Matthew Walker

Best Dissertation Prize Winner

MSc Public Policy and Administration 2016-17

gov.msc@lse.ac.uk

Measuring Transforming Rehabilitation's Impact on Public Service Motivation

A dissertation submitted to the Department of Government, the London School of Economics and Political Science, in part completion of the requirements for the MSc in Public Policy and Administration.

August 2017

10,159 words

	TABLE OF CONTENTS
Page 2	Abstract
Page 3	1. Introduction
	A. Public Service Motivation: Determinants and Effects
	B. Context of Study: Transforming Rehabilitation
Page 12	2. Data Collection and Research Design
	A. Data Collection
	I. Characteristics of the Respondent Sample
	B. Measures used in Survey
	I. Public Service Motivation
	II. Value Congruence and Job Satisfaction
	III. Demographic Variables
	IV. Additional Measures
	C. Hypotheses
Page 21	3. Results
Page 29	4. Discussion and Limitations
	A. Discussion of Results
	B. Limitations
Page 39	5. Conclusion
Page 42	Bibliography
Page 48	Acknowledgements
Page 48	Appendix 1: Information on Postings of Survey
Page 48	Appendix 2: Sources of Items used in Survey
Page 50	Appendix 3: MLR Regression Models with Responses to Questions Outlined in Section 2.B.IV as the Dependent Variables

Abstract

This study seeks to evaluate two issues still undetermined by the public service motivation (PSM) -theory literature: (i) whether PSM may be vulnerable to reduction on account of adaptation to an incompatible working environment, and (ii) whether the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction may be mediated by the employee's level of value congruence with his/her employer. To evaluate these issues, a cross-sectional survey was conducted of English and Welsh probation workers (n = 517) following their recent division into newly-established public and private sector organisations under the Coalition Government's Transforming Rehabilitation reform agenda. Using multiple linear regression analysis, it is found that the New Public Management (NPM) -style reforms introduced have, to date, not resulted in disparate levels of PSM across the part-privatised probation service, indicating that PSM is not vulnerable to reduction on account of negative adaptation processes. Results also show that PSM is not significantly related to job satisfaction amongst the respondent sample, indicating that value congruence may usurp the importance of PSM in the determination of job satisfaction in a post-reform, politically charged working environment in which reform efforts have not been well received, as is the case in the current English and Welsh probation service.

1. Introduction

A. Public Service Motivation: Determinants and Effects

The publication of Perry and Wise's (1990) seminal work 'The Motivational Bases of Public Service' prompted great academic interest in the concept of public service motivation (hereafter, 'PSM') which has remained strong to this day, resulting in PSM becoming 'one of the core concepts of public administration and public management research' (Vandenabeele 2014, p.153). PSM describes 'the belief, values and attitudes that go beyond self-interest and organizational interest, that concern the interest of a larger political entity and that motivate individuals to act accordingly whenever appropriate' (Vandenabeele 2007, p.549). Studies into PSM concern the altruistic, pro-social motives agents may possess (Rainey 1993), which are grounded in values and beliefs that favour self-sacrifice in advance of the greater good (Kim and Vandenabeele 2010), and which duly influence the agent's behaviour (Wise 2000) in their professional (Cheng 2015) or civic (Houston 2006) capacity. Research into PSM has now been conducted in a vast array of geographical and organisational contexts (Perry and Vandenabeele 2015), with the majority of studies concerned with evaluating (and, ultimately, confirming) the two main tenets of PSM-theory: that, (i) public sector employees have greater levels of PSM than private sector employees (Steijn 2008; Taylor 2008; Vandenabeele 2008a), and that (ii) PSM is positively associated with desirable performance outcomes (Bellé 2013; Brewer and Selden 1998; Leisink and Steijn 2009).

The predominant explanation for tenet (i) (the prevalence of PSM in the public sector) is that high-PSM individuals have a better 'fit' – defined by Kristof-Brown et al. (2005, p.281) as 'the compatibility between an individual and work environment that occurs when characteristics are well matched' – with public sector organisations. This is due to the public sector's focus on equitably serving the public interest (Boyne 2002), in contrast with the

private sector's focus on maximising profit through 'effective production and low-cost operations which [do] not appear to correspond well with the altruistic foundation of PSM' (Kjeldsen and Jacobsen 2012, p.902). As a consequence of this greater level of 'fit', high-PSM individuals are, according to the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework (Schneider 1987) often used to explain tenet (i), more likely to approach a public organisation, get hired, and remain in the long-term (Schneider et al. 1995) as both the individual and his/her employer share congruence of values and mission. This explanation assumes that PSM is an antecedent of employee job decisions, such that individuals are drawn to the public sector on account of their high-PSM. Studies have been consistent in finding that PSM is already unequally distributed amongst students (i.e. pre-workforce entry) (Christensen and Wright 2011), that early childhood experiences are significant determinants of PSM (explaining the disparity of PSM levels amongst students) (Perry 1997), and that early PSM levels are a significant determinant of sectoral preference (Carpenter et al. 2012).

