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Abstract: The results of this study are part of the results of a dissertation study with the theme of the influence of the work environment and empowerment on public service motivation and employee work commitments within the scope of the Southeast Sulawesi Provincial Office, Indonesia. This study aims to explore the effect of public service motivation (hereinafter abbreviated as PSM) on the work commitment of civil servants. To determine the effect of PSM (Attraction to Public Service, commitment to public values, compassion, and self-sacrifice) on work commitments (work engagement and job involvement) the structural equation modeling (SEM) model is used. The results found that PSM has a positive and significant effect on work commitment. These findings also have important implications for the development of the PSM concept in relation to work commitments, especially in the public sector.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Historical experience on the performance of government organizations in Indonesia and in Southeast Sulawesi in particular, so far has not shown optimal results. Even the performance of government organizations is increasingly in the public spotlight. The community’s intense demands on government organizations to function ideally are one of the most prominent issues today. The ideal function referred to is how government organizations can efficiently and effectively provide and serve the interests of society adequately. The birth of the PSM concept in America is also inseparable from the crisis of public confidence in the performance of various government agencies from the mid-1960s to the late 1980s [Lipset and Schneider’s, 1987 in Perry and Wise, 1990]. At that time it was estimated that only about a quarter of the total number of government institutions were still considered “do what is right” [Perry & Wise, 1990]. Efforts to rebuild public service commitments at all levels of government organizations, the bureaucrats and academics began to pay attention to the issue of what values can stimulate and direct the behavior of employees in providing the best service to the community, as well as efforts to renew public service. One concept that is considered to be one of the answers to these problems is public service motivation (PSM). The concept of PSM must be part of the mechanism of government bureaucratic behavior in achieving the expected service performance [Perry and Wise, 1990]. Based on these thoughts, Perry and Wise [1990] -- came to be known as the first people to introduce the concept of public service motivation as a scientific study, starting to identify, clarify and evaluate research findings related to the specific formulation of the PSM concept. can apply to public organizations. As a result, Perry and Wise [1990] proposed three propositions for further testing as follows:

