

## FEATURES OF PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION: THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL DIMENSION

Aušra Vaisvalavičiūtė

Kaunas University of Technology

### Abstract

An essential attention is paid to public service motivation (PSM) in an article. Processes of public administration modernization, more increased requirements to public service induced a more considerable academic discourse on this topic. An avail of motivation is certain. It helps to increase the productivity, efficiency and quality of public sector and to stimulate the commitment of work of public servants too. According to methods of qualitative information compilation and scientific studies generalization, the paper explores the importance of public service motivation, its development, highlights the PSM concept. In comparison with other European countries, there are also emphasized the features of Lithuanian public servants motivation.

**Keywords:** motives, motivation, public service, public service motivation.

### Introduction

**The problem, novelty and relevance of the paper.** In today's world global, economic, social changes have an inevitable impact on the development and content of public administration, present new requirements for public sector management and administration. According to Čiupaila (2007), the state's political and economic power, development, the world's political and financial support depends very much on the ability of forecasting, planning, making effective and efficient decisions on government, state institutions and agencies.

As Marcinkevičiūtė (2005) states, society considers that public servants work ineffectively; they lack motivation to achieve better results. According to Daley (1986), the problems of efficiency are caused not by lack of motivation to achieve results or high workload, but by the lack of circumstance to divulge the potential of workers and by the their untapped determination to achieve results. All of this obligated to search for more effective, modern management and administrative methods, techniques and tools and to pay special attention to PSM.

With reference to Grant (2008), one of the key objectives of the public servants is to make a posi-

ve difference in the health, safety and well-being of individuals, groups and communities. For example, fire-fighters and medics save lives, police officers protect the public, public defenders safeguard the constitutional rights of citizens, military protects the state from the attacker, lifeguards promote the safety of swimmers and etc. Therefore, individuals, groups or communities that receive some benefit from the public sector, are partly dependent on motivated employees, on how effectively and qualitatively they perform their duties.

The general theme of motivation was analyzed by various scientists and practitioners. As Palidaukaitė (2007a) notes, this problem was treated by such theorists of management like Taylor, Maslow, Herzberg, Adams and et al. In different countries many investigations, by which there were formulated the fundamental motivation theories, were carried out in the private sector, while the subject of public service motivation was initiated to analyze relatively later.

The interest in PSM continues to grow in Lithuania. The increasing number of Lithuanian scientific publications, which were written by Palidaukaitė (2007, 2008), Marcinkevičiūtė (2005, 2006) and others, and carried out studies of motivation of civil servants reveal this fact. However, there is not plenty of Lithuanian scientific literature that analyzes the theme of PSM. Moreover, the analysis of foreign authors' scientific papers reveals that the question of Lithuanian PSM does not fall into field of their research in the meantime. Vandenabeele, Hondeghem (2005) in their study *Values and motivation in public administration: public service motivations in an international comparative perspective* compare the US, France and the Netherlands by dimensions of PSM distinguished according to Perry (1990; 1996). Norris (2004) in the article *Still a public service ethos? Work values, experience, and job satisfaction among government workers* analyzes various motivational values of public servants in various countries, but Lithuania is not included among them.

It is important to note that idealistic and altruistic motives of people are usually treated as the basis

of PSM in many scientific studies. However, in an opinion of the author of this paper, this statement is correct partly, especially when we are talking about less developed countries, where the lack of financial and/or material resources is felt. Therefore it is very important not only to analyze the concept of PSM, its genesis, but also to reveal what peculiarities are appropriated for public servants in Lithuania in comparison with other European countries in the paper.

*The subject* of the article is the public service motivation.

*The aim* of the article is to highlight the features of the motivation of public servants in Lithuania.

In order to achieve this aim, the following *objectives* are set: to reveal the importance of PSM; to review its development; to highlight the concept PSM and the discover features of Lithuanian PSM in comparison with other European countries.

*The methods* of analysis of scientific literature, secondary statistic and comparative analysis, data descriptive and generalization are used in this research.

### **The importance of PSM**

With reference to Paliduskaitė (2007a), in order to reform and improve state's management, to enhance the accountability and responsibility of government, the public sector institutions began to pay more attention to motivation of public servants, to quality of their performance, to improvement of efficiency and promotion of employee work's satisfaction. According to Grant (2008), many existing models of motivation of public servants are focused on individualistic, instrumental goals and incentives and they capture the importance of the prosocial purpose of public service. Therefore, motivation is important not only with a view to satisfy needs and expectations of individual people who work in the public service, but also it helps to ensure the quality implementation of mission of public service.

Brewer (2002) supports this idea and argues that PSM is directly related to individuals' quality of work. According to Brewer (2002) and Kim (2006), motivated public servants are more committed to their work, they strive to attain goals and objectives as well as they can, to contribute to public welfare, to help each other and citizens, they voluntarily assume responsibility for their actions, participate in making a social policy, etc.