Some studies have investigated the possibility of a different explanation for tenet (i), namely, that the greater prevalence of PSM in the public sector may also be, partially, a consequence of employee job decisions (i.e. the result of socialisation and adaptation processes once in-role) (Wright 2007; Wright and Grant 2010; Perry and Hondeghen 2008). It is claimed that, by working in an environment that is focused on serving the public, with like-minded co-workers and an abundance of opportunities to act pro-socially, a public sector employee's PSM may increase with time beyond the level possessed on entry to the organisation. However, research concerned with evaluating whether PSM can be increased through socialisation and adaptation processes has produced mixed results. On the one hand, Ward (2013) found that PSM can be cultivated through participation in a programme that propagates civic-orientated behaviour (AmeriCorps), and that the effect of participation (in contrast with non-participation) on individuals' PSM remained significant seven years after

completion of the program. On the other hand, Oberfield (2014) found that the PSM levels of new recruits to the police force remained relatively unchanged throughout a two-year longitudinal study. Lee and Kim (2014) found evidence of organisational socialisation affecting PSM, but their findings are limited by a problematic research design: respondents were asked to recall their PSM levels at an earlier time and then score their PSM levels again at the time of the study in order to establish a temporal dimension, rendering responses unreliable on account of social desirability and choice-supportive biases (Baron 2007). Similarly, although Pedersen (2015) found that PSM can be situationally determined through the use of low-intensity external interventions (i.e. informing participants that their efforts would benefit citizens in need), it is unclear whether this result is indicative of PSM's long-term changeability, or simply its susceptibility to present differently in an artificial environment on account of a contextual manipulation.

However, very few studies have investigated the other side of this coin: whether PSM may be *vulnerable to diminution* on account of adaptation to a work environment that is *not* compatible with public service values. This study is prompted by the need to address this gap in the literature. The possibility that PSM may be susceptible to diminishment because of adaptation to an incompatible working environment is a pressing concern, given that (a) the New Public Management ('NPM') -style reforms of the UK public sector that have become particularly prevalent in the last decade as the state seeks to address its structural deficit (Taylor-Gooby 2012) utilise an array of incentives (i.e. Payment by Results, hereafter, 'PbR') and public management techniques (i.e. privatisation and introduction of competition to the market) that are thought to be incompatible with PSM (Weibel et al. 2009; Hedderman 2013; Burgess and Ratto 2003), and that (b) PSM is positively associated with desirable performance outcomes and therefore any reduction may imply a deterioration of service quality. The few empirical studies that have evaluated the possibility of PSM's vulnerability

to NPM-style reforms paint a mixed picture. Whereas Bellé and Ongaro (2014) found that two decades of aggressive NPM-style reforms in the Italian public sector had not equalised PSM levels across the private and public sectors, Hebson et al. (2003) found that the use of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the UK health and local authority sectors had led to a clear weakening of some key elements of the public sector ethos. In sum, the prospect that PSM may be vulnerable to reduction on account of adaptation to an incompatible working environment has not yet been conclusively determined. Accordingly, evaluating this prospect is a major focus of the present study.

The second focus of this study concerns a gap in the predominant explanation offered for tenet (ii): PSM's positive association with desirable performance outcomes. A variety of empirical studies have confirmed that PSM is positively related with employee performance (i.e. Frank and Lewis 2004; Andersen et al. 2014), organisational performance (Kim 2005; Brewer 2013), and organisational commitment (Crewson 1997; Pandey et al. 2008). These positive associations are predominantly explained as the consequence of PSM's positive relationship with job satisfaction (Homberg et al. 2015). According to this logic, high-PSM individuals enjoy a greater level of intrinsic reward than low-PSM individuals when given the opportunity to serve others, resulting in higher job satisfaction (Naff and Crum 1999; Pandey and Stazyk 2008). PSM is thought to increase job satisfaction because it 'provides a lens through which workers view their work and interpret their work experience' (Taylor and Westover 2011, p.734); a lens which colours public sector work as an opportunity to pursue the common good and which brings high-PSM individuals heightened satisfaction. In turn, higher job satisfaction is thought to bring about desirable performance outcomes (Taylor and Westover 2011). This explanation assumes that PSM has a direct influence on job satisfaction (Naff and Crum 1999; Rainey 1982).

