collection methods, population and sample information, along with data analysis techniques. Chapter three addresses any limitations or threats to the study and how they will be accounted. The fourth chapter follows with the analysis of data collected as well as the findings.

The fifth chapter discusses the findings relevant to the hypotheses and research questions as well as applies the findings to what was found in the literature review. The fifth chapter also presents areas for further research in the current field.
Chapter Two: Review of Relevant Literature

The purpose of this study was to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees. This study also sought to find if the intrinsic motivation of front-line local government employees was congruent with the public service motivation (PSM). Further, this study examined the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) were perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory. In order to address this purpose, the following concepts, theories, and previous research are relevant to forming testable hypotheses.

Motivation

Motivation is the drive to act towards an end. Varying amounts and types of motivation specify a rise to action based on underlying goals or attitudes (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the closest scientific and psychological concepts to motivation were notions such as “reason”, and “instinct” (Mowrer, 1952). Freud refers to the connection between the mind and actions of the individual where there exists a stimulus, an incentive, and a goal (Freud, 1910). Freud’s factors depend on an instinct for motivation however, many of his instincts focused on sexual natures and the avoidance of death.

Beck (1978) defines motivation as “the contemporary determinants of choice (direction), persistence, and vigor of goal-directed behavior.” This is based on the assumption that there is not inertia to something unless a stimulus exists (Beck, 1978). The study of motivation refers to the observation of influences on the direction, drive, and persistence of action. Much like the
physical force of objects, motivation can be viewed as the psychological force of conscious or

Behavioral concepts emerged that focused on complacency where motivation was associated
with a formula of drive, random behavior, response, and decrease in drive followed by fixation
of response. Motivation was then a learning concept where performance is associated with a
self-selected response (Mowrer, 1952). Freud (1910) explains that as individuals, we strive to
separate our sexual impulses as an energy from the intended goal and that these rational
processes exist.

Herbert Simon (1967) offers an explanation of motivation of behavior in terms of serial
processing where a strict hierarchy of goals regulates behavior however, individuals also follow
imperative emphases or stresses and may adjust this hierarchy of goals. The hierarchy will
remain strict until the goal is met but the individual will adjust to factors such as feedback and
environment. Simon (1967) provides an example of a public speaker. The speaker’s goal is to
relay the content of a speech from beginning to end however, while achieving that goal, the
speaker may make adjustments based on how the audience responds. In the middle of the speech
a “subgoal” may appear to better engage the audience based on feedback from facial expressions
or participation (Simon, 1967).

Strict hierarchy of goals can be altered due to many circumstances such as the environment.
Information is serially processed but, adapts to different factors that result in behavior. Simon
(1967) explains two means in which information is processed and turns into behavior. The first
focusing on goals, where one goal is dealt with and the action terminates when the goal is met. The second means allows the interruption of emotion, where the process is able to react to urgent needs and readjust for these intermissions (Simon, 1967).

Newell, Shaw, and Simon (1958) further explain information processing systems in terms of memories, primitive information processes, and programs of processes. In this explanation, memories are a controlled system that symbolize relational information and provide this information for primitive processes to operate upon. A set of rules is then defined which, combines the processed memories and primitive information to create a program of processing. This program then produces externally observable behavior (Newell & Shaw, 1957; Newell, Shaw, and Simon, 1958).

According to Maslow (1943) humans are motivated by a series of basic goals, or desires. These goals are arranged hierarchically and are desired in relevant order. When one need is met, or satisfied, the next need becomes the highest desire according to the hierarchy of goals. Higgins and Sorrentino (1990) explain motivation as a constant process of internal guidance, self-regulation, and feedback control. Individuals form goals, which then activate action towards those goals. Motivation is simply being “moved” to do something. When an individual is motivated, they feel an active energy toward an end (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

McClelland and Steele (1973) explain the importance of “drive” in human motivation. When a stimulus becomes strong enough within the individual, drive to action is produced. Any stimulus has the capability to become strong enough to produce a drive to action however, primary drives
are the main creator for motivation. Primary drives are more physical drives in the human body such as pain, hunger, and fatigue. Secondary drives are viewed as the psychological factors that motivate an individual to action based on influences such as social needs (McClelland & Steel, 1973). Clark Hull provided one of the first complete theories of human behavior. Hull’s theory, in reference to motivation, suggests “habit” and “drive” are separate occurring variables where “drive” increases “habit” and produces the activity towards a potential reaction. “ Habit” is the result of an association between stimulus and response where “drive” actuates “habit” into performance (Beck, 1978).

Lawler (1994) simply explains that individuals seek specific outcomes (needs), which are hierarchical with security needs at the lowest level and social and self-actualization needs (autonomy) at the higher level. Work motivation is found in the higher category of needs. When an individual makes the choice to work in an organization, they choose the organization based on their own preferred outcomes.

**Work and Motivation**

Work motivation can be defined as an internal and external set of forces where an individual initiates work-associated behavior in various forms, directions, and intensities. Additionally, motivation is a key element to performance and productivity (Pinder, 2008). Katzell and Thompson (1990) define work motivation as “a broad construct pertaining to the conditions and processes that account for the arousal, direction, magnitude, and maintenance of effort in a person’s job. Basically, work motivation is how and individual’s behavior is empowered, directed, controlled, and sustained. The study of work motivation focuses on increasing precision among these factors (Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004).
In order to examine why individuals respond differently to similar working situations, the research suggests that psychological and environmental factors such as motivation, expectancy, and incentive must be evaluated. When observing why individuals provide different levels of effort and motivation when performing their jobs, it is important to look at the individual differences as well as the environmental influences (Vroom, 1964). For instance, when choosing an occupation or organization, individuals make their decisions based on outcomes that go along with their own preferences (Lawler, 1994). Therefore, according to the public service motivation (PSM), individuals that prefer the outcome of affecting their community and serving the public will choose to work in the public sector (Houston, 2006). Latham and Pinder (2005) further explain the role of values in work behavior where certain individuals exhibit certain motivations when preferred values are activated.

Work motivation can be seen through many theoretical lenses such as McGregor’s (1966) Theory X and Theory Y where an assumption is made of the employee regarding the degree of interference of management practices. This theory explains that Theory X represents an employee that is passive to organizational needs and in turn, will focus on external demands such as higher pay. Theory Y represents an employee that is self-aware and self-controlled and requires interference and supervision from management practices. Theory Y is based on the concept that an individual will strive for development and responsibility and organizational goals without interference from management practices (Latham, 2012). According to Theory Y, an individual’s experience in an organization causes them to respond to organizational needs. Further, motivation towards organizational development and the need for organizational
responsibility exist within the individual. These organizational goals are not a result of management tactics (McGregor, 1966).

There has been similar theoretical research in the non-profit sector where employees are able to find intrinsic utility in the value of assisting in service to others through the workplace and enjoy the satisfaction of the work context that is found to be inherent in these organizations (Benz, 2005). The field of public administration offers a developed understanding of motivation in the context of public organizations. Wright (2004) explains the importance of continued research in this area, as work motivation has no single comprehensive theoretical basis and is a challenging concept to define and study. The only overarching definitions include a common goal of understanding the processes and factors that affect motivation in the workplace.

**Motivation: Intrinsic and Extrinsic**

Ryan and Deci (2000) dissect the concept of motivation further by distinguishing between levels of motivation and the orientation of motivation. In other words, to what extent is an individual motivated towards action to and end and what type of motivation gave rise to that action?

Psychologists refer to intrinsic motivation as a non-drive-based motivation where the energy is found to be inherent in the nature of an individual. Intrinsic motivation is an essential energy that is found in the active nature of an organism (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In other words, intrinsic motivation is “fundamental” and extrinsic motivation is “acquired” (Deci, Benware, & Landy, 1974). Intrinsic motivation refers to an “inherent interest” and extrinsic motivation is moving towards an external outcome. An individual is intrinsically motivated when there is an internal enjoyment when compared to an external pressure or reward (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
Intrinsic motivation refers to an inherent drive within an individual and not from outside the individual towards completing a task. Tasks are not characterized as intrinsic as the form of motivation comes from the individual (Frey, 1994). One person may show an intrinsic motivation towards a specific goal where another person may show extrinsic motivation, or no motivation at all, towards the same task. There is a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic preferences where reactions to external intervention of reward or regulation result in different modes of behavior (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Extrinsic motivation can be broken down by categories of autonomy. The least autonomous being externally motivated by reward or to avoid pressure (introjected) and the most autonomous leaning into the intrinsic categories of identification and integration (internalization). When an individual exhibits introjection, that person is extrinsically motivated to avoid guilt or external pressure. On the other hand, when an individual identification they see value in the task or integration where the individual has created internal reasons for completing the activity (Moran, Diefendorf, Kim & Liu, 2012).

Intrinsic job rewards are considered to be the individual’s attainment of self-satisfaction received when performing an action. On the other hand, extrinsic rewards are acquired independently by an individual, such as a pay increase or promotion. It has been shown that public employees place a higher value on these intrinsic rewards (over extrinsic rewards) than private employees (Houston, 2006). It has also been suggested that public-sector employees are less interested in
economic rewards and more likely to consider intrinsic rewards of public service important when compared to private-sector employees (Crewson, 1997).

Lawler and Hall (1970) distinguish intrinsic motivation from job involvement and from job satisfaction. Job satisfaction relates to the agreement between the individual and the job design where job involvement relates to an individual’s self-esteem or their psychological identification with their job. Further, intrinsic motivation relates to the individual’s performance as a factor in the satisfaction of the worker’s higher order needs (Lawler & Hall, 1970).

Intrinsic task motivation, as defined by Greenberg and Baron (2008), explains what an individual is willing to do. In order to facilitate creativity, an individual must hold an inherent interest in the task. This refers to motivation in terms of interest, engagement, and challenge. In other words, if someone is passionate about their occupation, they are more likely to exhibit creativity. Further, an individual is likely to be highly motivated when an internal reason exists to perform the task at hand. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation is not likely to be high when an individual is performing a task for an external reason such as monetary rewards. The creativity level is likely to decrease when external reasoning (pay) is presented to internally motivated individuals (Greenberg and Baron, 2008). In turn, Deci (1971) suggests that extrinsic rewards, such as money, lead to a “cognitive re-evaluation” by an individual as to the reason that they are intrinsically motivated. This has been suggested to be linked to the association and use of money in our culture and may lead to the “buying off” of intrinsic motivation and decreasing it all together (Deci, 1971).
As previously discussed, Newell, Shaw, and Simon (1958) explained that externally observed behavior is created by a sequence of memories that from primitive process that all result in a program of information processing. The authors further explain that “a program viewed as a theory of behavior is highly specific: it describes one organism in a particular class of situations. When either the situation or the organism is changed, the program must be modified. The program can be used as a theory that is a predictor of behavior,” (Newell, Shaw, & Simon, 1958; p. 151). Theories provide an outline to specific definitions in detailed domains that offer explanations to the logical sequence of relationships in order to make predictions (Wacker, 1998). Precise predictions are made concerning specific behavior that can be rigorously tested. Individuals may also show similar qualitative programs for various situations in given situations (Newell, Shaw, & Simon, 1985).

**Goal-Setting Theory**

Goal setting theory focuses on directed action that roots in a specific purpose. This theory views motivation in terms of a conscious approach. “The theory’s core premise is that the simplest and most direct motivational explanation of why some people perform better on work task than others is because they have different performance goals” (Locke and Latham, 1994; p. 15). Locke and Latham (2006) explain the relationship between goals and performance where greater goals result in a higher effort and attention towards goals takes precedent over efforts and actions that are not associated with the goal. Over all, performance is a function of knowledge and skills turning into a level of effort and action as motivation.

According to goal setting theory, employee performance will be higher when goals are challenging instead of easy (Fried & Slowik, 2004). Goal commitment is based on the
relationship between the difficulty level of the goal and performance. Further, performance towards goals is contingent on the individual where some people require easier or more difficult goals (Klein et al., 1999). Fried and Slowik (2004) introduce time as a variable in goal-setting theory where different goals and different environments require different amounts of time to perform those goals and individuals respond differently when time is introduced and performance is observed.

Self-efficacy is an individual’s own perception of their ability to perform in certain environments or situations and to execute the necessary activities to perform (Bandura, 1977). Philips and Gully (1997) found that higher learning goal orientation may lead to higher self-efficacy and higher performance orientation is likely to correspond with lower self-efficacy. In all, self-efficacy leads to higher individual goal setting and higher performance.

**Self-Determination Theory**

Self-determination theory differentiates forms of motivation based on the reasons behind the rise to action (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Ryan and Deci (2000) use determination theory to explain that there are factors in the environment that may promote or undermine intrinsic motivation. This assumes that intrinsic motivation is an inherent factor in an individual that can be facilitated and not created or caused. Self-determination theory relies on internalization as integrated and “introjected” where partial or full internalization exists (Deci, Eghrari, Patrick & Leone, 1994). This introjected motivation is viewed as a regard for approval followed by internalized expectations. Self-determination theory signifies that a greater emphasis is placed on internalization, or internal reasons for motivation and less on external controls of motivation (Miller, Das & Chakravarthy, 2011).
From the lens of self-determination theory, an individual shows extrinsic motivation when the action is completed due to avoiding pressure or guilt or receiving praise or reward. The individual then shows a sense of what they “should” do (Moran, Diefendorf, Kim & Liu, 2012). Self-determination theory simply rests on an individual’s psychological need for autonomy and competence as control over one’s desired actions, interactions, and environment (Milyavkaya & Koestner, 2010).

Autonomous motivation is intrinsic motivation and controlled motivation would be where an individual feels that they are pressured to take specific action (Gagne & Deci, 2005). In terms of academic motivation, Vansteenkiste, Lens, and Deci (2006) explain through self-determination theory, that goal framing is more intensely processed when the activity is framed as being intrinsic. In other words, there is a richer quality of motivation when goals are framed as being intrinsic.