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

Even Perry and Wise [1990] indicated that PSM can influence organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and individual creativity in the public sector. With that proposition, Perry and Wise [1990] and Perry [1997] provide the following definition of PSM: “Public service motivation may be understood as an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations”. Therefore, PSM can be interpreted as a basic motive for someone to provide services to other people (the public) through public institutions (government organizations), so the concept of PSM views that someone who has a high PSM motive will tend to choose to work in government organizations. Even Perry’s first premise [2000] about PSM, that humans are not motivated solely by rational economic considerations (benefit-cost) or the principle of maximizing utility alone, but can be motivated by psychological social values that are in the social environment. This is consistent with the view of the flow of human behavior [human relations school], especially Elton Mayo [1945] in Katz and Rozensweig [1974:81], and Beer [2009:xiv]. Therefore, PSM is formed by rational, normative, and affective motives, so that this motive can be measured with four components, namely: [1] attraction to public-policy making, [2] compassion, [3] commitment to civic duty/public interest; and [4] self-sacrifice [Perry, 2000]. Attraction to public-policy making is based on rational motives; commitment to civic duty/public interest based on normative motives; and compassion based on affective motives [Perry, 2000]. The concept of commitment as a form of individual work attitude in organizations has become one of the important emphases in the thinking flow of human behavior [human relations school], especially Elton Mayo [Forness and Rocco, 2011; Beer, 2009:xiii-xiv; Rayney , 2009:34]. Mayo [1945] in Forness and Rocco [2011], argues that to increase employee productivity, it is far more important if the organization emphasizes efforts to
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increase commitment, morale, motivation, cooperation, and employee loyalty rather than sanctions (punishment). Even Blau and Boal [1987], Wiener and Vardi [1980] in Cohen [1999] state that commitment is an important predictor such as, turnover intentions, performance, job satisfaction, pro-social behavior, absentee level, and employee inaction in work (tardiness). According to Meyer et al. [1993] in Forness and Rocco [2011], that: “Commitment as the degree of pledging or binding of the individual to a set of behaviors and motivates one to act”. So commitment is dedication or a sense of emotional attachment that is manifested through one’s motivation and behavior to do something. The term “Something” in this context can refer to the organization, work unit, work team, or task/work. Furthermore, Greenberg and Baron [2000] defines that: “Employee commitment as an extent to which an employee identifies and is involved with his organization or is unwilling to leave it”. So the essence of commitment as a form of individual work attitude in the organization, can be characterized as: [1] seriousness in work, [2] loyalty, [3] self-motivation, [4] work involvement, and [5] psychological attachment or the emotional attachment a person has to a job, task, and/or organization in which he works. Referring to the commitment structure proposed by Carmeli et al. [2005] and Forness and Rocco [2011], the concept of commitment in the context of this study is individual commitment, which specifically focuses on the job/work commitment component. Rabinowitz and Hall [1977] in Forness and Rocco [2011], define job commitments (job/work commitment) as follows: “Job commitment is the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his/her work and the degree to which one work performance Aff one “self-esteem and self-image”. So job commitment can be interpreted as the degree of psychological attachment [feeling—emotional] of a person [employee] to the task/work, and feel that the effort to achieve the results or objectives of the task/job is something that is very meaningful for him. Work commitment is often interpreted as a combination of motivation and confidence to carry out work [Blanchard et al., 2001:24]. Motivation in this sense can be in the form of interest, enthusiasm, attention, effort, and various other expressions that reflect a strong desire to unite with the work or organization. Conclusion Pilbeam and Marjorie [2008:361] that employees who are committed to their work and organization, have characteristics, among others: [1] have a sense of ownership of their work, because he is aware that his work has important meaning both for himself and for his organization, [2] has a high level of involvement, both to his work and to the overall work in his organization, [3] has strong confidence in his ability to complete and be responsible for his work, and [4] has a level of absenteeism and missed work or late entry low deliberate work. Work commitment is also characterized by the amount of emotional attachment and dedication of a person to his task and to his organization known as work engagement [Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001 in van den Berg, 2011; Robinson et al., 2004 in Kullar et al., 2008; Thompson, 1998 in Gerald, 2011; Vance, 2006; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Xanthopoulou et al. 2009; Willey et al., 2010; Levy, 2010; Bakker et al., 2011, and Bakker, 2011]. Therefore, work commitment can be identified through: [1] the level of work involvement of a person towards a task/job [Ott, 1996: 277; Kanungo, 1982 in Price, 1997; Blau & Boal, 1987; Naquin & Holton III, 2002; Pilbeam & Marjorie, 2006], and [2] work engagement [Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001 in van den Berg, 2011; Robinson et al., 2004 in Kullar et al., 2008; Thompson, 1998 in Gerald, 2011; Vance, 2006; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Xanthopoulou et al. 2009; Willey et al., 2010; Levy, 2010; Bakker et al., 2011, and