However, this presumption of a direct relationship between PSM and job satisfaction is inconsistent with recent research on the 'dark side' of PSM (van Loon et al. 2015; Hartl 2016), according to which *frustrated* PSM can be *harmful* to employee welfare and job satisfaction. Just because public employment can provide opportunities to satisfy public service motives does not mean that every public organisation will provide these opportunities (Wright and Pandey 2008). Findings regarding the 'dark side' of PSM suggest that high-PSM individuals must be given meaningful opportunities to discharge their altruistic instincts for PSM to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Homberg et al. 2015), and that the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction is therefore mediated by an additional factor (Taylor 2013; Bakker 2015).

One promising candidate for the mediating factor, which has received some empirical support in the literature (i.e. Wright and Pandey 2008; Caillier 2015) is individual-organisation value congruence (hereafter, 'value congruence'): the extent to which an employee feels that his/her values are shared with, and reflected by, his/her employer. According to this view, high-PSM individuals are likely to be satisfied with their job so long as they believe that it serves the public and the values they feel are important (Vinzant 1998), but they are likely to feel frustrated and unsatisfied if they believe that their employer gets in the way of them making a positive impact (Taylor 2013). Differences of organisational mission, management practices, and client-facing orientation are all factors which may determine levels of value congruence (Moynihan and Pandey 2007). Accordingly, the second focus of this study is to evaluate the extent to which value congruence mediates the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction.

B. Context of Study: Transforming Rehabilitation

The present study is set in the context of the current English and Welsh probation service, following the recent implementation of a set of reforms outlined in the 2010-15 Coalition Government's 'Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform' (hereafter, 'TR'). Under the TR reform agenda which was enacted in 2014, the 35 public sector Probation Trusts that were previously responsible for providing all probation services in England and Wales were replaced by 21 newly established private-sector led 'Community Rehabilitation Companies' ('CRCs') and a new public sector National Probation Service ('NPS'). Ownership of the CRCs, which are now responsible for all medium-and low-risk probation cases (roughly 70% of the total caseload), was contracted out by the Ministry of Justice ('MoJ') to the private and voluntary sectors by way of a competitive bidding process undertaken from September 2013 to February 2014 (Strickland 2016). Ultimately, the 21 contracts were divided up between 8 winning bidders, with 20 of the contracts won by for-profit commercial enterprises (House of Commons ('HoC') 2016). The remaining probation service workload – namely, management of high-risk probation cases and the advising of courts on the sentencing of all offenders – remains in the public sector under the remit of the NPS. (National Audit Office ('NAO') 2016).

The stated aim of TR was to 'make progress in driving down reoffending rates', which had remained stubbornly high at around 27% (one-year proven reoffending rate for all offenders) since the early 2000's (MoJ 2012), by 'transform[ing] the way we rehabilitate offenders' (MoJ 2013, p.6). As events unfolded, what become clear was that the 'transformative' or 'revolutionary' aspect of the Coalition government's 'rehabilitation revolution' (HM Government 2010, p.23) would concern 'the process by which rehabilitation was to be organised, rather than any distinctive quality that the rehabilitation itself offered' (Squires 2016, p.286). In introducing the reforms, the government put great emphasis on how the they

would ‘reduce red tape and managerialism and focus agencies on reducing reoffending’ (Phillips 2014, p.32) by introducing ‘new payment incentives for market providers […] giving providers flexibility to do what works […], but only paying them in full for real reduction in reoffending’ (MoJ 2013, p.6). The Coalition government’s approach to tackling high reoffending rates was to introduce more market model solutions to the public sphere (Taylor-Gooby 2012), broadly in line with the central tenets of the NPM canon (Barzelay 2001): decentralisation of risk and reward, introduction of independent providers and competition, PbR contracts, and deregulation of service provision so that providers are offered the freedom to innovate in ways that, allegedly, ‘slow-moving state bureaucracies cannot’ (Whitehead 2015, p.290).

Aside from the politicians driving the reforms and the commercial interests that stood to gain from entering the market, ‘very few key players in the criminal justice system […] supported this privatisation’ (Burke and Collett 2016, p.121; Clare 2015). Opposition to TR was so strong amongst probation staff that Chris Grayling (the then-Secretary of State for Justice) resorted to issuing a ‘social media gag’, prohibiting probation officers from criticising TR or the Justice Secretary on social media (Travis 2013). Opponents of the reforms often criticised: (i) the complete lack of evidence ‘that anything [that is proposed] will work’ (Justice Committee 2014, p.11) – particularly the inclusion of PbR, which was viewed by some as unethical (Whitehead 2015) and liable to produce perverse incentives (Hedderman 2013; HoC 2016) – and the rapid advancement of the reforms without adequate testing (Annison et al. 2014); (ii) the poor track record of the likely victors of a competitive bidding process for such large contracts (Travis 2014; New Philanthropy Capital 2015); and (iii) the probability that stratifying the probation service along the boundaries of risk would result in a fragmented service (Robinson 2016; Dominey 2016; Evans 2016), with unequal standards of

training and service, and which would ultimately be harmful to probationers' chances of desistance (Kay 2016).