**Expectancy Theory**

The expectancy theory rests on the concept that the degree of an individual’s inclination to act in a certain way depends on the strength of expectancy that the act will produce a specific outcome or goal (Atkinson, 1964). This is a cognitive concept that is independent to the probability of an outcome (Porter and Lawler, 1968). When valence is combined with expectancy, a motivational behavior will lead to the outcome (Heneman and Schwab, 1972). Vroom (1964) explains that an individual will choose an action based on the probability of an outcome. Job performance is a role of the “want” to perform along with motivation and aptitude (Heneman and Schwab, 1972).
The “expectance-value” approach to motivation is when an individual places value on various actions based on the value of the expected outcomes of those actions. This is the tie between the knowledge of something and moving towards action or “knowing and doing” (Higgins & Sorrentino, 1990). Expectancy is the relationship between action and anticipated outcome where values are placed on actions based on probabilities of specific outcomes. The individual bases the behavioral action on the level of belief that the outcomes will be probable while taking outside controls into consideration (Vroom, 1964).

Beck (1978) breaks expectancies down through a comparison of attributions. Where operationally they may seem to be the same concept, expectancy infers that one thing will follow another and attribution infers that one thing has followed another. In other words, an individual may anticipate, or expect, that a specific outcome will follow and action or the individual may credit, or attribute, the outcome to the preceding action.

Expectancies can be further broken down into $S$ expectancies and $R$ expectancies in terms of stimuli ($S$) and response ($R$). Responses to stimuli and expectancies can be learned which offers the base of incentive motivation. Moreover, when it is learned that new stimuli offer new responses with new environmental contingencies, this information is stored and creates an expectancy. Therefore, expectancy is the stored information of the learned stimuli and response sequence (Bolles, 1972). To simplify, $S$ expectancy, or a stimulated expectancy, will happen regardless of behavior where $R$ expectancy, or response expectancy, is a correlation between behavior having a causal effect on environmental outcomes (Beck, 1978).
Javiland and Ebrahimabadi (2011) use a Chiang and Jang’s (2008) modified expectancy theory model to study the influence of demographic characteristics on employee motivation. Chiang and Jang’s (2008) model suggests employee motivation with a modified expectancy framework to incorporate five elements. These elements include expectancy, extrinsic instrumentality, intrinsic instrumentality, extrinsic valence, and intrinsic valence. Javiland and Ebrahimabadi (2011) found that type of employment and education demographics influenced an employee’s motivation. Further, their research was conducted in a private sector Iranian oil company where the employee’s education level influenced extrinsic instrumentality where the higher the education level of the employee, the more they expect monetary bonuses, pay increases, and promotions.

Crowding Out

“Crowding out” refers to the psychological process where an individual’s intrinsic task motivation is diminished when an external control mechanism is detected (Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 1985). When assessing the concept of crowding out through an economic approach, monetary rewards are expected to increase motivation and types of motivation are not distinguished (intrinsic and extrinsic). When either monetary rewards or regulations intervene from outside of an individual’s perceived nature (self-perception) of the performed task, intrinsic motivation may be affected (Frey and Jegen, 2001). In other words, the incentive, in terms of reward or regulation, undermines intrinsic motivation (Frey, 1994). Deci, Ryan, and Frey’s research has explained that external control may “crowd out”, or undermine intrinsic motivation but on the other hand, Kuvaas (2006) found a negative relationship between employees with low intrinsic motivation and performance appraisal satisfaction and a positive relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and
employees with high levels of intrinsic motivation. Further, high levels of intrinsic motivation may be directly related to effective performance appraisal systems.

Georgellis, Iossa and Tabvuma (2011) found that the intrinsic over extrinsic rewards of the public sector is what attracts public employees as defined by the public service motivation (Houston, 2006). Evidence was found showing that intrinsic motivation was crowded out when external rewards were introduced which reduced the intrinsic motivation that attracts public employees to public sector organizations (Georgellis, Iossa and Tabvuma, 2011).

**Locus of Control**

Motivation theory refers to the concept of how specific behavior is initiated, continued, directed, and stopped in terms of concurrent subjective reactions (Porter and Lawler, 1968). When referring to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the main distinction can be found in taking action because something is self-pleasing (intrinsic) or because something leads to an independent outcome (extrinsic) (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Extrinsic rewards can influence change in an individual’s perception of control and causality, other mechanisms of external control structures, such as performance appraisal systems, may have the same effect (Deci & Ryan, 1980). Individuals view external and internal control on the basis that an outcome is due to the individual’s behavior verses an external source of control (Rotter, 1966, 1990). Building on Rotter’s (1966) idea of “locus of control”, Frey (1994) explains that the locus of control shifts when a transfer in internal causation is perceived by the individual as being triggered by an external source (Deci, 1971).
Miller, Das and Chakranarthy (2011) explain through self-determination theory that when an individual perceives a controlling environment, less self-determination towards motivation will exist. When an individual perceives an external force, the loss of control can diminish intrinsic motivation (Frey, 1994). External control may “crowd out”, or undermine intrinsic motivation where an individual’s intrinsic task motivation is diminished when an external control mechanism is detected (Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 1985).

In an organization, control provides a systematic prescription to individual behavior and keeps these behaviors in-line with the organization’s mission and goal. Organizations rely on the function of control to reach a mission by providing order to a group of diverse interests and bringing synchronicity to individual performance within the organization. One function of control is to align behaviors of individual members. This can present problems between the function of control and individual modification in the organization (Tannenbaum, 1962). Simply stated, control is essentially the observation and instruction of subordinates by a supervisor within an organization (i.e. performance expectations) (Ouchi, 1979).

Order is a necessary condition of organizational conformity where there is opportunity for performance and security. The creation and maintenance of organizational order may be unevenly distributed due to hierarchical systems within the organization. In other words, a small minority regulates order to be followed by a large majority and individuality is neglected (Tannenbaum, 1962). Further, order through control outlines what is necessary to complete required outputs or services of the organization (Ouchi, 1979).
The traditional approach to work force management is through control. In the private sector, a change in control has been observed in order to increase organizational commitment, which may in turn, increase performance that is required to compete in the current global market (Walton, 2003). When order is set in an organization, such as a rule or standard for output, performance must be observed to make a comparison on whether or not the performance is satisfactory in order to lead to the desired output or standard of service (Ouchi, 1979). The idea behind this shift in approach from control to commitment is to expand the scope of motivation for individuals to increase their own performance versus the requirement of increased performance from a hierarchical organizational structure. This increases the feeling of organizational responsibility within the individual (Walton, 2003).

**Front-Line Government Employees**

The focal point in organizational literature has taken a sidetrack from focusing on the organization as a whole to focusing on the front-line employees as well. These employees carry out the responsibility that is held by public organizations (Prottas, 1978). Especially at the street-level, the motivation of public employees who actually deal with the public personally should be examined. Maynard-Moody and Mosheno (2003) explain the importance of examining front-line government workers where a strong relationship exists between the employee and the public. This view of the organization should be considered on the level that “who people are” has an impact on the employee’s decision-making.

When evaluating management policies, it is important to recognize that private sector practices should be applied carefully (Fountain, 2001). Goodsell (2004) offers support by way of comparing “apples to oranges” in that comparing practices between the public and private sector
should be done carefully and on a case-by-case basis. The differences in the operational practices of the public and private sectors are not so obvious as private firms can be organized bureaucratically, both public and private organizations can be disciplined my market economics such as budget conflicts, and the existence of hybrid organizations (Goodsell, 2004).

Some areas of service operation in the private sector may not be applicable to the public sector as fundamental elements of service are very different. For instance, the citizen as the customer may receive public services due to need versus loyalty. In the private sector, customer service is improved to focus on customer loyalty and retention versus the fundamental element of serving public “needs” and trying to provide a better experience to the citizen as the customer (Fountain, 2001). Contact between citizens and local government employees are mostly driven by a need for public services (Thomas & Melkers, 1999).

For example, customers do not go to the DMV to renew their driver’s license because they want to. They need to because it is required by law to drive with a current license. Therefore, the cycle of demand directly affects the DMV as a monopoly however, the employees do not have the resources to supply the number of customers that they are required to serve. In turn, due to having to mass process requests of a large number of customers, customer service is sacrificed and discretion is now at the hand of the front-line bureaucrat. Front-line local government employees are involved in a complex web of control mechanisms, organizational constraints, and incentive structures when it comes to the policy implementation process (Meyers and Vorsanger, 2007).
As profit margin is not a bottom line for the public sector, a problem is posed in its inability to deliver due to lacking resources or being held down by administrative processes. Public servants are required to work around these ingrained obstacles and continue to provide adequate service to the citizen. Fountain (2001) refers to Lipsky’s (2010) ideas towards the problematic fundamentals in the relation between the constraints of street-level bureaucracy and the quality of service provided.

Lipksy explains the bureaucratic decision making process as a passive role of technical procedure defined by what is inherent in the organization and that bureaucratic decision making is controlled by the politics of the institution. On the other hand, Moore (1987) takes Lipksy’s account of street-level bureaucratic decision making to a further dimension outside of the cognitively and morally passive bureaucratic framework that Lipsky has characterized. Moore (1987) offers a view of bureaucratic decision-making that focuses on perspective and strategy over maximizing utility.

Moore (1987) expresses the importance of studying the way that street-level bureaucrats denote and relate with the organizational process. In other words, how they deal with the dynamic of their jobs and the motives behind their actions of decision-making. The front-line employee is presented with significant opportunity to affect the implementation of public policy, as these employees are responsible for the majority of core processes and public services for public agencies (Meyers & Vorsanger, 2007).
Further, it is suggested that when the discretion of bureaucrats is reduced through increased monitoring, the public service effort may also be reduced along with corruption and a decrease in productivity (Kwon, 2014). This idea runs parallel to the concept of “crowding out” refers to the psychological process where an individual’s intrinsic task motivation is diminished when an external control mechanism is detected (Frey & Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 1985). However, when bureaucrats are incentivized through performance pay can counteract the reduction in discretion and promote an increase is public service productivity (Kwon, 2014).

**Hypothesis (H1)**

The previous literature suggests that individuals display different forms of motivation based on underlying attitudes and goals (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Motivation can further be characterized as intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is a fundamental and inherent motivation that is found in the nature of the individual and extrinsic motivation is an externally acquired motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Benware, & Landy, 1974).

When comparing public and private sector employees, it has been found that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards (Houston, 2006). It is suggested that public employees are more interested in the intrinsic rewards of the public sector than extrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997). Front-line local government employees carry out the responsibility that is held by public organizations (Prattas, 1978). Especially at the street-level, the motivation of public employees who actually deal with the public personally should be examined. Maynard-Moody and Mosheno (2003) explain the importance of examining front-line government workers where a strong relationship exists between the employee and the public.
Amabile et al.’s (1994) research indicated that individuals can concurrently be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Although much of the research implies that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are mutually exclusive, there is little support for this matter. Amabile et al. (1994) show data that explains intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as two “unipolar constructs.” This study focused on intrinsic motivation as a single construct as well as a congruent construct when compared to extrinsic motivation.

H1 – Local government front-line employees will show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.

Public Service Motivation (PSM)

In a review of the research on the motivation of bureaucrats, Goodsell (2004) explains “what really activates bureaucrats is a belief in the inherent worth of their agency’s mission, the social reinforcement effects of their professional environment, and the concept of public service.” Perry and Wise (1990) clarify PSM as an individual’s motivation based exclusively in public organizations. An individual can root their “self-importance” in the importance of public policy in modern society, which is unique to the public organization. This, in-turn, provides a foundation of serving the public interest (Perry, 1996).

The existence of a service ethic in the public sector has been supported by a high value in performing work to help others (Wittmer, 1991). The theory of PSM as described by Perry (2000) has a multitude of foundations and premises on which a modern theory of PSM is constructed. Perry suggests that there exists an attraction to policy making, compassion,
commitment to civic interest, and self-sacrifice. There is an individual and self-conceptualizing process where identity and values are formed and can be found in the logic of motivation.

Supported by Wildavsky (1987), values are external and preferences are internal to the theory of motivation. In this sense, preferences are formed by internal processes that result in behavior. Perry (2000) suggests that individuals form their preferences according to their own self-concept along with the creation of values and preferences formed from external interaction. In an organizational setting, PSM is a result of multiple contexts that include environment, motivation, individualism, and behavior. PSM can be used as an alternative to rational choice models in explaining motivational theory. Houston (2006) characterizes PSM as producing employees that place a high value on commitment to the public and self-sacrifice. It is important to the performance of a public organization to select individual employees who align themselves with PSM. Provan and Milward (1995) explain that when public interest is implicated in the public and non-profit sectors versus the private sector, organization goals can become more important than organizational ends.

Crewson (1997) found that public employees with service preferences (intrinsic) versus economic benefit (extrinsic) tend to have a higher level of commitment to their organization where employees who favor economic or extrinsic rewards are more likely to be disaffected. Brewer et al. (2000) breaks PSM into different conceptualizations of individuals. “Samaritans” have a need to help other people and view themselves as guardians. “Communitarians” feel a call to public/civic duty and value the relationship with the citizen. “Patriots” are motivated by
the advocacy of the public and have needs in a larger spectrum of civic duty. “Humanitarians” are motivated by the call to social justice and equity.

Gabris and Simo (1995) refer to public motivation as an individual’s interest in the policy process and dedication to advocacy along with the loyalty to government and belief in social equity. Brewer et al. (2000) found that public employees may be indifferent to the policy process and may not be motivated by the excitement but did find that public employees are mainly motivated by social equity, changing society, and serving the public. Scott and Pandey (2005) found that employees with high levels of PSM do not have a negative perception of “red tape” or rules and regulations. These employees view rules as a legitimate aspect of their purpose of service and show less frustration with procedural difficulties.