Brewer, Selden and Facer (2000) similarly claim that PSM is important not just to motivation, but also to productivity, accountability of public servants' activities. As Moynihan, Pandey (2007) note, PSM helps not only to understand the traditional differences between three sectors, but it is also useful in understanding public-regarding behaviour in organiza-

tions characterized by varying levels of publicness.

PSM is often analyzed from the perspective of intrinsic and extrinsic motives. According to Moynihan, Pandey (2007), Houston (2000) and Paliduskaitė (2008), while some empirical studies, investigated, for example, by Buchanan (1975), Gabris and Simo (1995), demonstrate that there is no difference between public and private organizations on extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, the other ones substantiate that ethic is more important for public sector employees than for those who work in private sector. Rainey (1982) ascertains that public and private managers showed differences in their perceptions of the importance of various types of rewards, for example, public managers regarded that work which is helpful to others is more important for public service than higher pay, status and prestige. Wittmer (1991) comes to similar conclusion in his study of reward preferences for three exiting sectors.

Wright, Pandey (2005) note that PSM can also guide management practice by supporting that the unique opportunities/rewards in public sector can compensate low (in comparison with private sector) extrinsic rewards. These authors also maintain that PSM suggests the job in public sector should be understood as fulfilling a calling/mission and not only doing a work. Consequently, motivation promotes the unselfish, ethical, moral behaviour of public servants, when the priorities are given not to the extrinsic rewards, but to the internal ones.

PSM therefore enables to focus on public interests in administrative work. Perry and Wise (1990) argue that individuals with a high sense of the public interest are more likely to select career in public service. According to Moynihan, Pandey (2007), some other authors also accept this fact, for example, Brewer, Selden (1998) note that individuals with a high sense of the public interest are more willing to protect the public interest; Crewson (1997) states that they exhibit higher levels of organizational commitment; meanwhile in the opinion of Naff, Crum (1999), they enjoy higher job satisfaction and are less likely to leave their jobs.

It can be argued that the importance of motivation is very high in public service. It affects not only the civil servants' activities, their needs, interests, job satisfaction, but also the welfare of all society.

While talking about PSM it is important to note that although the importance of PSM is obvious, there is no universal recipe how to motivate public servants, what means, tools, methods of motivation would be the most efficient. Moreover, there is still a lot of discussion about the concept of PSM. In the following two sections there will be analyzed the conception of motivation, its development in public sector and the concept of the PSM.

### **The development of PSM**

As Mann (2006) says, “motivation is at the core of the PSM construct”. Therefore it is very important to discuss the concept of motivation before analyzing the concept of the PSM.

It should be emphasized that motivation is a complex, volatile phenomenon that depends on the different individuals, environmental conditions, time, and organizational changes. Therefore, it is unequivocally impossible to answer how motivate employees. As Marcinkevičiūtė (2006) and Palidaukaitė (2007a) note, while there are created a lot of theories and concepts which clarify motivation, but there is no single, all-encompassing theory of motivation: each new approach only extends the understanding of motivation. This incites to look for solutions, to mobilize internal resources, to change traditional working and management method, etc.

Motivation is derived from the Latin word “movere”. According to Grant (2008), Mann (2006) and Palidaukaitė (2007a), motivation is an umbrella concept, which includes psychological processes, promotes open and vibrant, supporting actions. The basis of motivation is human needs. In order to achieve its goals each organization must ensure the satisfaction of needs of the workers, because it encourages people to work better.

There is no universal definition of motivation. Every author explains it by himself. According to Mann (2006), motivation is “a person’s desire to work hard and work well – to the arousal, direction, and persistence of effort in work settings”. Robins (2003) maintains that the concept of motivation closely relates with the term of need. According to the author, motivation is the desire to do something. Meanwhile, the dictionary of international words defines motivation as process of behaviour, action, activity promotion, which is created by various motives or whole of them (Vaitkevičiūtė, 2001).

In this case it is important to note that a motive is described in scientific literature as the reason for action, which is related to satisfaction of the objective needs. According to Vandenamee, Hondelghem (2005), motives can be understood as psychological deficiencies or needs. Meanwhile Stankevičienė, Lobanova (2006, p. 155) argue that motive is the reason for the action, arising from the person interaction with the object, which satisfies his needs, interests, values, objectives. Thus, a motive can be defined as a cause of human activities associated with the satisfaction of needs or expectations, while the motivation may be understood as a process that allows people to do what the manager or the organization want them to do.

When talking about PSM and its development in public sector, it can be observed that the first papers

on motivation in public sector, in comparison with similar studies in private sector, appeared half a century later. As Vandenamee (2005), Palidaukaitė (2007a) state, Weber (1947) was the first who indirectly mentioned some aspects of motivation in his study about bureaucracy. He singled out motivational aspects such as clearly defined scope of work (job content), the possibility of career according to the basis of professional achievements (knowledge, experience, and seniority), the fixed remuneration for the work, the rational management and etc.