The question of the extent to which TR has been a success or failure remains an open matter as, ultimately, success will depend on the extent to which reoffending rates are reduced (HoC 2016), and the first set of official reoffending statistics are not expected until late 2017 (NAO 2016). However, what is clear is that the transition to the new institutional arrangements has not been smooth. A complete commentary on the issues that have arisen since June 2014 is beyond the scope of this study but, in brief, the reforms thus far have been seriously hampered by: poorly devised and incomplete contracts with the CRCs, resulting in them being insufficiently incentivised to provide some areas of service to an adequate standard (HM Inspectorate of Probation & HM Inspectorate of Prisons 2017); unexpectedly low volumes of medium-and low-risk cases (6-36% lower than expected) which has made business under the current contractual arrangements (already too stringent themselves as a result of the competitive bidding process) unsustainable for the CRCs (Justice Committee 2017a; Sturgess 2011); a lack of trust amongst sentencers in the CRCs to deliver community sentences, resulting in a diminishing use of community sentences (HM Inspectorate of Probation 2017); and a plethora of major I.T. issues across the NPS and CRCs (Justice Committee 2017a; Justice Committee 2017b).

On the 1st of June 2014, 54% of the 17,000-strong Probation Trust workforce were involuntarily transferred to the CRCs through a statutory Staff Transfer Scheme, with the remaining 46% transferred to the NPS (NAO 2014a). Staff were divided between the NPS and the CRCs on the basis of a snapshot assessment of their caseloads on a single day in November 2013 (Burke 2014); a process which 'caused much consternation, dissatisfaction and bewilderment among probation staff', and was seen as 'an extremely simplistic methodology, [that] did not properly acknowledge their probation experience, qualifications

and skill sets' (Kirton and Guillaume 2015, p.21). As a consequence of TR, over 9000 workers suddenly found themselves involuntarily 'sifted' off to the private sector, 'on a personal journey in a situation not of [their] choosing' (Robinson et al. 2016, p.173).

The probation service provision landscape post-TR offers a unique opportunity to investigate whether PSM is vulnerable to diminishment on account of sensitivity to an uncomplimentary working environment and the extent to which value-congruence mediates the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction. The reforms can be considered as an exogenous source of variation, dividing a workforce in a near-random allocation process into two groups that have since received different 'treatments'; with 'treatment' understood as the differences of organisational context employees have had to adjust to, as determined by the organisations' disparate cultures, values and pressures (Mullins 2010). Two implicit assumptions of this methodology, albeit ones which are supported by a great deal of research, are that the difference of ownership between the CRCs and the NPS (i.e. private vs. public) and the difference of payment mechanism (i.e. PbR vs no-PbR) are relevant factors in the determination of PSM (Bellé 2015), value congruence (Wright and Pandey 2008), and job satisfaction (Georgellis and Tabvuma 2010; Herzberg 1966). Arguably, on the 31st of May 2014, levels of PSM, value congruence, and job satisfaction would have been equally distributed across the two (yet to be formally split) groups. Over three years later, therefore, differences observed in these three variables amongst NPS and CRC staff can be attributed to differences in the organisational contexts they have had to adjust to.

2. Data Collection and Research Design

A. Data Collection

Evaluating CRCs and NPS employees' levels of PSM, value congruence and job satisfaction required the collection of a new dataset from a respondent sample consisting of current employees from both the NPS and the CRCs. Data was obtained by conducting an online, cross-sectional survey of current probation staff for six weeks between the 11th of June and the 24th of July 2017. Details of the measures used in the survey and this study's research design are more fully described in sections 2.B and 2.C. Various bodies assisted in the promotion and circulation of the survey amongst the probation workforce, including: Napo (formerly, the National Association of Probation Officers), UNISON (Police and Justice Service Group), the Probation Institute, the Criminal Justice Alliance, Clinks, Russell Webster, and the Probation Matters blog (see Appendix 1 for more information). Reviewing the responses for unintended respondents (i.e. retired probation staff and individuals not employed by the probation service), resulted in the removal of two responses, leaving a total of 517 complete responses (although only 482 of these responses included values for value congruence, and 398 of those 482 included values for job satisfaction, due to these variables' late inclusion). It is impossible to know the overall response rate due to the use of Twitter and blog-posts by some of the promoting actors and the absence of information on how many individuals viewed these posts; however, it is known that roughly 380 of the responses were the result of the two trade unions (Napo and UNISON) circulating the survey in separate emails to roughly 8,500 members collectively, suggesting a response rate of approximately 4.5% to those messages.