Bakker, 2011]. Work involvement is the degree of desire and effort of someone to work or complete a job [Robinson et al., 1989 in Price, 1997]. Someone who has a strong desire to work hard can be said that he has a high level of involvement in work. Blau [1985] in Blau and Boal [1987], states that: “Blow involvement is defined as the extent to which the individual identifies psychologically with his/her job”. From the various definitions available, it can be concluded that work involvement can be interpreted as the degree of attachment of an employee’s thoughts and feelings to an assignment/job, and views that work is the most important part of his life. Several studies have found that predictor variables are high and low levels of employee work engagement, including: transformational leadership [Ram and Prabakhar, 2010]; organizational justice [Saufi et al., 2013; Al-Abrow et al. [2013]; psychological empowerment [Saufi et al., 2013; Schaufeli and Baker, 2004]; and PSM (Burley, 2011). Work engagement can be interpreted simply as a degree of emotional attachment to one’s task and work unit. This can be manifested in the form of pride, satisfaction, and loyalty to the tasks and work units. Khan [1990], known as the first person to introduce the concept of engagement, states that someone who has a personal engagement can be characterized by the ability to regulate or direct themselves (self-regulation) and emotionally unite with the task/work and or work unit [Hughes et al., 2008]. Khan [1990] in Hughes et al. [2008] provides the following definition of engagement: “Personal involvement as the harnessing of organization members” selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. So personal engagement can be interpreted as the personality of someone who always focuses on the role of his task which is always manifested through physical outpouring, thoughts, and emotions (feelings) in order to produce performance in carrying out the task/job. Employee engagement is a manifestation of the enthusiasm, commitment, pride, and loyalty of an employee to their duties and organizations, as well as having the awareness and dedication to work wholeheartedly in order to achieve their personal goals and the organization in which they work. Schaufeli and Baker [2001] in van den Berg [2011], states that: “Work engagement as a positive state of ultimate satisfaction consists of three characteristics: vigor, dedication and absorption. Vigor is related to feeling strong and having energy to continue to work long; Dedication refers to a strong involvement to work. Absorption is related to being fully immersed in the job and forgetting everything else around”. Furthermore Wells and Concelman [2005] in Macey and Schneider [2008], stated that: “Management is an amalgamation of commitment, loyalty, productivity and ownership”. So work engagement can also be interpreted as an overall commitment, loyalty, productivity, and a sense of ownership of a person (employee) to the task/work. Work engagement in this perspective is not only limited to emotional attachment to tasks, but also involves one’s work effort in producing productivity. According to Macey and Schneider [2008], work engagement has many meanings, and sometimes connotes job involvement as conceived by Kanungo [1982], so both of these variables should be used together in an empirical research context."...... a particularly
noteworthy example of such an impression is job involvement [cf., Kanungo, 1982]. Thus, the lack of precision in the engagement concept does not imply that the concept lacks conceptual or practical utility. However, the concept would be more useful were it to be framed as a model that simultaneously embraces the psychological state and the behavior it implies” (Macey and Schneider, 2008). Macey and Schneider [2008] emphasize that employee engagement has four components, namely: [1] pride, [2] satisfaction, [3] advocacy, and [4] retention. The pride component is related to a person’s sense of pride in an organization and/or work unit. Satisfaction is related to one’s job satisfaction in carrying out tasks. Advocacy relates to the loyalty and/or attitude of one’s defense towards the organization or work unit. Retention is related to a person’s attachment not to leave the organization or their duties. The results of the review of Perry et al. [2010] research results from 1990-2010, conclude: [1] PSM correlates significantly with organizational commitment and lower turn-over [Crewson, 1997; Naft & Crum, 1999; Vandenabeele et al., 2009]; [2] PSM correlates significantly with job satisfaction [Rainey, 1982; Steijn 2008; Vandenabeele et al., 2009]; [3] PSM can be a determinant of individual performance, as well as an organizational strategy in recruiting, selecting, and developing human resources in organizations [Georgellis, Iossa & Tabvuma, 2008]; [4] PSM correlates significantly with individual productivity [Grant, 2007; 2008]; and [5] PSM is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness in the environment of government organizations [Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999; Brewer & Selden, 2000; Kim, 2005]. Ban and Vandenabeele [2009] who examined the effect of PSM on organizational behavior among EU Commission staff (6,950 people from 27 countries), concluded that PSM had a significant effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment (normative, continuance, and affective commitment), and PSM can become one of the assessment components in the recruitment and selection system of employees of public organizations at national, sub-national and international scale, including NGOs. Although there is no research that explicitly examines the effect of PSM on work commitment, but with the findings that states that PSM influences organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, and performance, it can be justified that PSM can influence work commitment (work involvement and work engagement) civil servants. Therefore the research question: does the Community Participation System have a significant effect on the work commitment of civil servants?