Another author, Simon, in his study *Administrative behaviour* (1948) expanded the subject of motivation of public sector employees. Palidaukaitė (2007a) also points out that he identified incentives for ordinary workers (wages, status, relations with the working group, career opportunities, etc.) and incentives for the elite or the control groups (prestige, power). Simon related the seeking of some objectives to personal or organizational roles and argued that participation in decision-making process increases employee’s satisfaction with their activities and raises productivity.

According to Vandenamee (2005), Downs (1967) continued the development of the theme of motivation in public sector. He found that the desire to serve the public interest is a “goal or motive” of officials, whereas Mosher (1968) pointed out that “the nature of public service demands a unique sense of loyalty on the part of the public employees”.

The concept of PSM was subsequently developed by many other scientists. According to Houston (2000), Vandenamee (2005) and Palidaukaitė (2007a), such scientists as Buchanan (1975), Rainey (1982) explored this concept by looking for different reward preferences of public managers. Perry and Porter (1982) identified some typical factors of the motivational context of employees who worked in public sector, such as structures, rules and procedures which were determinate by external control institutions (remuneration, career, discipline), multiple, contradictory, abstract organizational goals and values and etc. PSM was finally conceptually and empirically developed by Perry and Wise (1990, 1996) in the last decade of the XX century. According to this there will be analyzed the concept of PSM in the next section.

### **The concept of PSM**

As mentioned above, the first who formulated the concept of PSM were Wise and Perry (1990). In their study *The motivational bases of public service* they have defined PSM as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry, Wise, 1990, p. 368). According to Perry, Wise (1990)

and Brewer (2002), three groups of motives comprise the basis of PSM:

1. *Instrumental or rational motives*. An individual believes that his or her personal interests coincide with the majority's. Such motives allow people to participate in political processes, they relate with special or personal interests, etc.
2. *Norm-based motives*. The desire to serve the public interest, loyalty to the government, patriotism, and duty.
3. *Affective motives*. These are grounded in human emotions, are characterized by a desire and willingness to help others.

PSM impacts public sector workers' activities in two ways: affects the decision to act in organization and the decision to act for organization. In the study *Measuring Public Service Motivation: an assessment of construct reliability and validity* Perry (1996) provides the polysemous dimensional scale of PSM, and in another study, *Antecedents of Public Service Motivation* (1997), confirms the reliability and the rationale of the scale. By using various surveys Perry (1996) also identifies four motives of public servants:

1. Attractiveness to policy and participation in it.
2. Commitment to public interest.
3. Compassion.
4. Self-sacrifice.

In the view of these motives, it can be noted that motivation of public servants prefers intrinsic remuneration rather than extrinsic. According to Paliduskaitė (2007a), intrinsic reward is associated with the satisfaction of the individual experience in performing the task (e.g., winning and the sense of value). Intrinsic remuneration, by contrast, is what is given to the individual by someone else (e.g., pay, promotion, job security, status and prestige).

In the case of PSM it is important to emphasize that many authors use Perry's concept of PSM, while others try to provide their own ones. For example, Vandebaele (2007) notes that PSM can be explained by integrating institutional and psychological theories. The author acknowledges institutional differences and defines an institution as "a formal or informal, structural, societal or political phenomenon that transcends the individual level, that is based on more or less common values, has a certain degree of stability and influences behaviour" (Vandebaele, 2007). This can be understood as recognition of institutional and individual public servants' values. The higher degree of organization's responsibility, the more individual public servants' values are consistent with the public sector values. This leads the greater motivation of public servants.

Meanwhile, Brewer and Selden (1998) define PSM as "the motivating force that makes individu-

als deliver significant public service". In contrast to Perry, they analyze different individual conceptions of PSM. Vandebaele, Hondeghem (2005), Vandebaele (2005) also signify that Brewer and Selden identify four different types of motivated individuals in public service:

1. *Samaritans* see themselves as guardians of the underprivileged.
2. *Communitarians* are stirred by sentiments of civic duty.
3. *Patriots* "put duty before self" in a sacrificing manner.
4. *Humanitarians* are driven by a sense of social justice.

As Brewer (2002) notes, some other authors, who analyze PSM, try to explain, how PSM is relevant to effective democratic governance. In this case Wise (1999) introduces six propositions:

1. The salience of PSM will vary over time.
2. PSM will be significantly related to organizational context and environmental factors that impact organizational performance.
3. PSM is positively related to quality and effectiveness of task performance.
4. A person with strong PSM will be more likely to forego short-term efficiency based performance rewards and invest time and resources into educating the public.
5. A person with strong PSM will be more likely to draw on personal values to resolve problems and issues in the performance of job tasks or efforts to achieve organizational goals and objectives.
6. A person with strong PSM will be more likely to engage in administrative tasks and to step outside the box to locate innovative solutions.

Meanwhile Rainey and Steinbauer (1999, p. 23) define PSM as a "general altruistic motivation to serve the interests of a community of people, a state, a nation or humanity". However, according to Vandebaele (2005), this definition is a general one and makes an explicit link with a political system.