I. Characteristics of the Respondent Sample

Table 1 (below) shows the demographic make-up of the respondent sample. The respondent sample's demographic characteristics are similar in proportion to those found in Kirton and Guillaume's (2015) survey-sample of probation staff, and they also cohere with reports of the feminisation of the probation service (Mawby and Worrall 2011) and the low numbers of new recruits whilst the CRCs continue to pursue a programme of job-cuts (Justice Committee 2017a; Napo 2015).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the respondent sample (*n* = 517).

		Frequency	*%*			*Frequency*	*%*
Gender	Male	154	29.8		PSO	129	25.0
	Female	363	70.2		CA (Case Administrator)	25	4.8
Age	18-25	7	1.4		Admin	22	4.3
	26-35	66	12.8		Other	31	6.0
	36-45	139	26.9	*Region*	East Midlands	25	4.8
	46-55	174	33.7		East of England	38	7.4
	56+	131	25.3		London	56	10.8
Duration of Service	< 1 year	4	0.8		North East	64	12.4
	1-3 years	25	4.8		North West	55	10.6
	4-6 years	27	5.2		South East	71	13.7
	7-9 years	43	8.3		South West	71	13.7
	10-12 years	93	18.0		Wales	29	5.6
	> 12 years	325	62.9		West Midlands	69	13.4
Employed 1st June 2014?	No	22	4.3		Yorkshire and the Humber	39	7.5
	Yes	495	95.7	*Org. Preference*	CRC	34	6.6
Current Employer	CRC	231	44.68		NPS	263	50.9
	NPS	286	55.32		No preference/ Not consulted	198	38.3
Role	Manager or SPO	68	13.2		Not employed	22	4.3
	PO	242	46.8				

B. Measures used in Survey

I. Public Service Motivation

PSM is this study's main dependent variable. It is typically understood in the literature to be a multidimensional formative construct formed out of four-dimensions: attraction to public participation, commitment to public values, compassion, and self-sacrifice (Kim et al. 2013; Vandenabeele 2008b; Kim and Vandenabeele 2010). Although many previous studies have abandoned the four-dimensional conceptualisation of PSM in favour of a global measure (Alonso and Lewis 2001; Brewer and Selden 2000), a four-dimensional measure of PSM was preferred for this study due to its ability to provide a more nuanced understanding of the different origins and forms of PSM (Wright, Christensen, and Pandey 2013). Each dimension was measured using four five-point Likert-type scale items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), resulting in a four-dimensional 16-item measure of PSM, as advocated by Kim et al. (2013), with overall PSM measured as the average score of each dimension, and each dimension measured as the average score of its four items. Each of the survey items used to measure PSM were taken from previously validated and commonly used measures (see Appendix 2 for more information).

However, the four-dimensional construction of PSM was found to be untenable for this study due to a lack of internal consistency in the 'attraction to public participation' and 'commitment to public values' dimensions. When multiple items are used to measure the same thing, they must have internal consistency (demonstrated by the items having equal covariances) establishing that they are 'parallel' (Bland and Altman 1997). Cronbach's alpha ('α'), one of the most widely used measures of internal consistency in the social sciences (Bonett and Wright 2015), was used to measure the internal consistency of each dimension (results shown in Table 2). The standard convention within social science research is that an α-score is considered acceptable if it is above 0.65 (Vaske et al. 2007). The low α-score

observed for the first two dimensions is indicative that the items used to measure them were not successful in picking out a unique latent construct (i.e. the dimension). Numerous other studies have had similar issues with the attraction to public policy (Coursey and Pandey 2007; Ritz 2011) and commitment to public values (Leisink and Steijn 2009; Taylor 2007) dimensions of PSM.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Scores for PSM Dimensions (using standardized items)

	Average inter-item correlation	*α-score*
Attraction to Public Participation	0.0964	0.2992
Commitment to Public Values	0.1087	0.3279
Compassion	0.3549	0.6876
Self-Sacrifice	0.4087	0.7344
PSM (Four-Dimensional)	0.3577	0.6901
PSM (Global Measure)	0.1761	0.7738

Consequentially, it was decided that the four-dimensional construction of PSM should be abandoned in favour of a global construct measured as the average of the 16-items without their being divided into dimensions (α-score 0.77). It was felt that this was the best measure of PSM to proceed with, as: (i) the global measure still includes items that correlate to each of the four dimensions of PSM; (ii) there is precedent of using a global measure of PSM with a very similar number of items and α-score (i.e. Vandenabeele (2014), whose measure features 18 items with an α-score of 0.79); and (iii) research has shown (i.e. Wright, Christensen, and Pandey 2013) that different measures of PSM (multi-dimensional, global etc.) produce largely equivalent results.