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

From the beginning until now, PSM has been assessed as having an effect on job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, as well as on employee performance in the public sector [Perry and Wise, 1990; Pandey et al., 2008; Petrovski, 2009; Ban and Vandenabeele, 2009; and Perry et al., 2010]. The results of Petrovski’s [2009] synthesis of 70 research results, concluded that PSM has a significant effect on individual performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB employees in the public sector. Burley [2011] found that PSM had a negative and significant effect on turnover intention among US Cyber Security employees. Morisson’s dissertation research [2012], found that PSM influences organizational commitment, and negatively influences turnover intention which is mediated by organizational commitment. Pandey et al. [2008] and [Ban and Vandenabeele [2009] found that PSM had a significant effect on the overall component of organizational commitment. Park et al. [2009], found that intrinsic motivation (as the basis of PSM) has a significant effect on job engagement. Similarly the findings of Galletta et al. [2011], that intrinsic motivation (as a basis for PSM) influences affective commitment. Furthermore, Aborisaide and Obioha [2009] found that work motivation (as one of the basic theories of PSM) correlated significantly with job commitment. The results of the exploration of the Institute of Public Administration [IPA, 2013] indicate that PSM influences employee engagement. Because PSM can be explained through work motivation theory in general [Wright, 2003, 2004; Perry, 2000], and PSM influences organizational commitment and employee performance, it is also expected that PSM can influence work commitment. In other words, the research findings can be justified in the research hypothesis, that:

Hypothesis 1: PSM has a significant effect on the work commitment of civil servants.

Fig.1. Hypothesized model of this study

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Population, Samples and Respondents

The study population was 2,282 people, namely all civil servants in 16 departments in Southeast Sulawesi Province, Indonesia with the criteria, they were: [1] civil servants; [2] has been a civil servant ≥ 3 years; [3] does not occupy a structural position, and [4] is not a former structural official in the current scope of service/work unit. A sample unit of 300 people was determined according to the Slovin formula.

3.2 Instruments and measurements

The method of data collection is by distributing questionnaires (self-report) to 300 people, but the number of questionnaires filled out and deemed suitable for processing is only 246 respondents, so the sample rate is 82%. The PSM variable as a latent variable is measured by 4 indicator variables adopted from Perry and Wise [1990; Pandey et al. [2008]; Ban and Vandenabeele [2009]; Park et al. [2009]; Perry et al. [2010]; Kim and Vandenabeele [2011] Variable indicators include: [1] attraction to public service (APS), (2) commitment to public values (CPV), [3] compassion (COM), and [4] self-sacrifice (SS) Overall PSM indicator variables are measured by 20 question items adopted from Kim et al. [2011] APS is measured by 5 items, for example: [1] I am interested in helping to improve public service; [2] I admire people who
initiate or are involved in activities to help my community. CPV is measured by 6 items, for example: [1] I think equal opportunities for citizens are very important, [2] It is important that citizens can rely on the continuous provision of public. COM services are measured by 5 items, for example: [1] I feel sympathetic to the plight of the underprivileged. SS is measured by 4 items, for example: [1] I am prepared to make sacrifices for the good of society, [2] I believe in putting civic duty before self. Work commitment as a latent variable is measured by two indicator variables adopted from Pilbeam and Marjorie [2006: 357]; Kanungo [1982] in Price [1997]; Naquin and Holton Ill [2002]; Xantopoulou et al. [2009]; Park et al. [2009]; Wiley et al. [2010]; Bakker et al. [2011], namely [1] job involvement, and [2] work engagement. Job involvement is measured by 6 question items that adopt the work involvement measurement from Kanungo [1982] in Price [1997], for example: [1] the most important things that happen in life involve work, [2] work is something people should get involved in most of the time. Work engagement was measured by 4 question items adopted from the measurement of Willey et al. [2011], known as the Kenexa Employee Engagement Index [EEI], for example: [1] I am proud to tell people I work for my organization, [2] overall, I am very satisfied with my organization as a place to work. The whole question item is measured using a Likert scale with five answer choices, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

3.3 Validity, Reliability, And Normality

By using the Pearson Product Moment statistical test, all measurement items meet the validity requirements, where the value of \( r > 0.30 \) [positive] and \( p < 0.05 \). Similarly, the reliability test results, obtained results that the entire measurement item has a reliability coefficient value greater than 0.70. Data normality test results using the Skewness test show that all variables meet the normality requirements at a significance level of 0.01. In this case the Mardia Multivariate Kurtosis coefficient value of 1,959 is still below the 2.58 limit value, so it can be said that the data used are normally distributed.