The concept of PSM usually represents an individual's predisposition to realize altruistic or prosocial behaviours regardless of setting. Perry (2000) in his study *Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public Service Motivation* identifies many social institutions, such as church, school, and family, that signify the sociohistorical context of PSM. Other authors, e.g. Pandey, Wright, Moynihan (2007), note that public service organizations can foster PSM among employees through the communication of appropriate norms or rules. However, this approach raises the following issues: any individual regularly works in the environment, which inevitably affects his interests, attitudes, needs, and etc., and this influences his motivation in

turn. A public servant does not work in vacuum, he is not isolated from the outside world, therefore some changes, for example, in the state or the global economy, may force him to revisit the scale of his priorities, values, needs.

Pandey et. al. (2007) and Vandenabeele (2005) maintain that individuals are often motivated by collective goals, which do not necessarily serve self-interest or their ego-centric needs. Public sector's organizations may provide a more hospitable setting for the fulfilment of altruistic and pro-social motives. Thus, PSM can be explained as beliefs, values and attitudes that go beyond self-interest or organizational interest, concern the political system, and motivate targeted action.

It is important to note that there arise some difficulties when analyzing the concept of PSM. According to Camilleri (2007), there are fifteen PSM theories, supporting 32 conceptual variations. Such situation illustrates that PSM is a complex problem and there is no consensus in the formulation of an all embracing unified theoretical framework.

Mann (2006) also agrees with this attitude and notes that PSM, like motivation in general, is not directly observable and the results of various empirical researches are usually contradictory. The attitudes and intrinsic motivations are generally studied with help of questionnaires, but the data which are obtained in this way are inaccurate, based on quantitative data analysis only, and cannot fully disclose the essence of motivation. It is impossible to measure human needs, desires, satisfaction and etc. by using mathematical formulas and calculations. It can be argued that PSM is a constantly changing phenomenon, which reflects different forms of motivation in the various sectors and organizations, in other words, it is like response to the changing public attitudes to government service.

The creation of a universal concept of PSM is aggravated by interface between the PSM and the rational choice theory. According to Zey (1998), it is very difficult to fit PSM into the rational choice theories that have dominated public administration. The fundamental assumption of rational choice is that the basis of every social action is an order to achieve a specific goal and that the benefits and the costs of this action are calculated on a rational base. Dunleavy (1992) also states that there exists only one motive, i.e. utility maximisation, which is translated into budget maximisation or power maximisation in public administration. Therefore the concept of PSM cannot be entirely embedded in this kind of theory (research project).

Terminological differences also cause some difficulties in the analysis of the PSM concept. As Vandenabeele, Hondeghem (2005) maintain, some, often

non-American authors, do not use the term *public service motivation*, but choose other similar terms like *public service ethics* or *public service ethos*.

It is also important to mention that the content of concepts which are similar to PSM differs according to nation or region. Such both terminological and content differences complicate researches of PSM. In opinion of Vandenabeele, Hondeghem (2005), "the existence of similar but not identical concepts to explain disinterested public behaviour, varying from one institutional environment to another, makes it very difficult to conduct macro-level comparative studies. It would be as if we were comparing apples with oranges".

As Vandenabeele (2005) notes, an umbrella definition of PSM would solve these problems. It would integrate the different elements of various definitions, while at the same time incorporating elements that are provided in definitions of similar concepts by not only by American, but also by others authors. Nevertheless, the concept of PSM should cover not only PSM in the narrow sense, but also other types of value-laden determinants, such as ethics.

When analysing the concept of PSM, it would be possible to accept Perry's concept of PSM and to term it as universal, but it is probably suitable when motivation of public servants is analysed only in more developed countries. It can be assumed that some aspects of Perry's concept, such as intention to help other people or to do work that is useful for all society, can be valued controversially in less developed or transitional countries. The comparative analysis of PSM in Lithuania and in other European countries confirms this statement.

### **The features of Lithuanian public service motivation in comparison with other European countries**

According to the results of the survey made by Norris (2004), for persons who pretend to public service in Scandinavian (Denmark, Norway, Sweden) countries, the most important motives are job security, to do a useful job to society and a job that helps other people. Such factors as high income, an interesting job and good opportunities for promotion are less important. In this case similar situation is in Central and Eastern Europe (East Germany, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Bulgaria, and Russia) countries. But motive of high income is in the second place after job security in countries of Western Europe (West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, France, Cyprus, Portugal, Israel, and Switzerland). A useful job to society and a job that helps others people are very important for public servants in Western Europe countries too.

With reference to data of Lithuanian public servants' motivation survey, which was done by Paliduskaitė (2007b), the content of job, remuneration (including social guarantees), work conditions and, like in other European countries, job security are the most important motives that influence the choice of aspirants to public servants to work in public service. Like in other European countries, good opportunities for promotion are less important for Lithuanian public servants. Such motives as a wish to work for society or to help other people are not very significant for them. By contrast to other analyzed European nations, for aspirants to public servants job content and material motives are more important than job that is useful for society or helps other people. Considering this fact, an assumption can be made that inside motivation of people who pretend to Lithuanian public service is low and they lack moral values.