When designing incentive structures, it is important for these rewards to be tied with performance however, these rewards do not need to be extrinsic. This can increase employee perceptions concerning performance and the success of their organization, which will trigger PSM concepts of organizational commitment and loyalty (Scott and Pandey, 2005). When pay is tied to strong performance, public service efforts and productivity are suggested to increase (Kwon, 2014). The PSM of public employees must be satisfied when implementing organizational motivation structures (Houston, 2000).

Deci, Benware, and Landy (1974) have also found implications concerning contingent and non-contingent pay as a reward. When rewards are contingent and stipulated on high outputs for high rewards, the indication of extrinsic motivation in employee is more evident. Houston (2000)
suggests that public employees hold a strong sense of accomplishment to their work and highly value intrinsic rewards. These employees in public organizations may not be so quick to respond to extrinsic incentives, such as high income, as being valuable to their work. When designing incentive structures in the public sector, it is important to consider that these employees do not place a great value on monetary rewards, as do private sector employees.

Perry and Wise (1990) acknowledge the view that public sector employees are motivated by the public service purpose. The authors explain PSM as one’s inclination to adhere to motives found to be unique to public organizations. PSM is mostly associated with the want to serve the public interest, an individual sense of civic duty and loyalty to the organization, and the goal of social equity. Rainey (1982) found that there is a stronger sense of altruism in public-sector employees where they view their work to be valuable versus considering extrinsic rewards. Frank and Lewis (2004) simply explain that public administrators value the want to help others and promote society.

Behavior implications of PSM include the relationship between an individual’s PSM and the likelihood that the individual will place value on the public organization. In the context of public organizations, PSM is related to performance where an organization with individuals with a high level of PSM are less likely to depend on extrinsic incentive systems to improve individual performance (Perry and Wise, 1990). In terms of organizational identification, when an employee closely identifies with the organization, their attitudes and behaviors are more likely to be motivated by and promote the basic values and mission of the organization (Wieseke, Ullrich, Christ & Van Dick, 2007). When an individual identifies with the beliefs and values of their
organization, these values become a part of that individual’s identity and self-concept (Pratt, 1998).

**Hypothesis (H2)**

Public employees that show characteristics of PSM place a high value on the civic duty of their work (Perry & Wise, 1990). These employees show a commitment to the values that are inherent in public organizations (Houston, 2006). Through PSM, employees are interested and attracted to the policy process and are dedicated and loyal to government process (Gabris & Simo, 1995). Public employees show a stronger sense of self-sacrifice and find their work valuable to their community (Rainey, 1982).

H2 – *Intrinsic motivation will have a stronger relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees than extrinsic motivation.*

**Performance Appraisal and Intrinsic Motivation**

Service providers that feel a strong identification with their service roles may show more positive performance in that role due to having an “identity-enhancing” position rather than a position that is “identity-threatening” (Ford & Etienne, 1994). Performance appraisal systems aim to communicate information regarding performance between a rater and a ratee. This communication process is usually between the rater as a supervisor and the ratee as a subordinate (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). A performance appraisal system may be used to address multiple aspects of the organization including individual performance, providing feedback, motivation, recognition, promotion and pay raises, needs assessments, etc. Performance appraisals may also be referred to, in the literature, as reviews, evaluations, ratings, and management objectives (Law, 2007).
“Performance refers to a person’s accomplishments on tasks that comprise his job. Performance, in essence, is the net effect of a person’s effort as modified by his abilities and traits and by his role perceptions. It can be evaluated by objective measures such as physical output, or by subjective measures such as ratings made by others or ratings made by the individual himself” (Porter and Lawler, 1968, p. 28).

Intrinsic motivation can be viewed as a greater internal need for performance satisfaction (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Motivation, in terms of performance, is based on the choice of the worker to rise to action in order to achieve an outcome. Further, a number of possible outcomes are evaluated by the worker’s expectations, whether it is towards production or effectiveness (Vroom, 1964).

Performance appraisals can be perceived as a form of external control, whether the outcome is positive or negative for the individual being evaluated (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Law, 2007). Elements that are inherent in performance appraisal systems feed into the perception of control. When performance appraisals are mandatory, established by a hierarchy (management or supervisory positions), and focus on previous actions and performance of the employee, perceptions of control are inevitable due to the employee’s loss of control in the performance appraisal process (Law, 2007). Subsequently, when an individual perceives their loss of internal control, caused by performance appraisal, the necessary conditions that harbor intrinsic motivation are compromised (Deci, 1975). It is then important to address whether the employee views the performance appraisal system as participatory or non-participatory (Roberts, 1995).
Performance appraisal systems can also be linked to financial rewards in the forms of salary determination, raises, bonuses, promotion, and layoffs. These perceptions of performance appraisal systems often promote the employees to focus on specific measurable goals and these systems may also deter employees from promoting creativity and internal goals (Law, 2007). When an “external agent” is evaluating an employee’s work, the individual may experience a loss of self-determination. Evaluations are then linked to perceptions of external control, as the fundamental goal is to measure compliance with external demands. This perception of external control may undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985 p. 55).

When rewards are used to reach a specific output, they are inherently used as a control mechanism, whether it is positive social feedback or monetary rewards. When the reward is perceived as being prominently used as a control mechanism, the individual perceives the locus of control to be external and therefore feels as if they are being controlled by the reward. If the reward is not used as a control mechanism then the individual will link the reward as internal and feel self-determined (Deci, 1975). In other words, whether the performance appraisal is linked to money or feedback, if the employee feels that they are to gain a tangible reward or avoid punishment for negative feedback then the employee will view the performance appraisal as a form of external control. This, in turn, may diminish intrinsic motivation (Frey, 1994; Deci, 1975).

Deci and Ryan (1980) explain the importance of the “performance-mediated effect” where reward structures can influence individual task performance and this influence can in turn, affect
levels of individual intrinsic motivation. In addition, Leppler and Greene (1975) propose that when an individual is aware that they are being observed, even when tangible rewards are not linked to evaluation, the individual’s interest in the task will decrease. Further, it was found that frequency of performance monitoring had little to no influence on this decrease in task interest.

Deci and Freys’s research suggests that due to the inherent link of performance appraisal to measurable goals setting (including financial rewards), employees who may have intrinsic internal goals are disheartened and encouraged to focus on these measurable performances objectives. Tannenbaum (1862) adds that individuals are typically less satisfied with their work when they do not have outlets of control. When individuals obtain a dimension of control over their work situations, they tend to more closely align themselves to the mission the organization.

Research shows that that fewer than 40% of municipalities attempt any form of “meaningful” performance measurement system. Further, in local governments that attempt effective performance measurement, the purpose was limited in the goal of accountability to citizens. Service quality measurement was found to be a problem with the local governments that attempt to produce meaningful performance appraisal (Poister & Streib, 1999). Most local governments administer performance evaluations in some form however, because an appraisal system is a facet of human resource department practices, it does not imply quality (Ammons & Condrey, 1991).

Successful performance appraisal systems may serve as an important key to running an effective organization however, performance appraisal systems are only as useful as the success of
implementation. Employee motivation can be undermined when performance appraisals are contradictory. As most research concerning performance appraisal has focused in other levels of government and sectors, there is a need for concentration on performance appraisal at the local government level (Daley, 1991).

Performance Management in Public Organizations (Participatory v. Non-Participatory)

Performance management in public organizations can have perverse effects on the organization and its employees. Performance management can block employee and organizational innovation and ambition by creating a strategic criteria focused on efficiency. If performance appraisals are viewed by the employees as meaningless, then the actual performance may be masked by a process where performance is not linked to effort. In turn, if performance appraisals are directly linked to measurable qualitative outcomes, such as the number of customers served, then professional attitudes may be pushed out (de Bruijn, 2007). This supports the notion of “crowding out” where external regulations directly influence intrinsic motivation due to the shift in self-determination (Frey and Jegen, 2001). For example, Kwon (2014) suggests that limiting and decreasing bureaucratic discretion can reduce public service effort and productivity.

Steel (1985) explains that traditionally, performance appraisal is conducted as a hierarchical process where a supervisor provides employees with guidelines as to where they currently measure and where they need to improve. Participation in the performance appraisal process has now become a common management practice. Participatory performance appraisals yield many benefits such as increasing communication between employees and supervisors, encouraging employees towards future development, increasing productive behavior, and enhancing
motivation by satisfying employee needs for fulfillment and self-actualization (Olsen & Bennett, 1975).

Giles & Mossholder (1990) show a direct relation between goal-setting and participation and employee satisfaction with performance evaluation. Roberts (2003) explains the importance of participation in performance appraisals for intrinsically motivated employees. If the employee is intrinsically motivated and does not feel that the performance appraisal system is participatory then the employee will not reap the cognitive and effective benefits of organizational and individual growth and development. If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system as participatory and valid, the employee is more likely to accept and learn from feedback even if the feedback is negative to the employee’s performance (Roberts, 2003). Roberts and Reed (1996) conducted a study that showed employees being rated by a supervisor. The employees perceived the performance appraisal to be more effective as an administrative process when the supervisor encouraged participation, goal setting, and feedback.

Korsgaard and Roberson (1995) explain the concept of “voice” in the performance appraisal process. The “voice” refers to subordinate participation in the performance appraisal where satisfaction in the process is enhanced in terms of procedural justice. When participation in the performance appraisal process is exercised, the employee feels that they were able to promote indirect control in the process or that their “voice” is valued within the organizational construct. In addition, a direct correlation may exist between participation in the performance appraisal process and subordinate reception of the overall performance appraisal system (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998).
The literature can be unclear on the operational definition of participation. While participation can refer to the state of attendance, this study refers to participation more as a function of involvement. Barki (1994) uses participation as “taking part” or contributing to a process where “involvement” refers to a more personal significance or representativeness in the information systems field. Roberts (2003) refers to participation as the opportunity for the employee to have a “voice” in the appraisal. Barki and Hartwick (1989) provide recommendations to operationalize and differentiate the use of participation and involvement across multiple fields of study. They recommend that the term “(user) participation” be used to refer to the representativeness in assignments, activities, and behaviors during a process where “(user) involvement” should refer to the importance and personal relevance that one is subjected to during a process (Barki & Hartwick, 1989).

Dow et al. (2012) offer additional classification to the participation construct into situational participation, intrinsic involvement, and influence where situational participation refers to the performance of an activity, intrinsic involvement refers to the perceived importance and personal relevance of an outcome, and influence refers to control over an outcome. When referring to employee participation in the performance appraisal process in this study, “participation” will be considered as a meaningful input where the employee was provided an opportunity to have a meaningful role in the appraisal process to include (but not restricted to) input and two-way communication (Roberts, 2003).
Kuvaas (2007) describes a positive relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal and intrinsic motivation where less intrinsically motivated employees have a negative perception of performance appraisal as well. Further, the employee perceptions of developmental such as clear goals, relevance, and understandable feedback may increase intrinsic motivation. When assessing participation in the performance evaluation between manager and subordinate, it is important to identify whether the employee was provided with the opportunity to present their ideas and feelings verses speaking time during the process. For example, this differentiation is important as “time talking” could lend more to defensive reasoning of the employees evaluation instead of an invitation for participation or objective discussion between supervisor and subordinate. When addressing participation versus speaking time during the evaluation, it should be asked whether or not the employee was presented with an opportunity to express their ideas (Greller, 1975).

**Hypothesis (H3)**

Performance appraisals can be viewed as a form of external control. When an employee is being evaluated by an external control, the employee can then feel a loss of self-determination and feel pressured to meet external demands causing a decrease of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system to be participatory, the employee is more likely to consider the evaluation as meaningful (Roberts, 2003).

H3 – *Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.*
Chapter Three: Methodology and Research Design

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees. This sought to find if intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees had the values associated with public service motivation (PSM). Further, this study examined the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) were perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

Research Questions

Intrinsic v. Extrinsic

Are front-line local government employees more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated?

Public Service Motivation (PSM)

Will intrinsic motivation have a stronger relationship than extrinsic motivation with the PSM of front-line local government employees, such as civic duty, commitment to public service, and serving the community?

Participatory v. Non-Participatory

Do intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems when they perceive them to be participatory versus non-participatory?
Hypotheses, Theoretical Foundations and Variable Measurement

Summary of Variables

H1 – *Local government front-line employees will show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.*

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: H1 compared two variables of motivation as intrinsic and extrinsic. The entire sample was front-line local government employees and there was not any manipulation in variables (INT_M/EXT_M).

H2 – *Intrinsic motivation will have a stronger relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees than extrinsic motivation.*

DV: Public Service Motivation (PSM)

IV: Motivation: There will be a stronger relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM where there will not be a strong relationship between PSM and extrinsic motivation. This will show that PSM and intrinsic motivation are directly related at the local level.

H3 – *Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.*

DV: Attitudes of Employees Towards PAS (PAS_ATT)

IV: Perception of the intrinsically motivated local government employees on whether the PAS is participatory or non-participatory. This was measured as all intrinsically motivated employee even if they were also extrinsically motivated, as it is not comparing one type of motivation to the other (INT_M_PART/INT_M_NPART).
Hypotheses and Measurement

H1 – Local government front-line employees will show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.

Theoretical Foundation (H1): Public employees place a high value on the intrinsic satisfaction of serving the public (Houston, 2006). Public-sector employees are less interested in economic rewards and more likely to consider intrinsic rewards of public service important when compared to private-sector employees (Crewson, 1997).

The hypothesis compares the measured values of the two independent variables of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of local government front-line employees. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation will be measured by four-point scale of agreement (Strongly Disagree = 1, Somewhat Disagree = 2, Somewhat Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4). The four-point scale did not include a neutral option in order to encourage complete responses. The scale contained four points to account for variability. The following questionnaire items (Table 1) designated measures of intrinsic motivation followed by the questionnaire items that will indicate the presence of extrinsic motivation.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic motivation</th>
<th>What matters most to me is enjoying what I do.</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>I seldom think about salary and promotions.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questionnaire items (Table 2) measured extrinsic motivation where agreement indicated the presence of extrinsic motivation in the front-line local government employees.