II. Value Congruence and Job Satisfaction

Value congruence and job satisfaction are used as both dependent and independent variables in the models developed for this study. Job satisfaction was measured as a single item score ('all things considered, how satisfied are you with your current job on a scale of 1 to 10?') that was derived from the measure used in Dolbier et al. (2005). A single-item measurement of job satisfaction was felt to be adequate given Wanous et al.'s (1997) finding that single-item measures of job satisfaction produce identical findings to multi-item aggregates in virtually all situations. Value congruence was measured as the average score of two items derived from the measure used in Wright and Pandey (2008) (see Appendix 2).

III. Demographic Variables

As indicated by Table 1, data was collected on various demographic variables that have been investigated as potential antecedents of PSM (Camilleri 2007; DeHart-Davis et al. 2006): age, gender, region of employment, employer, role and duration of service. Data was also collected on whether respondents were employed at the time of the CRC-NPS split (1st of June 2014), and which organisation (if any) respondents expressed a formal preference for prior to the split. 59.7% of the respondent sample who were employed at the time of the organisational split report that their Trust managers had asked for their organisational preference, although allocation was still carried out on the basis of the MoJ guidelines against the snapshot caseload procedure (Burke 2014). Kirton and Guillaume (2015) report that very few employees (less than 15%) appealed their allocation decision, with fewer still succeeding, as the only ground for reversal was misapplication of the MoJ guidelines.

Responses to the survey question 'what is your position at work' were sorted into 6 categories for the variable 'role'. Listed in order of seniority (highest first), the 6 categories

are: Manager/Senior Probation Officer ('Manager/SPO'), Probation Officer ('PO'), Probation Service Officer ('PSO'), Case Administrator ('CA'), 'Other' (often Residential Assistants or Site Hosts, for example), and Administrator ('Admin'). The categories are identical to those used by Kirton and Guillaume (2015), with the addition of CA which is a job title that has recently been introduced. The roles of the respondent sample in the present study are similar in proportion to those of the respondent sample in Kirton and Guillaume (2015). To climb the organisational hierarchy from PSO- to PO-grade, officers are required to obtain an additional qualification (equivalent to NVQ level-5) and pass a tough training regime (National Careers Service 2017). Prior to TR, POs typically held responsibility for high-risk cases and court-related functions, whilst PSOs held responsibility for medium-and low-risk cases. CAs perform administrative support for POs and PSOs, and are more directly involved in criminal justice casework than standard administrators.

IV. Additional Measures

The survey also included a ranking exercise, in which respondents were asked to 'rank the following in order of their importance to your work': 'relationship with the probationer', 'public protection', 'inter-agency collaboration', and, 'updating computer systems with new information'. The intention of this question was to evaluate claims that, for example, NPS employees would be more focused on public protection than CRC employees due to the high-risk profile of their caseload (Kay 2016).

An additional series of questions (five-point Likert-type scales) was included to assess whether employees of the NPS or the CRCs have a higher propensity to: (i) engage in 'parking' and 'creaming' ('I am more likely to concentrate my efforts on a client with a smaller risk of reoffending than a larger risk of reoffending'); (ii) feel that 'the humanistic

underpinning of probation work has been lost as a result of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms'; (iii) agree that 'operational performance has improved since June 2014'; or, (iv) feel that 'being so bound up in bureaucracy makes it difficult for me to perform my job'.

C. Hypotheses

The main focus of the present study is to evaluate whether PSM is vulnerable to reduction due to sensitivity to an incompatible working environment. It is hypothesised that the CRCs' organisational context – in particular, being a for-profit commercial enterprise with a portion of its payment contingent on performance – is incompatible with public service values (Andersen et al. 2011; Boardman et al. 2010; Bullock et al. 2015), as it is expected that the CRCs' predominant focus will be on organisational well-being (i.e. financial success), with the rehabilitation of service users relegated to being merely a means to that end (Senior 2016). Accordingly, the first hypothesis is as follows:

> *Hypothesis 1: CRC employees' PSM levels will be lower than NPS employees' PSM levels.*

The present study is also concerned with evaluating whether value congruence mediates the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction. It is expected that CRC employees' levels of value congruence will be lower than their NPS counterparts. Previous research attests to the general sentiment amongst probation officers that 'being part of the public sector, and not being involved in the pursuit of profit, was at the heart of the value system that the probation service should have' (Deering and Feilzer 2017, p.166; Napo-UNISON 2014). Furthermore, given the purported mediating effect of value congruence on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction, it is also expected that CRC employees' levels of job satisfaction will be lower than their NPS counterparts. Kirton and Guillaume's (2015) survey of probation

workers shortly after the implementation of TR, in which it was found that those who were allocated to the NPS were considerably more likely to agree with their placement (87%) than those who were allocated to the CRCs (52%), provides some preliminary support in favour of both aforementioned expectations. In line with Wright and Pandey's (2008) thesis of the mediating role of value congruence on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction, it is also expected that PSM will have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction, but that the extent of this relationship's statistical significance will decrease once value congruence is controlled for. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are advanced:

> *Hypothesis 2: CRC employees' levels of value congruence will be lower than NPS employees'.*
>
> *Hypothesis 3: CRC employees' levels of job satisfaction will be lower than NPS employees'.*
>
> *Hypothesis 4: PSM will have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction, but the extent of this relationship's statistical significance will decrease once value congruence is controlled for.*

Hypotheses 1-3 concern *inter*-organisational differences of employees' characteristics resulting from TR. Additionally, it is important to bear in mind prior research which found that differences of role (Waring and Bishop 2011; Robinson et al. 2016) and tenure (Moynihan and Pandey 2007) may result in disparate reactions to reforms *within* an organisation (i.e. sources of *intra*-organisational difference). For example, members of senior management have often been found to be less ideologically opposed to NPM-style reforms than those further down the organisational hierarchy (Dias and Maynard-Moody 2007; Deering et al. 2014). Furthermore, differences of organisational tenure may correlate with different training processes undergone at the point of recruitment, causing generational

differences of values and practice-norms within an organisation (Mawby and Worrall 2014). Accordingly, the following two hypotheses are advanced:

Hypothesis 5: Job role will have a statistically significant relationship with employee levels of PSM, value-congruence, and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: Duration of service will have a statistically significant relationship with employee levels of PSM, value-congruence, and job satisfaction.

3. Results

Multiple linear regression (MLR) analysis, carried out on Stata 15.0, was used to evaluate the hypotheses against the collected data. The first set of models, shown in Table 3, analysed the relationship between PSM (dependent variable) and the various independent variables shown in Table 3's leftmost column. The β-coefficients shown in Tables 3, 5, and 6 should be interpreted as the expected change in the dependent variable correlated with a one-unit increase of the independent variable, holding all other variables constant.

Table 3*:* MLR models of PSM

	Model 1		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value
Age	0.023	0.260	0.020	0.396	0.021	0.367
Gender	0.010	0.813	0.038	0.439	0.039	0.425
Region	-0.010	0.198	-0.014	0.111	-0.013	0.133
Employer	-0.024	0.544	-0.025	0.595	-0.031	0.514
Role	**0.033***	0.020	**0.037***	0.023		
- *Manager/SPO*					**0.418****	0.001
- *PO*					**0.393*****	0.000
- *PSO*					**0.391*****	0.000
- *CA*					**0.361****	0.008
- *Other*					**0.322***	0.017
- *Admin*					[Baseline]	
Duration of Service	-0.012	0.326	-0.012	0.400	-0.011	0.426
Employed June 2014	0.010	0.919	0.004	0.975	-0.016	0.886
Value Congruence			-0.002	0.952	-0.004	0.891
Job Satisfaction			-0.004	0.708	-0.008	0.495
Constant	**3.81*****	0.000	**3.82*****	0.000	**3.67*****	0.000
No. of Observations	517		398		398	
R^2	0.0188		0.0307		0.0549	

** = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001.*

'Employer' is a binary categorical variable that could assume the value of either 'CRC' or 'NPS'. For the purposes of the regression analyses it was recoded as a dummy variable, with NPS assigned the value 1 and CRC assigned 0. Employer was not found to have a statistically significant relationship with PSM in any of Table 3's three models. This result suggests that Hypothesis 1 should be rejected. In Model 1, role, duration of service, age, gender, region, and whether the respondent was employed by the probation service on June 1st 2014 were used as independent variables; role was the only independent variable found to have a statistically significant relationship with PSM ($p < .05$). In Model 2, job satisfaction and value congruence were added to the analysis; neither were found to be significantly related to PSM, although role remained significant at the 5% level. In Model 3, role was treated as a factor variable so that each of its categories were treated as separate covariates. Model 3 shows that, compared to the administrative role, all other probation service roles are correlated with an expected increase of PSM (holding all other variables constant) and this finding is strongly statistically significant. Interestingly, the extent to which PSM is expected to increase is perfectly correlated with the ordering of the probation service professional hierarchy: the more senior the respondent, the greater the expected increase of PSM. This finding strongly supports Hypothesis 5's claim that job role will have a statistically significant relationship with PSM. The lack of a significant relationship between duration of service and PSM, on the other hand, suggests a rejection of Hypothesis 6's claimed relationship between duration of service and PSM. However, it should be noted that low R^2 values were observed across all three models (the highest observed R^2 (Model 3's) was only 0.0549), indicating that roughly 95% of the observed variation of PSM was left unexplained by the independent variables employed.