By according to results of surveys of Norris (2004) and Paliduskaitė (2007b), for public servants in the above-mentioned European countries high income, an interesting job and good opportunities are less important than a useful job to society, a job that helps other people or job security. Meanwhile, the main motives of Lithuanian public servants are the desire for improvement, interesting job, good relations with colleagues and managers, the importance of the job, working conditions and remuneration for the work. Compared with those in Scandinavia, Western Europe and Central and Eastern European countries, material motives and those related to organizational environment and content are more important to Lithuanian public servants than a useful job to society or a job that helps other people. This shows that Lithuanian public servants are more interested in their own welfare than in welfare of the whole society.

The results of Lithuanian public service motivation study also indicate that, similarly to the case in other countries, career opportunity for Lithuanian public servants is not the most important motive that propels them to work in the public service. It is also important to note that the most essential motives to stay in public service are better remuneration, social guarantees, career opportunities and opportunities for self-expression. In comparison with other above-mentioned countries, it can be made the assumption that such values like a wish to care about others, goodwill, compassion, self-sacrifice, and the objective to work for all society are less important than material remuneration for Lithuanian public servants.

In summary, it can be argued that, in comparison with other more advanced European countries, such motives as to do a work that is useful to society, to care of the welfare of others are less important to Lithuanian public servants than other motives. A

presumption can be made that such facts are partly contradictory to propositions about motives of public servants which were emphasized by Perry (1996). According to Paliduskaitė (2007a), transition countries have different values and motivation tendencies, which influence the culture of media and consumer society, and these tendencies likely impact the PSM and the motives of public servants.

In view of current economic situation in Lithuania a presumption can be made that material motives for aspirants to public servants or individuals who work as public servants are the most significant at the moment. On the other hand, is it possible to expect that idealistic motives can be the most important for people choosing the job in public service or working in it, if they have no possibilities to satisfy or can only partly satisfy their elementary needs? According to dominant public attitude that job in public service is more stable than in private one, we can suppose that motive of job security can be more significant than material motives in some cases. Therefore, it is hardly credible that altruistic motives will be the most important when choosing a job in public service or doing it. According to these presumptions it can be mentioned that regional differences should be taken into account and the influence of material motives cannot be excluded when creating the concept of public service motivation.

### Conclusions

1. The importance of motivation in the public service is undoubted. Motivation stimulates public servants, helps to satisfy their needs and expectations; it also ensures high-quality, productivity of all public service, enhances its image in the society. Motivated public servants are more likely to follow the ethical values, unselfish motives in their work, try to contribute to the creation of society's welfare, or not to satisfy only their own personal interests. However, the satisfaction of personal interests also motivates public sector workers. Therefore, public sector organizations should promote altruistic and socially-oriented activities of their employees.
2. The motivation of a public servant is volatile, mixed phenomenon that reflects the changing society's attitudes to public service. PSM expresses the value-oriented attitudes of public service, where the preferences are public interest, an internal or not external remuneration. However, in the light of each country, region, socio-economic, political context, the motives of public servants may be very different.
3. Despite the importance of motivation in public service and a great interest in it, there is no univer-

sal concept of PSM, there is not established how to evaluate the motivation and its influence on the activities of individuals or organizations, how to calculate the significance of various extrinsic and intrinsic motives. Many authors submit their concepts of PSM, but, in regard of the requirements for, the values, objectives of public servants, Perry's concept of PSM is considered to be one of the best, which mostly represents the essence of public service motivation.

4. Terminological, content, regional and other differences, constantly changing external environment, volatile attitudes and values of the public sector workers, and many other factors complicate the researches of PSM. It is therefore necessary to create a universal concept of the PSM, which would be equally applicable and understandable throughout the world.
5. Due to existent soviet mentality and the influence of consumer culture, candidates for the Lithuanian public service or individuals who work there are not motivated to work for the society's interests or to care about the welfare of others. In contrast to more developed European countries, the most important to Lithuanian public servants is to satisfy their self-expression, perfection, or material needs. It should be emphasized that the lack of available information about the studies of motivation in public service in various countries restricts the thorough comparative analysis. Moreover, there is very little statistical data on researches into motivation in public service in various countries. Therefore it is necessary to investigate PSM as extensively as possible in various countries, including representatives of all sets of society, and to pursue an intensive communication about PSM.