**Table 2.**

| Extrinsic Motivation | I am motivated by the money I can earn. | 1-Strongly Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 2-Somewhat Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 3-Somewhat Agree  
|                       |                                            | 4-Strongly Agree  
| Extrinsic Motivation | I am motivated by the recognition I can earn from other people. | 1-Strongly Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 2-Somewhat Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 3-Somewhat Agree  
|                       |                                            | 4-Strongly Agree  
| Extrinsic Motivation | I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it. | 1-Strongly Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 2-Somewhat Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 3-Somewhat Agree  
|                       |                                            | 4-Strongly Agree  
| Extrinsic Motivation | I am motivated by opportunity for promotion. | 1-Strongly Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 2-Somewhat Disagree  
|                       |                                            | 3-Somewhat Agree  
|                       |                                            | 4-Strongly Agree  

In order to separate the respondents into groups of intrinsically motivated and extrinsically motivated, the questions testing both variables were scaled where the four intrinsic motivation items had a scale of 0-16 where a score between 9 and 16 indicated that the employee was
intrinsically motivated (Figure 1). The extrinsic scale used the four items to measure extrinsic motivation with a scale of 0-16 where 9-16 indicated extrinsic motivation. SPSS was used to provide descriptive statistics to include a frequency distribution and crosstabulation in order to determine if front-line local government employees were more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated (Meier, Brudney, & Bohte, 2006). According to this analysis, the mean for intrinsically motivated local government employees falls in the 9-16 range for intrinsic motivation and the 0-8 range for extrinsic motivation. Further, a new variable for motivation type (MOT_TYP) was formulated to examine group membership for intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, both, or neither.

**H2 – Intrinsic motivation will have a stronger relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees than extrinsic motivation.**

*Theoretical Foundation (H2):* The public service motivation (PSM) assumes that an individual has an inclination to be altruistically motivated based on what is inherent in the service of a public organization (Perry & Wise, 1990). Although intrinsic motivation is inherent in the theory of PSM, public employees exhibit a stronger sense of altruism and they find their work valuable to the community (Rainey, 1982). PSM is mostly associated with the want to serve the public interest and an individual sense of civic duty and loyalty to the organization (Perry & Wise, 1990).

The following questionnaire items (Table 3) measured loyalty to the organization, commitment to civic duty, public service, and the community as outlined by the public service motivation to see if there was a correlation between the variables. The independent variables are intrinsically
or extrinsically motivated local government front-line employees and the dependent variable is
the PSM. As previously explained, public service motivation was measured using a four-point
scale of agreement (Strongly Disagree = 1, Somewhat Disagree = 2. Somewhat Agree = 3,
Strongly Agree = 4). The four-point scale did not include a neutral option in order to encourage
complete responses.

In order to analyze the level of PSM the scale measured 0-20 for the five four-point items where
higher levels of PSM were between 11-20 with 16-20 being the highest variability and lower
levels of PSM were between 0-10 with 0-5 being the lowest variability (Figure 2). A multiple
regression model was used to analyze two independent variables (intrinsic motivation and
extrinsic motivation) and their relationship to a dependent variable (PSM). The data used for this
analysis were the scores for intrinsic motivation (INT_M), extrinsic motivation (EXT_M), and
PSM (PSM) as separate and isolated variables.

\[
\Delta PSM = \Delta INT_M
\]

**Figure 2.**

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public service motivation (civic duty)</th>
<th>I consider public service my civic duty.</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public service motivation (public)</td>
<td>Meaningful public service is very important to me.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service motivation (commitment to community)</td>
<td>I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service motivation (public service)</td>
<td>Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service motivation (organization loyalty)</td>
<td>What happens to this organization is really important to me.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3 – *Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.*

Theoretical Foundation (H3): – Employees are more likely to be accepting of a performance appraisal system if they feel that it is participatory. If the individual is intrinsically motivated, they are not likely to be accepting to the performance appraisal system if they feel that it is non-participatory (Roberts, 2003).

The dependent variable is the attitudes of the intrinsically motivated front-line government employee based on the independent variable of whether the perception of the performance appraisal was participatory or non-participatory. The following questionnaire items (Table 4) used a four-point scale of agreement (Strongly Disagree = 1, Somewhat Disagree = 2, Somewhat Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4) to measure whether or not the employee perceives the PAS to be participatory or not as well as the employee’s attitude towards the appraisal system. In order to
properly analyze the hypothesis, the data was prepared to include only respondents that indicated themselves to be intrinsically motivated and scored between 9-16 on the 0-16 scale for intrinsic motivation. From the intrinsically motivated employees, two sub-groups were created which represented the two independent variables. These new variables were intrinsically motivated employees who perceived the PAS to be participatory (INT_M_PART) and the intrinsically motivated employees who did not perceive the PAS to be participatory (INT_M_NPART) (Figure 3). Descriptive statistics were used to provide a frequency distribution and a crosstabulation for these two groups and their attitude towards PAS. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to indicate if there was a statistically significant difference between the group means for the variables.

**Figure 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT_M_PART</th>
<th>5-8_pos. att.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAS_ATT</td>
<td>0-4_neg. att.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INT_M_NPART**

**Table 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of PAS</th>
<th>I was able to communicate in the process of my performance evaluation.</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of PAS</td>
<td>I was able to provide input in the process of my performance evaluation.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards PAS</td>
<td>I am looking forward to having another performance review session in the future?</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree 3-Somewhat Agree 4-Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards PAS</td>
<td>I was satisfied with the process of my last performance review.</td>
<td>1-Strongly Disagree 2-Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Qualifying Items

The following qualifying questions (Table 5) addressed the full- or part-time status as some part-time employees did not receive performance evaluations. This study also aimed to measure the front-line government employee that had regular interactions with citizens. Employees were also asked whether or not they have had a performance evaluation while working in their current department in order to prevent new employees from responding about other experiences with performance appraisal. Management positions were also addressed as some managers conduct the PAS and may have differing perceptions and attitudes towards appraisal systems.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a full-time employee?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have first-hand interaction with a citizen or customer one or more times per day?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you in a management position?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received one or more performance evaluations while working in your current department?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was your last performance evaluation?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Variables

In order to prevent the possibility of a spurious relationship appearing in the results of this study, additional variables were included in the questionnaire (Table 6). This helps to strengthen the
explanatory power of any relationships presented between the dependent and independent variables (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000).

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>1-Male 0-Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>1-Under 18 2-18-25 3-26-35 4-36-50 5-51-65 6-Over 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the highest level of education you have completed?</td>
<td>1-Grade school or some high school 2-High school diploma or GED (Graduate Equivalency Degree) 3-Some college or technical training 4-College degree (BA, BS, or other bachelor's degree) 5-Master's or higher degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your annual income from this job?</td>
<td>1-Less than $30,000 2-$30,000--$49,999 3-$50,000--$74,999 4-$75,000--$99,999 5-$100,000 or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your annual household income?</td>
<td>1-Less than $30,000 2-$30,000--$49,999 3-$50,000--$74,999 4-$75,000--$99,999 5-$100,000 or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your race/ethnicity?</td>
<td>1-American Indian 2-Asian 3-Black/ African American 4-Latino/ Latin Decent 5-White 6-Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology and Research Design

Ryan and Deci (2000) explain a common approach to measuring intrinsic motivation is to measure inherent interest through self-report for a specific activity. Oh and Lewis (2009) used the U.S. Merit Principles Survey that took a random sample of employees from multiple federal agencies where a 43% response rate was achieved. Maynard, Moody, and Mosheno (2003) used interviews when collecting their data from public employees however, they did not use interviewed to collect data from the street-level workers due to a disparity in writing skills. The authors used a questionnaire and followed with a brief interview using three open-ended questions.

For this study, confidentiality was extremely important. It was suggested by the county’s human resources department that a survey web resource be used where the only identifying information was the county email addresses. In order to avoid multiple response limitations, survey completion could be monitored. After the pre-set time period, a reminder email was sent to the employees that had not yet completed the survey. This allowed the study to remain confidential but not completely anonymous. The population was notified that the data collected would not be provided to the county. The county would only receive the general findings as a result of the study. Due to the inability to offer complete anonymity to the respondents, the results faced a non-response limitation. Confidentiality was achieved by ridding all identifying information once the data set was complete.

Web-based surveys have grown in popularity as a survey research tool. The limitations in web-based surveys can be found in non-response bias. It is found that a younger, more highly
educated, male demographic is most likely to respond to a web-based survey. Due to the growth in internet and email usage, many surveys do not receive responses because they are classified by individuals and email hosts as “spam” (Sills & Song, 2002). On the other hand, web-based surveys can also control error as there is an equal opportunity for individuals to be included in the sample (Dillman, 1991).

Kiesler and Sproull (1986) explain the advantages of using an electronic network survey as lacking social contexts and making the survey environment impersonal and anonymous. Creswell (2003) explains that survey design can provide a quantitative depiction of perceptions by studying a sample of the intended population. This enables the researcher to make generalizable conclusions towards the phenomenon within a given population.

A cross-sectional internet-based questionnaire was used to collect data that addressed the suggested hypotheses. In order to reduce biasing error due to personal characteristics of an interviewer, the questionnaire was distributed through email/internet resources. This helped prevent bias based on an interviewer as well as increased confidentiality to promote accurate responses (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). Confidentiality was important, as the questionnaire controlled for demographic information such as gender, race, and household income level.

In compliance with Virginia Commonwealth University’s research standards, this study gained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) as the research focused on human subjects. Once approval was granted, the questionnaire was sent through the county.
Population

The population that was selected for this study included the county’s public library system and the department of parks and recreation. The county borders the state’s capital city limits. The county in the study was chosen due to the demographic and environmental diversity.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the estimated population of the county is almost 315,000 including around 24% of residents under the age of 18 and 13% over the age of 65. The diversity of race/ethnicity in the county is estimated as 61%, white persons, 30% black, 7% Asian, 0.5% American Indian, and 5% Hispanic or Latino. The county has about 89% of persons with a high school graduate degree or higher and 39% with a bachelor’s degree or higher. The county is about 53% female and the average median household income is a around $61,200. In 2011, the per capita income was a little over $33,300 and about 10% below the poverty level. The county selected is compared to the United States population below (Table 7). The selected county for this study is moderately representative of the United States population for the following demographics. The major differences are the percentages of black and Hispanic/Latino citizens as well as the citizens containing a bachelor’s degree or higher. The demographics for the respondents will be collected through the survey instrument.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic (Rounded)</th>
<th>Selected County</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents Under 18</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents over 65</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree or higher</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or higher</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$61,200</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Per Capita</td>
<td>$33,300</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All employees in the selected population received the questionnaire except for 62 employees that did not have a county email address. A random sample was not used due to limitations of a small population and concerns for the needed response rate. This addressed the external threat of generalizability as the entire population was selected to participate and the results will be generalized to similar populations (Morse, 1999). Further, the population included all permanent employees, from the two departments, as all permanent employees receive a performance evaluation and have access to a county email account.

There are 62 employees from the population that did not have access to a county email address. While Dillman (2000) explains that coverage can be increased through using mixed response modes, Fricker and Schonlau (2002) state that the survey literature shows little evidence that mixed-mode fielding (such as mail and email) increases the response rates over using a single mode. Therefore, an additional survey mode was not added to the design of this study. This presented a limitation of access to the study however, the literature shows that the effort to reach this part of the population may not increase the response rate.

**Survey Instrument**

In order to measure the variables previously explained in the hypotheses, this research used an adaptation of previous survey questions in order to address each variable. Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, and Tighe (1994) created questionnaire items that will measure intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. To measure intrinsic motivation, the authors included measures of
autonomy, competence, task involvement, and interest. The following items were derived from Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, and Tighe (1994) and adapted to fit a four-point scale of agreement.

- What matters most to me is enjoying what I do.
- I seldom think about salary and promotions.
- As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid.
- The work I do on my job is meaningful to me.
- I am motivated by the money I can earn.
- I am motivated by the recognition I can earn from other people.
- I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it.
- I am motivated by opportunity for promotion.

Crewson (1997) used the Federal Employee Attitude Survey (FEAS) to measure PSM by addressing core concepts of eagerness to work, loyalty, and alignment with organizational mission and values. Perry (1996) used the current literature to measure PSM through attraction to the policy-making process, commitment to civic duty and the public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. The following questionnaire items were adapted for this study to fit a four-point scale of agreement.

- I consider public service my civic duty.
- Meaningful public service is very important to me.
- I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
- Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.
- What happens to this organization is really important to me.

Landy et al. (1978) conducted a study using an instrument to measure an employee’s perception of the accuracy and fairness of their performance appraisal system. Further, their study focused on the system and process of the performance evaluation and not the physical characteristics of its administration. Roberts (1995) conducted a study to examine performance appraisal systems in local governments. The study measured the employee’s perception of the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system as well as the employee’s acceptance of the appraisal system. In
addition, the items evaluated whether or not the employee perceived the performance appraisal system to be participatory. Further, it also looked at employee’s perception of feedback, proper administration of the appraisal, documentation, and goal setting as a result of the evaluation.

While Roberts (1995) developed a scale for measuring perceptions of participatory performance appraisal, Burke, Weitzel and Weir (1978) provided a more objective scale of measuring participation to include questions addressing who spoke the most during the evaluation as well as the employee’s perception of value in the evaluation system. The authors ask straightforward questions as to whether or not the employees felt that they were able to express themselves during the appraisal and if they look forward to an upcoming appraisal. The following questionnaire items were adapted from the previous literature to fit a four-point scale of agreement.

- I was able to communicate in the process of my performance evaluation.
- I was able to provide input in the process of my performance evaluation
- I am looking forward to having another performance review session in the future.
- I was satisfied with the process of my last performance review.

