

Public Service Motivation and Sectoral Employment in Russia: New Perspectives on the Attraction vs. Socialization Debate

Online Appendix

J. Gans-Morse¹, A. Kalgin², A. Klimenko², D. Vorobyev³, and A. Yakovlev²

¹*Northwestern University*

²*Higher School of Economics*

³*Ural Federal University; CERGE-EI; and PRIGO University*

Contents

A Public Service Motivation Index	1
B Confirmatory Factor Analysis	2
C Robustness to Potential Attrition Bias	4

A Public Service Motivation Index

PSM index based on Kim et al., “Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23, no. 1 (2012)

Please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (1 to 5 scale, where 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree”)

- APS1: I admire people who initiate or are involved in activities to aid my community
- APS2: It is important to contribute to activities that tackle social problems
- APS3: Meaningful public service is very important to me
- APS4: It is important for me to contribute to the common good
- CPV1: I think equal opportunities for citizens are very important
- CPV2: It is important that citizens can rely on the continuous provision of public services
- CPV3: It is fundamental that the interests of future generations are taken into account when developing public policies
- CPV4: To act ethically is essential for public servants
- COM1: I feel sympathetic to the plight of the underprivileged
- COM2: I empathize with other people who face difficulties
- COM3: I get very upset when I see other people being treated unfairly
- COM4: Considering the welfare of others is very important
- SS1: I am prepared to make sacrifices for the good of society
- SS2: I believe in putting civic duty before self
- SS3: I am willing to risk personal loss to help society
- SS4: I would agree to a good plan to make a better life for the poor, even if it costs me money

Пожалуйста, укажите, в какой мере вы согласны или не согласны со следующими высказываниями

- APS1: Я восхищаюсь людьми, которые инициируют мероприятия или участвуют в мероприятиях, направленных на улучшение жизни в нашем обществе или районе
- APS2: Участие в деятельности, направленной на решение социальных проблем, – важное дело
- APS3: Служение обществу наполняет работу смыслом, это важно для меня
- APS4: Мне важно вносить вклад в общее благо
- CPV1: Считаю, что равенство возможностей для граждан – очень важное дело
- CPV2: Важно, что граждане могут рассчитывать на непрерывное предоставление социальных услуг
- CPV3: Формируя социальную политику, очень важно учитывать интересы будущих поколений
- CPV4: Этичное поведение – основа основ для государственного чиновника
- COM1: Я сочувствую тем, кто живёт в плохих условиях
- COM2: Я сопереживаю людям, попавшим в трудное положение
- COM3: Я очень огорчаюсь, когда вижу, что с людьми поступают несправедливо
- COM4: Очень важно думать о благополучии других людей
- SS1: Я готов приносить жертвы на благо общества
- SS2: Я считаю, что служение обществу превышает заботы о себе
- SS3: Я готов рискнуть своим благосостоянием, чтобы помочь обществу
- SS4: Я приму хороший план улучшения жизни бедным людям, даже если мне придётся потратить свои деньги

B Confirmatory Factor Analysis

This section employs confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to examine the fit of the four-dimensional Kim et al. (2013) PSM index to the data at each site. Given that tests based on the chi-square statistic are largely uninformative for large sample sizes, we follow Kim et al. and focus on the comparative fit index (CFI) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). As can be seen in Table B.1, the data are a reasonably good fit. At both sites – and at the Moscow site for the full sample, the subsample of panel participants, and the second wave measurement of PSM in 2019 – RMSEA is below the frequently used threshold of 0.08 and CFI is above 0.90 with the exception of the 2019 Moscow data. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), a CFI above 0.95 is preferable, and, as discussed in the Measurement section of the article, fit can be further improved by removing the COM dimension of the index. CFA results for the three-factor model excluding COM are shown in Table B.2. The CFI is right around or above 0.95 at both sites and for all samples. In our main analyses presented in the article, we employ the full PSM scale, but we emphasize that all of our findings are robust – and qualitatively and quantitatively very similar – if we instead utilize the three-dimensional PSM model.

Table B.1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Four-Factor Model

	Moscow 2016 Full Sample N = 803	Moscow 2016 Panel Participants N = 387	Moscow 2019 N = 267	Regional N = 376
<i>Standardized Factor Loadings</i>				
APS 1	0.573	0.545	0.602	0.664
APS 2	0.597	0.635	0.415	0.682
APS 3	0.737	0.746	0.802	0.725
APS 4	0.782	0.812	0.689	0.765
CPV 1	0.473	0.457	0.426	0.626
CPV 2	0.586	0.637	0.477	0.652
CPV 3	0.434	0.453	0.362	0.622
CPV 4	0.569	0.534	0.465	0.507
COM 1	0.711	0.703	0.706	0.712
COM 2	0.716	0.733	0.704	0.743
COM 3	0.642	0.679	0.522	0.634
COM 4	0.664	0.700	0.586	0.695
SS 1	0.766	0.794	0.750	0.806
SS 2	0.693	0.686	0.713	0.713
SS 3	0.795	0.816	0.814	0.820
SS 4	0.650	0.647	0.604	0.674
$\chi^2(df = 98)$	387.6	269.8	236.6	280.5
CFI	0.929	0.918	0.879	0.921
RMSEA	0.061	0.067	0.073	0.070

Note: All χ^2 statistics significant at $p < 0.001$.