## References

1. Brewer, G. A. (2002). Public Service Motivation: Theory, Evidence, and Prospects for Research. [Accessed on 2008-03-13]. Available online at <[http://www.allacademic.com/one/apsa/apsa02/index.php?cmd=Download+Document&key=unpublished\\_manuscript&file\\_index=1&pop\\_up=true&no\\_click\\_key=true&attachment\\_style=attachment&PHPSESSID=332fcc9416037e8d61809e4e7c6318c1](http://www.allacademic.com/one/apsa/apsa02/index.php?cmd=Download+Document&key=unpublished_manuscript&file_index=1&pop_up=true&no_click_key=true&attachment_style=attachment&PHPSESSID=332fcc9416037e8d61809e4e7c6318c1)>.
2. Brewer, G. A., Selden, S. C., Facer II, R. (2000). Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 3 (60), 254–264.
3. Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel Review*, 3 (36), 356–377.
4. Čiupaila, R. (2007). Naujoji viešojo vadyba viešajame sektoriuje. [Accessed on 2007-11-12]. Available online at <[http://www.nvv.lt/files/konferencija2007/ciupaila\\_pranesimas\\_nvv.pdf](http://www.nvv.lt/files/konferencija2007/ciupaila_pranesimas_nvv.pdf)>.
5. Grant, A. M. (2008). Employees without a Cause: The Motivational Effects of Prosocial Impact in Public Service. *International Public Management Journal*, 1 (11), 48–66. <<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t737963440~db=all~tab=issueslist~branches=11-v11>>.
6. Houston, D. J. (2000). Public Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. [Accessed on 2008-03-13]. Available online at <<http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/cache/papers/cs/16463/http://zSzzSzweb.utk.edu/zSzz-dhoustonzSzarticleszSzmotivate.pdf/public-service-motivation-a.pdf>>.
7. Kim, S. (2006). Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea. *International Journal of Manpower*, 8 (27), 722–740.
8. Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. [Accessed on 2008-05-28]. Available online at <[http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/160542365\\_1.html](http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/160542365_1.html)>.
9. Marcinkevičiūtė, L. (2005). Savivaldybės darbuotojų motyvavimo teoriniai ir praktiniai aspektai. *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos*, 5, 239–247.
10. Marcinkevičiūtė, L. (2006). Darbuotojų darbo motyvavimo modeliai. *Tiltai*, 1 (34), 11–18.
11. Moynihan, D. P., Pandey, S. K. (2007). The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation.. *Bush School Working Paper # 505* [Accessed on 2007-05-24]. Available online at <[http://bush.tamu.edu/research/working\\_papers/dmoynihan/OrganizationalInstitutionsIVPARversionIII.pdf](http://bush.tamu.edu/research/working_papers/dmoynihan/OrganizationalInstitutionsIVPARversionIII.pdf)>.
12. Norris, P. (2004). Still a public service ethos? Work values, experience, and job satisfaction among government workers. [Accessed on 2007-05-24]. Available online at <<http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~pnorris/Acrobat/Public%20Service.pdf>>.
13. Paliduskaitė, J. (2007a). Motyvacijos unikalumas valstybės tarnyboje. *Viešojo politika ir administravimas*, 19, 33–45.
14. Paliduskaitė, J. (2007b). Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tyrimo ataskaita. Valstybės tarnybos departamentas prie Vidaus reikalų ministerijos.
15. Paliduskaitė, J. (2008). Valstybės tarnautojų motyvavimas: lyginamasis aspektas. *Viešojo politika ir administravimas*, 25, 7–18.
16. Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P. (2007). Public Service Motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Testing a Preliminary Model. *La Follette School Working Paper No. 2007-017*. [Accessed on 2007-05-24]. Available online at <<http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/publications/workingpapers/moynihan2007-017.pdf>>.
17. Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring Public Service Motivation: an Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1 (6), 5–22.
18. Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2 (7), 181–197.
19. Perry, J. L. (2000). Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2 (10), 471–488.
20. Perry, J. L., Wise, L. (1990). The Motivational Ba-

- ses of Public Service. *Public Administration Review*, 3 (50), 367–373.
21. Rainey, H. G., Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galopping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1 (9), 1–32.
  22. Research project: Towards a public administration theory of “Public Service Motivation”: does “Public” make a difference? [Accessed on 2008-03-13]. Available online at <<http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/eng/research/io-ehrm14.htm>>.
  23. Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizacinės elgsenos pagrindai*. Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika.
  24. Stankevičienė, A., Lobanova, L. (2006). *Personalo vadyba organizacijoje*. Vilnius: Technika.
  25. Vaitkevičiūtė, V. (2001). *Tarptautinių žodžių žodynas*. Vilnius: Žodynas.
  26. Vandenaabeele, W. (2005). Government calling: Public Service Motivation as a decisive factor for government employment [Accessed on 2008-03-13]. Available online at <<http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/egpa/HRM/bern/Vandenabeele.PDF>>.
  27. Vandenaabeele, W. (2007). Leadership Promotion of Public Values: Public Service Motivation as a Leadership Strategy in the Public Sector [Accessed on 2008-05-07]. Available online at <<http://www.ipa.udel.edu/3tad/papers/workshop4/Vandenabeele.pdf>>.
  28. Vandenaabeele, W., Hondeghem, A. (2005). Values and motivation in public administration: Public Service Motivation in an international comparative perspective [Accessed on 2008-08-12]. Available online at <[http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/ethics/paper/Paper%20WS2\\_pdf/Vandenabeele&Hondeghem.pdf](http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/ethics/paper/Paper%20WS2_pdf/Vandenabeele&Hondeghem.pdf)>.
  29. Wright, B. E., Pandey, S. K. (2005). Exploring the Nomological Map of the Public Service Motivation Concept [Accessed on 2008-05-07]. Available online at <<http://pmanet.org/conferences/USC2005/USC2005papers/pmra.wright.pandey.2005.pdf>>.