4. RESULTS ANALYSIS

4.1 Confirmatory Test

PSM (X) confirmatory test results using the CFA (confirmatory factor analysis) method manifested by APS (X₁), CPV (X₂), COM (X₃), and SS (X₄) as a whole produce a coefficient of loading factor (λ) which is significant at the signif. level of 0.05. With a \( \text{CMIN/DF} \) value of 1.638 less than 2.00, so it can be stated as a model that is in accordance with the data. The GFI value of 0.972 (> 0.90) also shows that the PSM can be manifested by the four indicator variables.

CFA test results for Work Commitment (Y) manifested by Work Engagement (Y₁), and job involvement (Y₂) variables overall produce a loading factor coefficient (λ) which is significant at the 4 0.05 significance level. With a \( \text{CMIN/DF} \) value of 1.889 which is smaller than 2.00, it can be stated as a model that is in accordance with the data. The GFI value of 0.972 (> 0.90) also shows that the work commitment factor can be manifested by the two indicator variables.

4.2 Description of Respondents

The sex of the respondents consisted of 173 people (70.33%) male, and 73 (29.67%) female. The average age ranges from 20% to 2013 to 50 years. Age 20-25 years as many as 33 people (13.42%), age 26-30 years as many as 57 people (23.17%), age 31-35 years as many as 76 people (30.89%), age 36-40 as many as 40 people (16.26%), age 41-45 were 31 people (12.60%), and age 46-50 years were 9 people (3.66%). The education level of the majority of undergraduate respondents (S1) is 131 people (53.25%). High school education (SMA) as many as 93 people (37.61%), Academy (diploma 3) as many as 17 people (6.91%), and Masters (S2) as many as 5 people (2.03%). The working period of respondents ≤ 4 years are 65 people (26.43%), 5-8 years are 103 people (41.87%), 9-12 are 19 people (7.72%), 13-16 years are 9 people (3.66%), 17-20 years were 31 people (12.60%), and ≥ 21 years were 19 people (7.72%).

4.3 Hypothesis Testing Results

To test the effect of PSM on work commitments the structural equation model (SEM) with AMOS 16.0 is used. The results of the model evaluation turned out to be able to meet all the criteria of Goodness of fit indices according to Hair et al. [2011], so that the structural model produced can be said to be a model that meets the criteria for goodness-of-fit models. With these results, statistically PSM has a positive and significant effect on work commitment at the significance level \( \alpha = 0.05 \), with a coefficient of influence of 0.85.
commitment. Therefore this research problem can be answered, and the hypothesis stating that PSM has a significant effect on employee work commitment can be accepted.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis results of the testing of the influence of PSM on work commitments, the following conclusions and recommendations can be made: First, the PSM has a positive and significant effect on the work commitments of front-liner employees. Therefore, efforts to increase work commitments among civil servants require serious efforts for every leader of a public organization to increase the motivation of public services among employees in carrying out their duties as public servants. Second, although the respondents of this study were limited to employees who did not occupy structural positions, this result can be justified that efforts to increase employee work commitments must be accompanied by an increase in public service motivation among officials. In other words, given that the Indonesian people, especially in Southeast Sulawesi tend to be still paternalistic, the initial step that must be taken is to increase the motivation of public services among officials and then be proved by the employees who are subordinates. Third, the problem of the still low performance of government organizations which has become one of the public's highlights so far has actually allegedly been located in the motivation of public services both among officials and among front-liner employees. But this matter still needs to be studied further. For this purpose it is recommended for further researchers to examine the PSM relationship on employee performance mediated by work commitments.
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