Table B.2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Three-Factor Model

(excluding COM dimension)

	Moscow 2016 Full Sample N = 803	Moscow 2016 Panel Participants N = 387	Moscow 2019 N = 267	Regional N = 376
APS 1	0.562	0.538	0.592	0.660
APS 2	0.589	0.628	0.407	0.672
APS 3	0.753	0.754	0.813	0.732
APS 4	0.781	0.815	0.690	0.771
CPV 1	0.478	0.474	0.457	0.625
CPV 2	0.572	0.604	0.411	0.649
CPV 3	0.436	0.463	0.381	0.630
CPV 4	0.577	0.546	0.469	0.503
SS 1	0.764	0.797	0.742	0.808
SS 2	0.699	0.690	0.720	0.723
SS 3	0.800	0.819	0.827	0.826
SS 4	0.639	0.633	0.585	0.653
$\chi^2(df = 51)$	203.9	123.5	101.6	116.0
CFI	0.945	0.948	0.935	0.960
RMSEA	0.061	0.061	0.061	0.058

Note: All χ^2 statistics significant at $p < 0.001$.

C Robustness to Potential Attrition Bias

A potential concern is that rates of participation in the later survey waves differ across high and low-PSM individuals and that such differential attrition could lead to biased estimates. Note, however, that the very similar findings in Table 2 of the main article text when using the full sample and the sample of panel participants should in part mitigate these concerns. To further address potential concerns related to attrition bias, this section employs inverse probability weighting. In column 3 of Table C.1, we reproduce the analysis from column 7 of Table 2 in the main article text. In column 4 of Table C.1, we then show results when reweighting the regression analyses to account for the probability that a respondent from the initial study remained in the study for later survey waves. (Columns 1 and 2 in Table C.1 perform the same exercise for bivariate regressions.) The nearly identical results indicate that the attrition process is not driving our results. In other words, if the full sample that participated in the first wave of the study participated in follow up waves, our results would likely be very similar. Likewise, we show similar results in column 7 of Table C.1, which reproduces the analysis from column 1 of Table 5 in the main article text, and the inverse probability weighted results in column 8 of Table C.1.

Table C.1: Regressions Using Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW)

Dependent Variable	<i>Public Sector Employment</i>				<i>PSM 2019</i>			
	LPM (1)	IPW (2)	LPM (3)	IPW (4)	OLS (5)	IPW (6)	OLS (7)	IPW (8)
PSM	0.062 [†] (0.034)	0.064* (0.028)	0.047 (0.035)	0.041 (0.030)				
Public Sector Employment					0.219** (0.081)	0.222** (0.083)	0.219* (0.091)	0.206* (0.089)
Male			0.041 (0.045)	0.029 (0.042)			-0.097 (0.072)	-0.092 (0.075)
Risk Aversion			0.028 [†] (0.015)	0.026 [†] (0.015)			-0.035 (0.024)	-0.047 [†] (0.026)
Rel. in Public Sector			-0.017 (0.047)	-0.012 (0.042)			0.022 (0.080)	0.083 (0.095)
Religious			0.048 (0.040)	0.040 (0.037)			0.042 (0.069)	-0.017 (0.070)
GPA			0.010 (0.030)	0.014 (0.028)			0.021 (0.052)	0.050 (0.055)
Family Income			-0.011 (0.011)	-0.011 (0.011)			0.023 (0.022)	0.038 [†] (0.022)
<i>Department relative to Public Admin.</i>								
Business			-0.222*** (0.061)	-0.227*** (0.057)			-0.004 (0.100)	0.006 (0.103)
Economics			-0.235*** (0.052)	-0.232*** (0.050)			-0.081 (0.113)	-0.171 (0.127)
Political Science			-0.186** (0.071)	-0.184* (0.072)			0.203* (0.095)	0.189 [†] (0.101)
Sociology			-0.192** (0.063)	-0.193** (0.063)			-0.047 (0.118)	-0.074 (0.131)
Communications			-0.250*** (0.064)	-0.251*** (0.060)			1.011*** (0.201)	0.999*** (0.196)
Other			-0.210*** (0.060)	-0.204*** (0.059)			0.130 (0.094)	0.093 (0.096)
<i>Home region relative to Moscow</i>								
Regions			-0.057 (0.044)	-0.058 (0.042)			-0.020 (0.068)	-0.067 (0.070)
Foreign			-0.173* (0.073)	-0.173** (0.062)			0.207 [†] (0.118)	0.221 [†] (0.119)
Constant	-0.076 (0.123)	-0.097 (0.098)	-0.032 (0.216)	-0.005 (0.197)	3.754*** (0.035)	3.723*** (0.042)	3.678*** (0.259)	3.564*** (0.297)
Class Year FE	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes
Observations	337	332	332	332	223	221	221	221
R-squared	0.009	0.012	0.173	0.171	0.027	0.024	0.125	0.175

Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, [†] p<0.10. The *Public Sector Employment* dependent variable in column 1-4 is dichotomous and we accordingly use a linear probability model. Columns 5-8 show results from OLS regressions. IPW refers to Inverse Probability Weighting. Column 3 is the same as Column 7 of Table 2 in the main article text. Column 7 is the same as Column 1 in Table 5 of the main article text.

References

- Hu, L.-t. and Bentler, P. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: A multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1):1–55.
- Kim, S., Vandenberg, W., Wright, B., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R., Desmarais, C., Koumenta, M., Leisink, P., and Liu, B. (2013). Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(1):79–102.