The instrument asked the employee to respond to a qualifying question of whether they are full-time or part-time as many part-time employees to not receive performance evaluations. This question was important to determine eligibility so that employees that are not full-time did not count as non-responses (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). Due to the county’s cycle of performance evaluations, the employee was asked when they received their last evaluation to determine if they had recently received one or if they are about to receive the evaluation. In addition to these qualifying variables, the questionnaire addressed the demographics of the employee. Perry (1997) and Entwisle and Astone (1994) provide measures for demographic
information of the employee. This information includes gender, age, education, and income levels (Perry, 1997). Race and ethnicity were measured by the employee using self-categorization (Entwisle & Astone, 1994). The following questionnaire items were used to measure information for the qualifying and control variables to include the demographic information for the respondents.

- Are you a full-time employee?
- Do you have first-hand interaction with a citizen or customer one or more times per day?
- Are you in a management position?
- Have you received one or more performance evaluations while working in your current department?
- When was your last performance evaluation?
- What is your gender?
- What is your age?
- What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- What is your annual income from this job?
- What is your annual household income?
- What is your race/ethnicity?

**Limitations and Threats**

This study was not be able to keep the respondents confidential however, it was communicated that no identifying information would be provided back to the county other than the general results of the study as a whole. Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement in a study where validity refers to the accuracy. The results of a study may be repeated however, that does not mean that they are accurate (Wheeldon & Ahlberg, 2011). Reliability is not a concern of this study due to the adaptation of the questionnaire items from previous research. All questionnaire items were pulled from the literature and adapted to fit the population, sample, and style of this questionnaire.
Validity refers to the accuracy of the measurement. Internal validity questions whether something will compromise the causal relationships between the dependent and independent variables (Cook, 2000). In this study, design contamination could be a threat to internal validity where employees could discuss the appropriate answers to meet social norms of working in the public sector. To try to account for this threat, the employees were asked not to consult others when filling out the questionnaire. This also helped to guarantee the confidentiality of the data collected.

External validity addresses the representativeness of the sample population (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). Quantitative generalizability refers to the selection of a random sample that will adequately represent the entire population and to similar populations (Morse, 1999). The study results may be generalizable to similar populations based on geographic location and demographic information as described in the population.

Construct validity refers to whether or not the instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). Although questionnaire items were used from previous research, they were adapted to this specific study and adapted to fit a four-point scale of agreeability to better measure the variables.

The internet-based survey is a limitation of this study because many issues may arise. Cook et al. (2000) explain that limitations of internet-based surveys can start with sample issues when the respondents require access to a computer, which would prevent issues with employees that may not work in an office environment. Web-based surveys also require some sort of remedial level
of internet knowledge. The authors also point out that when the survey results are less salient, the response rates tend to be lower and contain more variability.

As previously mentioned, there were 62 employees from the population that did not have access to a county email account. This presented a limitation in access of the study however, Fricker and Schonlau (2002) explain through the current survey literature that there is little evidence that mixed-mode fielding (such as email and mail questionnaire administration) increases response rates over using a single mode of questionnaire administration.
Chapter Four: Findings

The following findings addressed each research question and hypothesis of this study. The purpose of the data analysis was to assess levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees, evaluate if the intrinsic motivation of front-line local government employees is associated with public service motivation (PSM), examine the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) are perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

Response Rate

A total of 258 employees received the questionnaire through an online survey service that was distributed through email by the county’s human resources department. The respondents needed at a ±5% margin of error for the population was 157 as calculated by the formula below.

\[
\frac{N}{(1 + N * e^2)} = \frac{258}{(1 + 258 * 0.05^2)} = 156.84
\]

After the allotted time for the employees to respond to the survey link and participate in the survey, 171 respondents were recorded. The respondents were asked to include their county employee identification name at the end of the questionnaire (item #28) in order for the researcher to account for multiple responses. Of the 171 respondents, 46 did not include their county ID and only 1 respondent completed the questionnaire twice and that respondent was removed from the data set. The 46 respondents that did not include their county ID were sorted by demographic questions and then qualifying questions to ensure that no two respondents provided the same information where it could be assumed to be a multiple response.
In order to account for non-response or completion error, respondents were removed from the data set if they did not complete any of the questionnaire items following the qualifying questions or if they did not complete more than 25% of the questionnaire. Of the 171 respondents, 13 were removed because they did not answer more than 25% of the questionnaire. None of these 13 respondents completed any item after the 7th question, which assumes that they lost interest in the survey and abandoned completion. Further, 2 respondents were removed due to multiple response error as they responded to the survey more than once. After cleaning for incompletion and duplication, 156 respondents remained in the data set for analysis.

Table 8: Incomplete/ Multiple Response Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed &lt; 25% of Questionnaire</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Sample</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When addressing individual item response rates and non-response patterns, 28 of the 29 questionnaire items used a multiple choice or likert scale to measure the variables. There were 41 missing values and the missing values were examined and no patterns were found for the missing values and the non-response was random.

An individual mean imputation method was used to fill in the random missing answers for the variable measures. The mean was calculated for each individual variable. If the majority of answers for a single variable were missing then the answer was left blank (Shrive, Stuart, Quan, and Ghali, 2006). For example, for extrinsic motivation, if three of the four extrinsic questionnaire items were answered, then the mean of those three responses was used to fill in the
fourth answer that was missing. If only one of the extrinsic questionnaire items was answered, then the other three were left blank and that respondent was removed from the data analysis involving the extrinsic variable.

Data Coding

The data set was coded in Microsoft Excel before being uploaded to SPSS 22 and all identifying information was removed including county ID, respondent ID, and IP address information, leaving only the questionnaire items and answers. In order to properly code the data, a variable definition table was created for coding. This table converted test responses into a numeric value and included a key to translate the text into values.

Research Question 1

Are front-line local government employees more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated?

Hypothesis 1

H1 – Local government front-line employees will show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.

Analysis

The 0-16 scales for intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were measured by the following questionnaire items. Each item used a four-point scale of agreement where Strongly Disagree = 1, Somewhat Disagree = 2, Somewhat Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4. The frequency distribution for intrinsic motivation (Table B) shows that the majority 60% of the respondents indicated that they strongly agree with the importance of enjoying what they do. Similarly, 65% strongly agreed with the importance of their job being meaningful to them. The questionnaire
items referring to salary, promotions, and pay where closer between somewhat disagree and somewhat agree. Of the respondents, 38% somewhat disagreed with seldom thinking about salary and promotions and 34% of the respondents somewhat agreed with the statement. Likewise, 43% of the respondents somewhat disagreed with the statement that as long as they enjoy what they do, they are not that concerned with salary and promotions where 34% of the respondents somewhat agreed with the statement.

The frequency distribution (Table 10) for extrinsic motivation shows that the majority of respondents somewhat disagreed (34%) or somewhat agreed (45%) with the statement referring to money as a motivator. Of the respondents, 45% somewhat agreed with the questionnaire item regarding opportunity for promotion. When the respondents were asked if they were motivated by the recognition that they can earn from other people, 51% of the respondents somewhat agreed. However, the largest majority of respondents (66%) strongly disagreed with the statement that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it. This presented a limitation in reliability, as there were inconsistencies between the two measures concerning recognition from other people in Table 10. Of the respondents, 51% somewhat agreed that they are motivated by recognition from other people whereas 66%, a large majority, strongly disagree that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it. In order to address this in the future, a test-retest method could be used to test the reliability of these measures (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 9. Frequency Distributions for Intrinsic Motivation Measures
What matters most to me is enjoying what I do.  4%  2%  34%  60%  156
I seldom think about salary and promotions.  21%  38%  34%  6%  156
As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid.  19%  43%  33%  5%  156
The work I do on my job is meaningful to me.  2%  4%  29%  65%  156

Table 10. Frequency Distributions for Extrinsic Motivation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated by the money I can earn.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated by the recognition I can earn from other people.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated by opportunity for promotion.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distributions below show the respondents grouped into low, moderately low, moderately high, and high levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. One respondent was removed due to an incomplete response for extrinsic motivation therefore, N=155. The respondents grouped into the low category scored between 1 and 4 on the 0-16 scale, the respondents labeled as moderately low scored between 5 and 8 on the 0-16 scale, the respondents grouped as moderately high scored between 9 and 12 on the 0-16 scale, and the respondents labeled as high scored between 13 and 16 on the 0-16 scale.

The frequency distribution table for intrinsic motivation (Table 11) shows that less than 8% of the respondents indicated moderately low to low levels of intrinsic motivation. Of the 155 respondents, 60% indicated moderately high levels of intrinsic motivation and 32% indicated high levels of intrinsic motivation. This assumes that 92% of the respondents reported moderately high to high levels of intrinsic motivation.

Table 11. Frequency Distributions For Levels of Intrinsic Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The frequency distribution table for extrinsic motivation (Table 12) shows that 59% of the respondents indicated moderately high extrinsic motivation whereas 33% of the respondents indicated moderately low levels of extrinsic motivation. While the frequency tables explain that the respondents showed higher levels of intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation, the tables show that the majority of respondents indicated moderately high levels of both intrinsic AND extrinsic motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new categorical variable (MOT_TYP) was created to simplify the measure and categorize each respondent as predominantly intrinsically motivated (1), extrinsically motivated (2), both (3), or neither (4). The new variable used the 0-16 scale to label each recipient (Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If</th>
<th>Then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Intrinsic</td>
<td>INT_M = 9-16 and EXT_M = 0-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Extrinsic</td>
<td>INT_M = 0-8 and EXT_M = 9-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Both</td>
<td>INT_M = 9-16 and EXT_M = 9-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Neither</td>
<td>INT_M = 0-8 and EXT_M = 0-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distributions for motivation (MOT_TYP) for the 155 respondents (Table 14)
shows that 33% or the respondents were intrinsically motivated and 6% were extrinsically motivated however, 59% of the respondents were both intrinsically AND extrinsically motivated according to the 0-16 scale. On the other hand, only 2% of respondents were neither intrinsically motivated nor extrinsically motivated according to the 0-16 scale.

Table 14. Frequency Distributions for MOT_TYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings and Discussion

H1 – Local government front-line employees will show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.

H0 – There will not be a difference in the level of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation for Local government front line employees

The data analysis shows that there is a difference in the levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the null hypothesis can be rejected. When intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are analyzed as two isolated variables, the respondents showed higher levels of intrinsic than extrinsic motivation. When the variables are analyzed together as a new categorical variable (MOT_TYP) then most respondents show both intrinsic AND extrinsic motivation and not one more than the other.

While more respondents were categorized (MOT_TYP) as intrinsically motivated at 33%, than extrinsically motivated at 6%, the majority of respondents indicated that they were both
intrinsically AND extrinsically motivated at 59%. When intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were isolated, the frequencies indicated that the respondents showed higher levels of moderate to high intrinsic motivation than moderate to high extrinsic motivation.

In previous research, Crewson (1997) assessed data from the 1989 General Social Survey, the 1994 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineer survey, and the 1979 Federal Employee Attitude Survey to address the importance of work attributes in the public and private sector. The data compared private employees to public employees, including local, state, and federal government employees. The analysis of the data provided that the public employees placed a higher value on intrinsic rewards and placed a lower value on extrinsic rewards. This study shows that intrinsic motivation is higher than extrinsic motivation, which is supported by Crewson (1997) and Houston (2006). However, when taking the MOT_TYP variable into consideration, the majority of the respondents valued both intrinsic and extrinsic measures.

Further, Amabile et al. (1994) designed a Work Preference Inventory to directly measure the degree to which and individuals indicate themselves to be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated in the workplace. While the data was collected for college students and working adults not specific to the public sector, the study found that the compensation aspect of extrinsic motivation was unrelated to the individual’s causality orientation. Further, this would suggest that when an individual is considered highly independent, they could have high levels of intrinsic motivation as well as high levels of extrinsic compensation motivation. In other words, an employee can be intrinsically motivated AND extrinsically motivated.
The expectations of this study suggested that local government front-line employees would show higher levels of intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation however it was not hypothesized that the employees would indicate high levels of one with the absence of the other. The current study is in-line with Amabile et al.’s (1994) findings that the employees were more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivate but the highest percentage of employees showed moderately high levels of BOTH intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Another finding that is supported by Amabile et al.’s (1994) findings regards the compensation aspects of extrinsic motivation as diminishing intrinsic motivation. When examining the frequency distribution tables for intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Tables B & C), all measures for intrinsic and extrinsic motivation EXCEPT for measures regarding pay or compensation have a large majority in one particular category. For the measures that ask the employees about pay or compensation to measure intrinsic or extrinsic motivation, there is a majority percentage for one response category but it is not a large majority. The percent differences between “somewhat disagree” and “somewhat agree” for these measures only differ by 10% at the most.

**Research Question 2**

Will intrinsic motivation have a stronger relationship than extrinsic motivation with the PSM of front-line local government employees, such as civic duty, commitment to public service, and serving the community?

**Hypothesis 2**

H2 –*Intrinsic motivation will have a stronger relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees than extrinsic motivation.*
**Analysis**
The frequency distributions for the questionnaire items measuring PSM (Table 15) show that the majority of the respondents somewhat or strongly disagree with all of the statements. Of the 154 respondents, 52% somewhat agreed that they considered public service their civil duty, 54% of the respondents strongly agreed that meaningful public service is very important to them. Of the 154 respondents, 53% respondents somewhat agreed that they would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed their interests and 49% of the respondents somewhat agreed that serving other citizens would give them a good feeling even if no one paid them for it. The largest number (76%) of respondents strongly agreed that what happens to the organization is really important to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Frequency Distributions for PSM Measures</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider public service my civic duty.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful public service is very important to me.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to this organization is really important to me.</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A multiple regression model was used to analyze two independent variables (intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation) and their relationship to a dependent variable (PSM). The data used for this analysis were the scores for intrinsic motivation (INT_M), extrinsic motivation (EXT_M), and PSM (PSM) as separate and isolated variables. It is hypothesized that intrinsic motivation will have a statistically significant relationship to PSM and extrinsic motivation will not. In
other words, there will be a positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM and no relationship between extrinsic motivation and PSM.