A. Vaisvalavičiūtė

## Valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos bruožai: teorinė ir praktinė dimensija

Santrauka

Viešojo sektoriaus modernizavimas iškėlė daug naujų iššūkių valstybės tarnybai. Nuo jos veiklos kokybės ir profesionalumo ėmė labai priklausyti valstybės įvaizdis, visuomenės pasitikėjimas valdžia, finansinių išteklių paskirstymo veiksmingumas, ekonominės, socialinės plėtros galimybės. Todėl viešojo sektoriaus institucijos vis daugiau dėmesio ėmė skirti žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymo sistemai, ypač valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijai, jų veiklos kokybės, efektyvumo gerinimui, darbuotojų pasitenkinimo atliekamu darbu skatinimui

Lietuvoje susidomėjimas valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tema taip pat didėja. Tai atskleidžia vis didėjantis lietuviškų mokslinių publikacijų skaičius, pvz., šią temą savo darbuose nagrinėja Palidauskaitė (2007, 2008), Marcinkevičiūtė (2005, 2006) ir kt., ir atliekami valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tyrimai. Vis dėlto reikia pastebėti, kad lietuviškos mokslinės literatūros, kurioje analizuojama valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tema, nėra gausu. Autorės atlikta užsienio autorių mokslinės literatūros analizė taip pat atskleidžia, kad kol kas Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos klausimas nepatenka į jų tyrinėjimų lauką. Todėl straipsnyje siekiama ne tik atskleisti valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos svarbą, apžvelgti jos ištakas, išryškinti valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepciją, bet ir, lyginant su kitomis Europos šalimis, atskleisti Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos bruožus.

Motyvacijos svarba valstybės tarnyboje yra neiginčijama. Ji ne tik padeda patenkinti valstybės tarnautojų poreikius ir lūkesčius, bet ir užtikrina kokybišką, produktyvią visos valstybės tarnybos veiklą, gerina jos įvaizdį visuomenėje. Motyvuoti valstybės tarnautojai yra labiau atsidadę savo darbui, siekia kuo geriau įvykdyti numatytus tikslus ir uždavinius, prisidėti prie visuomenės gerovės kūrimo, geranoriškai padeda vieni kitiems ir piliečiams, savanoriškai pri-

siima atsakomybę už savo veiksmus, dalyvauja socialinės politikos kūrime ir pan. Kuo didesnė valstybės tarnautojo motyvacija, tuo labiau jis nori dirbti viešajame sektoriuje, dalyvauti savo organizacijos veikloje. Tačiau kaip motyvuoti valstybės tarnautojus, kokie būdai, priemonės, metodai yra patys efektyviausi – vieningos sistemos iki šiol nėra. Juo labiau, kad vis dar diskutuojama dėl pačios valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepcijos.

Motyvacijai paaiškinti sukurta daug teorijų ir koncepcijų, tačiau iki šiol nėra vienos, visa apimančios motyvacijos teorijos: kiekvienas naujas požiūris tik praplečia motyvacijos supratimą. Įvairūs autoriai skirtingai apibrėžia motyvacijos sąvoką. Robins (2003) motyvacijos sąvoką glaudžiai sieja su poreikio terminu. Tačiau *Tarptautinių žodžių žodyne* „motyvacija“ apibrėžiama kaip elgsenos skatinimo procesas, kurį sukelia įvairūs motyvai (Vaitkevičiūtė, 2001). Pastarieji suprantami kaip tam tikros veiklos priežastys, susijusios su objektyvių poreikių patenkinimu.

Pirmieji darbai apie motyvaciją viešajame sektoriuje, lyginant su analogiškais tyrimais privačiame sektoriuje, pasirodė apie pusę šimtmečio vėliau. Apie kai kuriuos motyvacijos aspektus savo studijoje apie biurokratiją užsiminė Weber (1947). Simon (1948) praplėtė viešojo sektoriaus darbuotojų motyvacijos temą, išskirdamas eilinių darbuotojų ir elito paskatas. Viešojo pasirinkimo teorijos atstovas Downs (1967 m.) pastebėjo, kad valstybės tarnautojų elgseną veikia ne tik viešas interesas, bet ir privatus motyvai. Tuo tarpu Mosher (1968) nustatė, kad valstybės tarnautojams svarbus tam tikras lojalumo jausmas. Tačiau tik praėjusio amžiaus paskutiniajame dešimtmetyje Perry ir Wise (1990, 1996) suformulavo teoriškai ir empiriškai pagrįstą valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepciją. Perry (1996) išskyrė keturis viešojo sektoriaus tarnautojų motyvus, tokius kaip patrauklumas politikai ir dalyvavimui

joje, įsipareigojimas viešiesiems interesams, užuojauta ir pasiaukojimas. Atsižvelgiant į šiuos motyvus, valstybės tarnautojų motyvaciją galima traktuoti kaip teikiančią pirmenybę vidiniams, o ne išoriniams atlygiams. Kitaip tariant, pasitenkinimas atliekamu darbu, savo vertės suvokimas valstybės tarnautojams yra svarbesni nei iš išorės gaunamos paskatos, tokios kaip darbo užmokestis, statusas, karjera, darbo saugumas, socialinė garantijos, prestižas ir pan.

Valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepcija dažniausia siekiama reprezentuoti individo polinkį realizuoti savo altruistinius poreikius, nepaisant aplinkos. Vis dėlto iki šiol nėra sukurtos universalios valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepcijos. Todėl, atsižvelgiant į valstybės tarnautojams ir apskritai visai valstybės tarnybai keliamus reikalavimus, vertybines nuostatas ir tikslus, iki šiol pačia priimtinausia ir labiausiai atspindinčia valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos esmę laikoma Perry (1990) pateikta valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepcija. Remiantis ja, valstybės tarnautojų motyvacija yra individo polinkis reaguoti „į išskirtinius ir unikalius motyvus, kylančius viešosiose institucijose bei organizacijose“ (Perry, 1990).

Terminologiniai, turinio, regioniniai ir kiti skirtumai, nuolat besikeičianti išorinė aplinka, permainingos pačių viešojo sektoriaus darbuotojų nuostatos, požiūriai bei vertybės ir daugelis kitų veiksnių labai apsunkina valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tyrimus. Valstybės tarnautojų požiūriai, vidiniai ar išoriniai motyvai dažnai analizuojami pasitelkiant kiekybinio tyrimo metodus, tačiau taip gauti duomenys yra netikslūs ir negali iki galo atskleisti motyvacijos esmės. Todėl būtina sukurti universalią valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepciją, kuri būtų vieningai taikoma ir vienodai suprantama visame pasaulyje.

Nors daugelis autorių pritaria Perry (1990) suformuluotai valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepcijai ir siūlo ją laikyti universalia, tačiau galima pastebėti, kad tai greičiausiai tinka tik analizuojant valstybės tarnautojų motyvaciją išsivysčiusiose šalyse. Tačiau mažiau išsivysčiusiose, pereinamojo laikotarpio posovietinėse valstybėse kai kurie Perry išskirti valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos aspektai

gali būti vertinami prieštaringai. Tai patvirtina ir autorės atlikta lyginamoji analizė.

Išanalizavus Norris (2004) ir Palidaskaitės (2007b) atliktų valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos tyrimų duomenis, paaiškėjo, kad svarbiausi Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojų motyvai, tiek renkantis darbą valstybės tarnyboje, tiek jau joje dirbant, skiriasi, lyginant su Skandinavijos (Danija, Norvegija, Švedija), Centrinės ir Rytų Europos (Rytų Vokietija, Vengrija, Čekija, Slovėnija, Lenkija, Bulgarija, Rusija) ir Vakarų Europos (Vakarų Vokietija, Italija, Nyderlandai, Ispanija, Prancūzija, Kipras, Portugalija ir Šveicarija) šalimis. Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojams, priešingai nei kitų Europos šalių valstybės tarnautojams, materialiniai ir su darbo turiniu bei organizacine aplinka susiję motyvai yra svarbesni nei visuomenei naudingas darbas ar pagalba kitiems žmonėms. Panašiai kaip ir kitose analizuotose šalyse, karjeros galimybė Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojams nėra pats svarbiausias motyvas, skatinantis dirbti valstybės tarnyboje. Tai liudija, kad Lietuvos valstybės tarnautojai yra labiau suinteresuoti savo nei visos visuomenės gerove. Galima daryti prielaidą, kad tai iš dalies prieštarauja Perry (1996) akcentuotiems darbo valstybės tarnyboje motyvams. Greičiausiai tai sąlygoja išlikęs sovietinis mąstymas, vartotojiškos ir masinės kultūros įtaka ir kiti posovietinėms valstybėms būdingi bruožai.

Atsižvelgiant į susiklosčiusią Lietuvos ekonominę situaciją, galima daryti prielaidą, kad šiuo metu materialiniai ir darbo saugumo motyvai tiek renkantis darbą valstybės tarnyboje, tiek joje jau dirbantiems asmenims yra patys reikšmingiausi. Kita vertus, ar galima tikėtis, kad žmonės negalėdami ar tik iš dalies gebėdami patenkinti savo pirminius poreikius, darbą valstybės tarnyboje rinksis ir joje dirbs vedini idealistinių paskatų. Remiantis šiomis prielaidomis, galima teigti, kad kuriant valstybės tarnautojų motyvacijos koncepciją, vertėtų atsižvelgti ir į regioninius šalių skirtumus, neatmetant ir materialinių motyvų svarbos.

**Pagrindiniai žodžiai:** motyvai, motyvacija, vieša paslauga, vieša paslaugos motyvacija.