The regression equation is below:

\[ Y_i = b_0 + b_1x_{1i} + b_2x_{2i}, \ldots \]

\[ PSM = b_0 + b_{INT\_M}x_{INT\_M} + b_{EXT\_M}x_{EXT\_M} + b_{GENDER}x_{GENDER} + b_{AGE}x_{AGE} + \ldots + b_{MGMT}x_{MGMT} \]

where \( INT\_M \) = intrinsic motivation, \( EXT\_M \) = extrinsic motivation, \( GENDER \) = gender of respondent, \( AGE \) = age of respondent, \( ED \) = education level of respondent, \( ANN\_INC \) = annual income, \( HOUS\_INC \) = household income, \( RACE \) = race of respondent, \( INTERACT \) = level of interaction that the respondent has with citizens, and \( MGMT \) = whether or not the respondent is in a management position.

Due to incomplete responses, the population for this analysis was 154 (N=154) as two of the respondents did not answer the items referring to PSM and were removed from the data set before analysis. The control variables in the model below include the demographic variables as well as management status and the level interaction with citizens.

The correlation table shows the magnitude of the relationship between the variables (Table 16). The closer the Pearson Correlation is to the value of 1, the more consistence in the relationship between the two variables. The Pearson correlation value for the variables PSM and \( INT\_M \) is 0.420, which indicates a moderately significant relationship between these two variables at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). The Pearson correlation value for the variables PSM and \( EXT\_M \) is 0.066, which suggests that there is a weak relationship between these two variables. Therefore, both relationships are statistically significant however, the relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM is stronger than the relationship between extrinsic motivation and PSM. Because the
Pearson correlation value for PSM and INT_M is positive, at 0.420, this indicates that the relationship between the variables is positive. When one variable increases, the other variable will also increase.

The correlation table also shows a significant relationship between PSM and level of interaction with the citizen with a Pearson Correlation of 0.172, at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), and the Sig. (p) value is less than 0.05 and therefore indicates a statistically significant relationship between the variables PSM and level of interaction with the citizen for the respondents (Table 16). This implies that the more an employee interacts with citizens, the more likely their level of PSM will increase. While the 0.172 correlation indicates a positive, statistically significant relationship, the magnitude of the relationship is weak and will be further analyzed in the regression model.

Table 16. Correlations for Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and PSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERACT</th>
<th>MGMT</th>
<th>INT_M</th>
<th>EXTR_M</th>
<th>PSM</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>ANN_INC</th>
<th>HOUS_INC</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>172**</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The multiple regression coefficient table provides the multiple correlation coefficient (R) and the coefficient of determination (R²), which measure the power of the regression model (Table 17). R Square is 0.25, which is on the lower side of power. When considering all of the independents variables in the model, the R Square explains the variance in the independent variable, or PSM. In other words, the R Square provides the degree of explanatory power that all of the independent variables have over the dependent variable. Therefore, at 0.25, the R Square value
shows a low explanatory power for explaining the variance between the independent variables and PSM.

**Table 17. Multiple Regression Correlation Coefficient**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.500&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficient table for PSM explains that INT_M with t=5.122 is significantly different from 0 because the Sig. (p) value is less than 0.05 and EXT_M with t=2.140 is also significantly different from 0 because p=0.034 which is less than 0.05 (Table 18). Therefore, the statistically significant B coefficient explains that for every 0.511 increase in INT_M there will be a 0.511 increase in PSM at a 95% confidence level. While the previous correlation table indicated a relationship between level of interaction with citizens (INTERACT) and PSM, the coefficients table shows that there is not a significant relationship between these two variables because the Sig. (p) value was close to being significant but is greater than 0.05 at 0.62.

**Table 18. Coefficients of PSM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>11.138</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT_M</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>5.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT_M</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>2.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-1.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANN_INC</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUS_INC</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-1.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACT</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>-.548</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-1.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Beta coefficient indicates which of the two independent variables (INT_M/ EXT_M) has a greater effect on the dependent variable (PSM). The Beta coefficient shows that the level of intrinsic motivation (INT_M) has a greater affect on levels of PSM at 0.411 than the level extrinsic motivation (EXT_M) at 0.177. The equation is below:

\[ Z_y = b_1 Z_{x1} + b_2 Z_{x2} \]
\[ Z_y = 0.411Z_{x1} + 0.177Z_{x2} \]

**Findings and Discussion**

H2 – *Intrinsic motivation will have a stronger relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees than extrinsic motivation.*

H0. *Intrinsic motivation will not have a relationship with the PSM of local government front-line employees when compared to extrinsic motivation.*

The null hypothesis stipulates that INT_M will not be related to PSM when compared to EXT_M. The multiple regression model showed that the null hypothesis can be fully rejected. The hypothesis can be supported because the regression analysis shows that intrinsic motivation has a greater influence on the PSM of local government front-line employees when compared to extrinsic motivation. The Beta coefficient shows that intrinsic motivation (INT_M) has a greater effect on PSM at 0.411 than extrinsic motivation (EXT_M) at 0.177. Therefore, while both types of motivation have an effect on PSM, intrinsic motivation has a greater effect on PSM than extrinsic motivation.

In previous research, Brewer et al. (2000) had participants rank statements about the topic of public service according to their attitudes. The participants included public employees and
students of public administration and government. The results of the study indicated that the participants were indifferent and showed neutral attitudes towards the public policymaking process and were motivated by serving the public, making a difference in society, and preserving and promoting social equity.

Further, Rainey’s (1982) study explained that public sector managers rate “public service” more highly than private sector managers. This study supports the assumption that public employees are incentivized by public service. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) found that PSM was positively related to level of education however, this study did not show an influence of education on PSM.

This study shows that the majority of respondents somewhat agreed that public service is their civic duty and strongly agreed that public service is important to them. The largest majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement “what happens to this organization is really important to me” which indicates organizational commitment to be the most important aspect of public service. Further, the regression model in this study explains that motivation has an affect on PSM however, intrinsic motivation showed to have a greater affect than extrinsic motivation.

Research Question 3
Do intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems when they perceive them to be participatory versus non-participatory?

Hypothesis 3

Analysis
H3 – Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive
attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.

In order to properly analyze the hypothesis, the data was prepared to include only respondents that indicated themselves to be intrinsically motivated and scored between 9-16 on the 0-16 scale for intrinsic motivation. This qualification provided 143 responses for analysis with one removed for incomplete responses for PAS_TYP and PAS_ATT.

The frequency distributions for the questionnaire items measuring whether the PAS is participatory or non-participatory (Table 19). Of the 143 respondents, 57% strongly agreed that they were able to communicate in the process of their performance evaluation and 50% of the respondents strongly agreed that they were able to provide input in the process of their performance evaluation.

Table 19. Frequency Distribution for Participatory/ Non-Participatory PAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to communicate in the process of my performance evaluation.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to provide input in the process of my performance evaluation.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution for the questionnaire items measuring attitudes towards PAS shows that 40% of the 143 respondents somewhat agreed that they were looking forward to having another performance evaluation in the future (Table 20). When asked if they were satisfied with the process of their last performance evaluation, 43% of the respondents strongly agreed.

Table 20. Attitudes Towards PAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am looking forward to having another performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was satisfied with the process of my last performance review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>22%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>22%</th>
<th>143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>review session in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the intrinsically motivated employees, two sub-groups were created which represented the two independent variables. These new variables are intrinsically motivated employees who perceived the PAS to be participatory (INT_M_PART) and the intrinsically motivated employees who did not perceive the PAS to be participatory (INT_M_NPART). Descriptive statistics were used to provide a frequency distribution for these two groups and their attitude towards PAS. The attitudes towards PAS were categorized as positive (5-8) or not positive (0-4) on a 0-8 scale.

Table 20 shows the frequency distribution for intrinsically motivated employees (N= 143) who perceived their PAS to be participatory verses non-participatory. Of these intrinsically motivated employees, 86% perceived the PAS to be participatory and only 14% did not perceive the PAS to be participatory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participatory</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates if there is a statistically significant difference between the group means for the type of PAS (PAS_TYP) and attitudes towards PAS (PAS_ATT). The Sig. (p) value will determine if the type of PAS has an influence on attitudes towards PAS. The Sig. (p) value is 0, which shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the means (Table 21). In other words, any change in attitudes towards PAS is due to change in type of PAS.
Table 21. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAS_ATT*</td>
<td>6.269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.269</td>
<td>46.239</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS_TYP</td>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>6.269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.269</td>
<td>46.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>19.116</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.385</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explain how much the participatory and non-participatory variables had on the attitudes towards PAS, the Eta Squared divides the Sum of Squares Between Groups by the total Sum of squares. In other words, the Eta Squared will indicate how much variance in the attitudes towards PAS is a result of participatory or non-participatory PAS perceptions.

The Eta Squared calculated from 6.269/ 25.385 is 0.247 (Table 22). This simply means that only 24.7% of the variance in attitudes towards PAS is due to whether or not the respondent perceived the PAS to be participatory or non-participatory. According to Cohen’s (1988) rules of effect size, 24.7% of variance between the dependents variable and the independents variables is considered a large effect.

Table 22. Measures of Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAS_ATT*</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS_TYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings and Discussion

H3 – Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.
H$_0$. *Intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show no relationship between attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.*

According to the analysis, the null hypothesis can be rejected, as intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems when they are perceived to be participatory. These employees showed a high percentage of positive attitudes towards PAS when they perceived them to be participatory over non-participatory. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) explains that a change in the means of attitudes was due to manipulation of the type of PAS. The Eta Squared also explained that there was a large effect on the perception of participatory and non-participatory PAS on attitudes towards PAS.

In previous research, Roberts and Reed (1996) conducted a mail survey study that examined supervisory style for performance appraisal by participation, goal setting, and feedback. Roberts and Reed found that employee attitudes towards the PAS are linked to their acceptance of the performance appraisal system. The study found that employees who perceived the supervisors to used participation, goal-setting, and feedback in the performance appraisal process believed the appraisal to be more effective and had a higher acceptance of the appraisal process. Further, the researchers explained that employee’s acceptance of the appraisal process is a key factor in fostering positive attitudes and increases the performance appraisals value towards motivation and productivity.
This study adds to Roberts and Reeds (1996) research regarding the type of PAS, whether it is participatory or non-participatory, causes a variation in the employee’s attitudes towards the PAS. The local government front-line employees that responded to the questionnaire had more positive attitudes when they perceived the PAS to be participatory when compared to when the PAS was not perceived to be participatory.

**Summary of Findings**

As observed in the statistical analysis of local government front-line employees, when intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are analyzed as isolated variables, the respondents showed more intrinsic than extrinsic motivation. When a single motivation variable was created to include intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, both, and neither, more respondents indicated themselves to be both extrinsically motivated AND intrinsically motivated over a single type of motivation.

The multiple regression analysis indicated that while both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation have an influence on PSM, intrinsic motivation had a greater affect on PSM than extrinsic motivation. In this analysis, the motivation variables were isolated.

The type of PAS was broken down into two variables of participatory or non-participatory based on the perception of the respondent. The large majority of respondents perceived the PAS to be participatory over non-participatory. Further, the type of PAS was then compared to the attitudes towards PAS. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) explained that a change in the means of attitudes was due to manipulation of the type of PAS.
The following chapter summarizes the nature of the problem, the purpose of this study, the literature, and previous research, along with the research questions and findings. The policy implications of these findings and recommendations for future research are also discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter Five: Conclusion and Discussion

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees. This study sought to find if the intrinsic motivation of front-line local government employees is associated with public service motivation (PSM). Further, this study examined the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) are perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

Review of the Literature

When compared to their private sector equivalents, research suggests that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards (Houston, 2006). In the public sector, the promotion of intrinsic motivation is desirable as public employees, showing higher levels of intrinsic motivation, tend to place a higher value on helping others and public service over financial benefits (Wright & Pandey, 2008).

When an external agent is evaluating an employee’s work, such as the case of performance appraisals, the individual may experience a loss of self-determination. This perception of external control may undermine any existing intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). When the performance appraisal is perceived as an external control mechanism, intrinsic motivation is then “crowded out” (Frey, 1994).
Front-line government employees, or street-level bureaucrats, are charged with the implementation element of the policy process. These employees tend to be over-worked and under-resourced and are the threshold between the public and government policy action (Liskpy, 2010). Therefore, if public employees show signs of intrinsic motivation, that are inherent in the missions and goals of public organizations, it is then important to explore their attitudes towards factors that may undermine this intrinsic motivation and to further investigate variables that may promote this intrinsic motivation.

Employee performance appraisal participation, goal setting, and feedback can influence performance appraisal acceptance and create positive outcomes concerning employee motivation and productivity (Roberts & Reed, 1996). For example, facets of performance appraisal systems can lead to higher employee acceptance such as employee participation in the performance appraisal process (Roberts, 2003). As performance appraisal is an important management tool in the public sector, procedurally, it is important for employees to perceive an open process to include employee participation (Daley, 1992).

**Research Questions**

**Intrinsic v. Extrinsic**

Are front-line local government employees more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated?

**Public Service Motivation (PSM)**
Will intrinsic motivation have a stronger relationship than extrinsic motivation with the PSM of front-line local government employees, such as civic duty, commitment to public service, and serving the community?

**Participatory v. Non-Participatory**

Do intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems when they perceive them to be participatory versus non-participatory?

**Previous Research**

The literature explains intrinsic motivation to be a fundamental and inherent motivation that is found in the nature of the individual and extrinsic motivation to be an externally acquired motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Benware, & Landy, 1974). When comparing public and private sector employees, it has been found that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards (Houston, 2006). It is suggested that public employees are more interested in the intrinsic rewards of the public sector than extrinsic rewards (Crewson, 1997).

Front-line local government employees carry out the responsibility that is held by public organizations (Prottas, 1978). Especially at the street-level, the motivation of public employees who actually deal with the public personally should be examined. Maynard-Moody and Mosheno (2003) explain the importance of examining front-line government workers where a strong relationship exists between the employee and the public.
The existence of a service ethic in the public sector has been supported by a high value in performing work to help others (Wittmer, 1991). Perry (2000) explains that there exists an attraction to policy making, compassion, commitment to civic interest, and self-sacrifice. There is an individual and self-conceptualizing process where identity and values are formed and can be found in the logic of motivation. Gabris and Simo (1995) refer to public motivation as an individual’s interest in the policy process and dedication to advocacy along with the loyalty to government and belief in social equity.

While Brewer et al. (2000) found that public sector employees are indifferent to the policy-making process, Crewson (1997) found that public employees with service preferences (intrinsic) versus economic benefit (extrinsic) tend to have a higher level of commitment to their organization where employees who favor economic or extrinsic rewards are more likely to be disaffected. Rainey’s (1982) study explained that public sector managers rate “public service” more highly than private sector managers and are incentivized by public service. Perry & Wise (1990) suggest that public employees that show characteristics of PSM place a high value on the civic duty of their work. These employees show a commitment to the values that are inherent in public organizations (Houston, 2006).

Performance appraisals can be perceived as a form of external control, whether the outcome is positive or negative for the individual being evaluated (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Law, 2007). When an individual perceives their loss of internal control, caused by performance appraisal, the necessary conditions that harbor intrinsic motivation are compromised (Deci, 1975). It is then
important to address whether the employee views the performance appraisal system as participatory or non-participatory (Roberts, 1995).

Roberts and Reed (1996) conducted a study that showed employees being rated by a supervisor. The employees perceived the performance appraisal to be more effective as an administrative process when the supervisor encouraged participation, goal setting, and feedback. If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system as participatory and valid, the employee is more likely to accept and learn from feedback even if the feedback is negative to the employee’s performance (Roberts, 2003).

**Methods**

This study used a 29-item, internet-based questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to 258 county employees in two different departments. The population included all permanent employees as only permanent employees obtain county email addresses. The questionnaire was sent by email due to the requirement for county employees to use email to report their timesheets.

The questionnaire was administered by the county’s human resources department over a four-week period. Of the 258 county employees to receive the questionnaire, 171 responses were recorded. After, the data was sorted and cleaned, 156 responses remained for data analysis. The data was then coded and imported into SPSS for analysis.
The questionnaire consisted of five qualifying items. These items will address the respondent’s full- or part-time status, whether or not they have had a performance evaluation while working in their current department, and whether or not they are in a management position. These items will be addressed as some part-time employees do not receive performance evaluations and in order to prevent new employees from responding about other experiences with performance appraisal. Management positions will also be addressed as some managers conduct the PAS and may have differing perceptions and attitudes towards appraisal systems.

The questionnaire used a four-point scale of agreement (Strongly Disagree = 1, Somewhat Disagree = 2, Somewhat Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4). The four-point scale does not include a neutral option in order to encourage complete responses. The scale contains four points to account for variability. The questionnaire items were adapted from previous research to measure levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, attributes of PSM, perceptions of participatory PAS, and attitudes towards PAS.

Different scales were created to analyze the four-point likert responses. For example, four items addressed the variable of intrinsic motivation. A 0-16 scale was then created to analyze low, moderately low, moderately high, and high levels of intrinsic motivation. The same scale was used to analyze and compare with extrinsic motivation.

In order to address the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation variables, frequency distributions and descriptive statistics were analyzed. A multiple regression model was used to analyze intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and PSM. Finally, a one-way analysis of variance was used to
analyze the influence of participatory and non-participatory perceptions of PAS on the respondent’s attitudes towards PAS.

**Findings**

The first hypothesis of the study addressed whether or not the front-line local government employees were more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated. While the analysis showed that the employees were more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated when the types of motivation were measure against each other, the majority of the employees indicated that they were both intrinsically AND extrinsically motivated when the new variable was created. Therefore, when considering the policy implications of this finding, it is important to recognize that while the majority of employees were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, there is still an strong sense of intrinsic motivation as indicated by the respondents of this study.

The second hypothesis focused on the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on PSM. In other words, does a respondent’s level of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation have a relationship with the level of PSM as the literature explains that they go hand in hand? A multiple regression analysis was used to address this hypothesis and found that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were related to PSM. While both types of motivation had an effect on PSM, intrinsic motivation had a greater affect than extrinsic motivation. Further, the study shows that the majority of respondents somewhat agreed that public service is their civic duty and strongly agreed that public service is important to them. The largest majority of respondents strongly
agreed with the statement “what happens to this organization is really important to me” which indicates organizational commitment to be the most important aspect of public service.

The third hypothesis of the study isolated the front-line local government employees who indicated themselves to be intrinsically motivated according to the 0-16 scale. It was then hypothesized that these intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees will show more positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems (PAS) when the PAS is perceived to be participatory than when it is not perceived to be participatory.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) found that the intrinsically motivated respondents showed a high percentage of positive attitudes towards PAS when they perceived them to be participatory over non-participatory. The ANOVA explained that a change in the means of attitudes was due to manipulation of the type of PAS and that there was a large effect of the perception of participatory and non-participatory PAS on attitudes towards PAS. In other words, when the perception of participatory changed, the attitudes towards PAS changed which suggests a direct effect of type of PAS on attitudes towards PAS.

**Recommendations and Implications**

*Policy Implications*

Previous research explains that individuals can concurrently be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Although much of the research implies that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are mutually exclusive, there is little support for this concept (Amabile et al., 1994). When addressing motivation in the local government sector, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation should
be viewed together instead of isolated constructs. As this study shows, employees are able to value both intrinsic AND extrinsic rewards and can be motivated by both.

Recommendation: Management practices should focus on the promotion of intrinsic motivation in congruence with extrinsic motivation in the local government sector.

Regarding intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and PSM, the previous research is inconsistent to explain whether or not public employees are have a desire and motivation for public service. While, there is a body of literature that links PSM to public employee intrinsic motivation, there is not a significant body of research that explores the direct links between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and PSM.

The theory of PSM as described by Perry (2000) has a multitude of foundations and premises on which a modern theory of PSM is constructed. Perry explains that there exists an attraction to policy making, compassion, commitment to civic interest, and self-sacrifice. There is an individual and self-conceptualizing process where identity and values are formed and can be found in the logic of motivation. Further, Houston (2000) offers that public employees hold a strong sense of accomplishment to their work and highly value intrinsic rewards. However, this study found that front-line local government employees also respond to extrinsic motivators.

• Recommendation: When designing incentive structures in the public sector, managers should include rewards that will motivate both intrinsic and extrinsic employees.
This study found that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation levels had a relationship with PSM. While the influence of intrinsic motivation on PSM was greater than that of extrinsic motivation on PSM, there was still evidence of a link between these three variables. Further, when attempting to enhance the motivation of front-line local government employees, management practices can be put in place to foster the PSM through intrinsic motivation as well as extrinsic rewards. As Brewer et al. (2000) found, indifferent and neutral attitudes existed towards the public policymaking process and were motivated by serving the public, making a difference in society, and preserving and promoting social equity.

- Recommendation: Because there is a stronger relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM, managers should focus on increasing intrinsic motivation and decreasing extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees.

Previous research identifies a direct relation between goal-setting and participation and employee satisfaction with performance evaluation (Giles & Mossholder, 1990). Roberts (2003) explains the importance of participation in performance appraisals for intrinsically motivated employees. If the employee is intrinsically motivated and does not feel that the performance appraisal system is participatory then the employee will not reap the cognitive and effective benefits of organizational and individual growth and development. If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system as participatory and valid, the employee is more likely to accept and learn from feedback even if the feedback is negative to the employee’s performance (Roberts, 2003).
This study found that the type of PAS, whether it is participatory or non-participatory, causes a variation in the employee’s attitudes towards the PAS for intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees. The intrinsically motivated local government front-line employees that responded to the questionnaire had more positive attitudes when they perceived the PAS to be participatory when compared to when the PAS was not perceived to be participatory.

As previously discussed, fewer than 40% of municipalities attempt any form of “meaningful” performance measurement system. Service quality measurement was found to be a problem with the local governments that attempt to produce meaningful performance appraisal (Poister & Streib, 1999). Most local governments administer performance evaluations in some form however, because an appraisal system is a facet of human resource department practices, it does not imply quality (Ammons & Condrey, 1991).

Participatory performance appraisals yield many benefits such as increasing communication between employees and supervisors, encouraging employees towards future development, increasing productive behavior, and enhancing motivation by satisfying employee needs for fulfillment and self-actualization (Olsen & Bennett, 1975). The importance of improving PAS as a beneficial management practice also links to increasing and harboring intrinsic motivation.

- Recommendation: Managers should develop more participatory performance appraisal system because they are viewed more positively by intrinsically motivated employees.
Implications for Public Sector Management

In order to address the policy implications and the implications for management practices that this study lends its findings to, the current state of intrinsic motivation and public service motivation in regards to performance appraisal systems should be examined. The purpose of this study was to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in front-line local government employees. This study sought to find if the intrinsic motivation of front-line local government employees is associated with public service motivation (PSM). Further, this study examined the differences in attitudes of intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees when performance appraisal systems (PAS) are perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

First, the study found that while the respondents were more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated, most of the respondents were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Further, the study found that while both types of motivation had an influence on PSM, intrinsic motivation had a greater influence than extrinsic motivation. The study showed that the majority of respondents somewhat agreed that public service is their civic duty and strongly agreed that public service is important to them. The largest majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement “what happens to this organization is really important to me” which indicated organizational commitment to be the most important aspect of public service.

When discussing these findings in the context of work motivation, the management literature offers the theory of person-environment fit. While the original literature focused mainly on vocational work, it has evolved into how compatible individuals are with their work environment
and the characteristics of the person-environment match (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). In other words, individuals that are motivated by public service are a good fit with the environment of public organizations.

In addition to the previous recommendations to management practices and current employees, another implication for management practices refers to potential employees. When considering public sector recruitment, organizations should focus on recruiting employees that not only exhibit intrinsic motivation but also value the attributes of PSM as these employees may be the best fit for public organizations. As Gabris and Simo (1995) previously suggested, PSM employees are interested and attracted to the policy process and are dedicated and loyal to government process.

Therefore, if the individual and the job, or environment, are a good fit, then the employee may have a higher level of intrinsic motivation towards their job as their need to PSM is being fostered. In support of this concept, Steijn (2008) found that private sector employees that showed high levels of PSM were more inclined to seek a public sector job than the private sector employees with lower levels of PSM. This context of the person-environment framework falls in-line with the theory of attraction-selection attrition.

Schaubroeck et al. (1998) explain Schneider’s (1987) attraction-selection attrition model as the process of an individual being attracted to, and preferred by, organizations based on the match of the personal and organizational characteristics such as culture, structure, etc. Subsequently, personal and organizational traits and characteristics become uniform. Further, Schaubroeck et
al. (1998) explain that individuals that have personal characteristics that are not a good fit with the organization may be recruited by the organization however, they are more likely to leave the organization. This also provides implications for organizational retention.

Therefore, the implications for practice is that public organizations should recruit individuals that exhibit intrinsic and public service motivation as these individuals will provide a better and more homogenous fit with the organization and in turn, influence organizational function. Further, these individuals will be more likely to stay with the organization that is a good environmental fit instead of seeking a better environmental fit.

Another implication of this study on management practices is the role of participation in the performance appraisal process. This study found that the type of PAS, whether they were perceived as participatory or non-participatory, caused a variation in the employee’s attitudes towards the PAS for intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees. The intrinsically motivated local government front-line employees that responded to the questionnaire had more positive attitudes when they perceived the PAS to be participatory when compared to when the PAS was not perceived to be participatory.

As previously explained, it is ideal for public sector organizations to not only attract intrinsically motivated individuals, but also to retain these individuals as committed and engaged employees. The literature explained that when employees buy in to management practices, they are more likely to gain professional growth from the practices. Performance management in public organizations can have perverse effects on the organization and its employees. Performance
management can block employee and organizational innovation and ambition by creating a strategic criteria focused on efficiency. If performance appraisals are viewed by the employees as meaningless, then the actual performance may be masked by a process where performance is not linked to effort. In turn, if performance appraisals are directly linked to measurable qualitative outcomes, such as the number of customers served, then professional attitudes may be pushed out (de Bruijn, 2007).

Successful performance appraisal systems may serve as an important key to running an effective organization however, performance appraisal systems are only as useful as the success of implementation (Daley, 1991). If the employee perceives the performance appraisal system as participatory and valid, the employee is more likely to accept and learn from feedback even if the feedback is negative to the employee’s performance (Roberts, 2003). The results of this study have not only offered the importance of performance appraisal as a management practice, but the use of participatory performance appraisals to harbor intrinsic motivation and provide a meaningful management practice. If the individual employee has a more positive view of performance appraisals when they are perceived to be participatory then management practices should turn focus on the facets of these participatory performance appraisal systems.

Greller (1998) explains different facets of PAS participation to be inviting comments, asking for ideas, providing the employee with a chance to introduce new topics, and the overall idea of the employee being encouraged to discuss any issues, ideas, or problems. This study shows that when the employee perceives the PAS to include participation then they have more positive attitudes towards the PAS. As discussed in the literature and framework leading to the
hypotheses of this study, the research design measured the employee’s perception and not the actual role or intent of participation in PAS. This is an important distinction when discussing the implications for public managers.

In order to convey the findings of this study into public sector management practice, the actual reality and intent of participation in PAS and the employee’s perception of participation in PAS must be taken into consideration. Not only does the literature explain the importance of participation in PAS but also this study showed the importance of the perception of participation in PAS, especially in terms of promoting intrinsic motivation. The intent of the process of PAS and the actual implementation of the process in PAS show a significant distinction in how the employee perceives the PAS. While the PAS may be designed to be participatory, it does not mean that the PAS was presented by the supervisor as being participatory. Den Hartog et al. (2004) suggest that variation can exist in the individual employee’s perception of management practices.

Many times PAS are designed by human resource specialists to include specific types of implementation. While den Hartog et al. (2004) have suggested variations in perceptions of management practices, Stiles et al. (1997) explain the variations in management implementation of the PAS such as some managers spending excessive time on PAS, others rating all employees as “average” to avoid singling out employees for good or bad performance, and other managers not spending much time at all on PAS in order to complete the requirement as a bureaucratic process.
This leads to the importance of proper training, development, and perceived importance between human recourse management specialists, top-level managers, and middle-level managers. While middle-level managers are often providing the supervisory role for the PAS, it is important that these managers are properly trained on how to conduct the PAS in order to portray a participatory PAS and in turn, the employee may perceive the PAS to be participatory. In other words, if the managers that will be implementing the PAS do not understand the importance of the PAS, they will not then provide the employee with a meaningful PAS process.

Miller and Thornton (2006) suggest that all parties, from front-line managers to senior managers must “buy in” to the PAS in order for it to be successful. If PAS ratings are perceived to be inaccurate then it is not likely that the employees will “buy in” to the PAS. The findings of this paper show the relationship between the employee’s perception of the PAS and the attitudes towards PAS for intrinsically motivated front-line local government employees therefore, it would be useful to promote management practices for PAS that increase employee “buy in” or employee attitudes towards PAS.

Further Research

This study raises some points and recommendations for future research. First, it is suggested for the current body of research to further examine the management practices regarding front-line local government employees. As previously discussed, these employees carry out the responsibility that is held by public organizations (Prottas, 1978). Especially at the street-level, the motivation of public employees who actually deal with the public personally should be examined. Moore (1987) expresses the importance of studying the way that street-level bureaucrats denote and relate with the organizational process.
Another recommendation for future research concerning intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is a closer examination of the types of motivation that coexist together and not as a unipolar construct. Amabile et al. (1994) found that when an individual is considered highly independent, they could have high levels of intrinsic motivation as well as high levels of extrinsic compensation motivation. In other words, an employee can be intrinsically motivated AND extrinsically motivated. The data collected by Amabile et al. (1994) was not specific to the public sector however, there is a opportunity for more research in the public sector on the coexistence of intrinsic AND extrinsic motivation.

Much of the literature regarding intrinsic and extrinsic motivation assumes that when there is more of one, then there is less of the other. When there is a lack of extrinsic motivation, then intrinsic motivation is “allowed” to flourish within the individual as a mutually offsetting relationship (Thierry, 1990). The question for future research is while extrinsic rewards may “crowd out” intrinsic motivation, can both types of motivation be nurtured at the same time? If an employee is highly extrinsically AND intrinsically motivated, does that extrinsic motivation prevent the intrinsic motivation from increasing when extrinsic rewards are or are not present?

While there is a large body of research concerning PSM in the public sector, there seems to be a need for further research specific to the federal, state, and local levels, individually. The current research explains that public employees that show characteristics of PSM place a high value on the civic duty of their work (Perry & Wise, 1990). These employees show a commitment to the values that are inherent in public organizations (Houston, 2006). Public employees show a
stronger sense of self-sacrifice and find their work valuable to their community (Rainey, 1982). Further, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) found a positive relationship between PSM and membership in professional organizations for state employees. Future research should test this relationship at the local level.

Federal, state, and local public employees have multiple degrees of separation between the employee and the community. Therefore, if PSM is evident and indicates community engagement and commitment as a facet, then it is important to compare the facets of PSM to different levels of public service involvement. Future research should focus on the operational constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in comparison with PSM to grasp a deeper knowledge of these relationships.

If performance appraisals, as a management and employee development practice, are viewed by the employees as meaningless, then the actual performance may be masked by a process where performance is not linked to effort (de Bruijn, 2007). It is important to further examine employee attitudes toward PAS processes in order to increase the usefulness of PAS as a management and employee development process. This study found that the type of PAS whether it is participatory or non-participatory, causes a variation in the employee’s attitudes towards the PAS.

**Conclusion**

This study sought to address intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, public service motivation, and performance appraisal practices in the front-line local government sector. The study
hypothesized that front-line local government employees would be more intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated, show a stronger relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM than extrinsic motivation, and show more positive attitudes towards PAS when they were perceived to be participatory versus non-participatory.

The survey research methodology and data analysis found that while the sample of front-line local government employees indicated more intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation, the majority of respondents indicated high levels of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Further, the analysis found that there was a significant relationship between intrinsic motivation and PSM. While both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation had an influence on PSM, intrinsic motivation had a stronger influence. When assessing the PAS practices, the respondents showed more positive attitudes towards PAS when they perceived them to be participatory versus non-participatory.

In light of these findings, recommendations for management practices and future research were suggested to include: focusing on intrinsic motivation in congruence with extrinsic motivation when designing management practices and incentive structures, applying management practices to promote intrinsically motivated employees that adhere to the values found inherently in public organizations, and supporting participation promote positive attitudes towards performance appraisal systems.
These findings and recommendations aim to increase and harbor intrinsic motivation in the local government sector and to offer additional data to the current and future body of research in the field of public management and administration.
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Appendix A

Instrument
Survey: Employee Motivation and Attitudes Towards Performance Evaluation

Purpose: The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information on the attitudes of employees regarding motivation and performance evaluation. The purpose of this study is to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in local government employees. Further, this study will seek to examine the effects of performance appraisal systems. Your willingness in providing this data will be very helpful in the testing of current theories of public management.

Confidentiality: This survey is confidential and will not be shared. No personal information will be kept after the data is collected. The information collected in this study will be shared as a whole and no individual data will be released. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty for not completing this survey. Please skip any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering.

1. Are you a full-time employee?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Do you have first-hand interaction with a citizen or customer one or more times per day?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Are you in a management position?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Have you received one or more performance evaluations while working in your current department?
   - Yes
   - No

5. When was your last performance evaluation?
   - In the last 2 months
   - In the last 6 months
   - In the last year
   - I have not received a performance evaluation in the last year
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

6. What matters most to me is enjoying what I do.
   Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

7. I seldom think about salary and promotions.
   Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

8. As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid.
   Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

9. The work I do on my job is meaningful to me.
   Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

10. I am motivated by the money I can earn.
    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

11. I am motivated by the recognition I can earn from other people.
    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

12. I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it.
    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

13. I am motivated by opportunity for promotion.
    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

15. Meaningful public service is very important to me.
    Strongly Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Strongly Agree

16. I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.
17. Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.

18. What happens to this organization is really important to me.

Please reflect on the last performance appraisal/evaluation that you received in your current department and indicate the degree in which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

19. I was able to communicate in the process of my performance evaluation.

20. I was able to provide input in the process of my performance evaluation.

21. I am looking forward to having another performance review session in the future.

22. I was satisfied with the process of my last performance review.

23. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

24. What is your age?
   - Under 18
   - 18-25
   - 26-35
   - 36-50
   - 51-65
   - Over 65

25. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
26. What is your annual income from this job?

- Less than $30,000
- $30,000--$49,999
- $50,000--$74,999
- $75,000--$99,999
- $100,000 or greater

27. What is your annual household income?

- Less than $30,000
- $30,000--$49,999
- $50,000--$74,999
- $75,000--$99,999
- $100,000 or greater

28. What is your race/ethnicity?

- American Indian
- Asian
- Black/ African American
- Latino/ Latin Decent
- White
- Other

29. Please enter your Henrico County user ID below: (ex: jon12@co.henrico.va.us)

(This information will only be used to prevent multiple responses. You will not be contacted and this info after data is collected. Please answer one time only.)
Appendix B

Descriptive Statistics\(^1\,^2\) for Questionnaire Items

Q1. Are you a full-time employee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Do you have first-hand interaction with a citizen or customer one or more times per day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Are you in a management position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Have you received one or more performance evaluations while working in your current department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Percentages were rounded and may add to 99-101.
\(^2\) Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were calculated after the data was cleaned and coded but before imputation for missing answers.
Q5. When was your last performance evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the last 2 months</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 6 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Q6. What matters most to me is enjoying what I do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. I seldom think about salary and promotions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. As long as I can do what I enjoy, I'm not that concerned about exactly what I'm paid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. The work I do on my job is meaningful to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. I am motivated by the money I can earn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. I am motivated by the recognition I can earn from other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. I believe that there is no point in doing a good job if nobody else knows about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. I am motivated by opportunity for promotion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. I consider public service my civic duty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Meaningful public service is very important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16. I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. What happens to this organization is really important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please reflect on the last performance appraisal/evaluation that you received in your current department and indicate the degree in which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Q19. I was able to communicate in the process of my performance evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. I was able to provide input in the process of my performance evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21. I am looking forward to having another performance review session in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22. I was satisfied with the process of my last performance review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23. What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q24. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade school or some high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. What is your annual income from this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000--$49,999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000--$74,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000--$99,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or greater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27. What is your annual household income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000--$49,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000--$74,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000--$99,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or greater</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. What is your race/ ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/ Latin Decent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

TO: Blue Wooldridge  
CC: Erin Luper  
FROM: VCU IRB Panel B  
RE: Blue Wooldridge; IRB HM20001622

On 5/30/2014 the referenced research study qualified for exemption according to 45 CFR 46.101(b), category 2.

The information found in the electronic version of this study’s smart form and uploaded documents now represents the currently approved study, documents, and HIPAA pathway (if applicable). You may access this information by clicking the Study Number above. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Subjects Protection (ORSP) or the IRB reviewer(s) assigned to this study.

The reviewer(s) assigned to your study will be listed in the History tab and on the study workspace. Click on their name to see their contact information.

Attachment – Conditions of Exempt Approval  Conditions of Exempt Approval:

In order to comply with federal regulations, industry standards, and the terms of this approval, the investigator must (as applicable):

1. Conduct the research as described in and required by the Protocol.
2. Provide non-English speaking patients with a translation of the approved Consent Form in the research participant's first language. The Panel must approve the translation.
3. The following changes to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB panel for review and approval before the changes are instituted. Changes that do not meet these criteria do not have to be submitted to the IRB. If there is a question about whether a change must be sent to the IRB please call the ORSP for clarification. THESE CHANGES MUST BE SUBMITTED: - Change in principal investigator - Any change that increases the risk to the participant - Addition of children, wards of the state, or prisoner participants - Changes in survey or interview questions (addition or deletion of questions or wording) that change the level of risk or adds questions related to sexual activity, abuse, past or present illicit drug use, illegal activities, questions reasonably expected to provoke psychological anxiety, or would make participants vulnerable, or subject them to financial, psychological or medical risk - Changes that change the category of exemption or add additional exemption categories - Changes that add procedures or activities not covered by the exempt category(ies) under which the study was originally determined to be exempt - Changes requiring additional participant identifiers that could impact the exempt category or determination - Change in inclusion dates for retrospective record reviews if the new date is after the original approval date for the exempt study. (ex: The approval date for the study is 9/24/10 and the original inclusion dates were 01/01/08-06/30/10. This could be changed to 01/01/06 to 09/24/10 but not to
end on 09/25/10 or later. ) - Addition of a new recruitment strategy - Increase in the planned compensation to participants

4. Monitor all problems (anticipated and unanticipated) associated with risk to research participants or others.

5. Report Unanticipated Problems (UPs), following the VCU IRB requirements and timelines detailed in VCU IRB WPP VIII-7.

6. Promptly report and/or respond to all inquiries by the VCU IRB concerning the conduct of the approved research when so requested.

7. The VCU IRBs operate under the regulatory authorities as described within: - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Title 45 CFR 46, Subparts A, B, C, and D (for all research, regardless of source of funding) and related guidance documents. - U.S. Food and Drug Administration Chapter I of Title 21 CFR 50 and 56 (for FDA regulated research only) and related guidance documents. - Commonwealth of Virginia Code of Virginia 32.1 Chapter 5.1 Human Research (for all research).
Appendix D

After consultation with Human Resources and approval by the Director of Recreation and Parks and the Director of the Department of Public Libraries, a VCU doctoral student has created a survey to collect information on employee motivation and attitudes towards performance appraisals. The purpose of this study is to look at levels of intrinsic motivation compared to extrinsic motivation in local government employees. Further, this study will seek to examine the effects of performance appraisal systems. Your willingness in providing this information will be very helpful in the testing of current theories of public management. Please click the link below.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/JVRYCJ2

Confidentiality: This survey is confidential and will not be shared. All personal or identifiable information will be destroyed after the study is complete. The information collected in this study will be shared as a whole and no individual data will be released. If you have any questions, please contact Erin Luper (luperel@vcu.edu) or Becky Simulcik in HR (sim10@co.henrico.va.us, 501-4783).

Thank you!
--
Erin L Luper
Doctoral Candidate
L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Appendix E

VITA

Erin Leah Luper began her academic career at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville with a Bachelor of Arts in political science followed by a Master of Public Administration. After her master’s degree, Erin pursued her Doctorate of Philosophy in Public Policy and Public Administration at Virginia Commonwealth University.

While completing her master’s degree, Erin worked for the Knox County Election Commission as a Deputy Administrator. Throughout her doctorate degree, she worked in the Department of External Relations in the L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs at Virginia Commonwealth University. Erin continues to work on her research and hopes to publish her work in public management.