Models 1-3 show the non-significance of the relationship between employer and PSM, controlling for the models' other independent variables. This result is unsurprising when

considering the NPS' and CRCs' mean PSM, shown in Table 4 (below). Across 517 respondents, the mean PSM of the NPS (3.929) and the CRCs (3.949) are a mere 0.02 points apart on a scale of 1 to 5. The proximity of the two values is remarkable. This finding strongly supports an outright rejection of Hypothesis 1.

Table 4: Means of Main Variables of Interest and Test of Means, Sorted by Employer

	NPS	CRC	P >|t|
PSM	3.929	3.949	0.592
Value Congruence	2.734	2.395	**0.000*** **
Job Satisfaction	4.597	3.672	**0.000*** **
Rank: Relationship with Probationer	1.503	1.792	**0.000*** **
Rank: Public Protection	2.062	1.944	0.135
Rank: Inter-agency Collaboration	2.888	2.844	0.436
Rank: Updating Computer Systems	3.545	3.420	0.147
'I am more likely to concentrate my efforts on a client with a smaller risk of reoffending than a larger risk of reoffending.'	1.951	1.996	0.625
'The humanistic underpinning of probation work has been lost as a result of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms.'	4.413	4.420	0.930
'Operational performance has improved since June 2014.'	1.570	1.602	0.691
'Being so bound up in bureaucracy makes it difficult for me to perform my job.'	4.388	4.307	0.391

** $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.*

Table 4 also shows, sorted by employer, the mean values and *p*-values resulting from significance testing the difference of the two means for value congruence, job satisfaction, and the responses to the questions outlined in section 2.B.IV. As advanced in Hypotheses 2 and 3, Table 4 shows that CRC employees have, on average, lower levels of value congruence and job satisfaction, and that the difference between the CRCs' and the NPS' mean values is highly statistically significant ($p < 0.01$) in both cases. On average, NPS employees' level of value congruence is 0.339 points higher (scale of 1 to 5) than CRC employees', whilst their average reported level of job satisfaction is 0.925 points higher (scale of 1 to 10). Another interesting result shown in Table 4 is the statistically significant ($p < 0.1$) difference between NPS and CRC employees' average ranking of the importance of

the relationship with the probationer to their work. NPS employees were more likely than CRC employees to rank their relationship with the probationer as the most important element of their work (i.e. value of 1) out of the list of four; a surprising result when contrasted with Kay's (2016) claim that NPS employees are more concerned with public protection because of the high-risk profile of their caseload. Sorted by employer, no statistically significant differences of means were found regarding employees' responses to the four five-point Likert-type scale items discussed in section 2.B.IV. Regression analysis was carried out to evaluate the factors that did have a significant relationship with responses to these questions (there were some significant findings, as shown in Appendix 3), but, due to a lack of direct bearing on this study's main foci, these models are not discussed any further.

Although Table 4 presents evidence in favour of Hypotheses 2 and 3, regression analysis was necessary to rule out the possibility that the statistical significance of the difference between the NPS' and CRCs' value congruence and job satisfaction means may have been because of omitted variable bias (i.e. that the result is due to collinearity between employer and another variable) (Jöreskog 1993). Accordingly, separate MLR regression analysis with value congruence and job satisfaction as the dependent variables was carried out, the results of which are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

Model 4 (shown in Table 5) is an MLR regression model with value congruence as the dependent variable. In Model 4, employer was found to have a highly statistically significant ($p < .001$) relationship with value congruence, with employment in the NPS (compared to employment in the CRCs) correlated with an expected 0.364-point increase of value congruence (scale of 1 to 5), holding all other variables constant. This result is strongly supportive of Hypothesis 2. None of Model 4's other independent variables have a significant relationship with value congruence, including PSM. This is a surprising result given Wright

and Pandey's (2008) finding that PSM had a statistically significant ($p < .05$) relationship with value congruence in their dataset.

Table 5*:* MLR models of Value Congruence

	Model 4		**Model 5**	
	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value
Age	-0.074	0.100	-0.079	0.091
Gender	0.051	0.595	0.032	0.740
Region	0.014	0.388	0.016	0.330
Employer	**0.364*** **	0.000	0.143	0.291
PSM	0.001	0.994	0.005	0.961
Role				
- *Manager/SPO*	0.277	0.243	0.229	0.354
- *PO*	0.069	0.746	0.088	0.700
- *PSO*	0.084	0.702	0.081	0.726
- *CA*	0.029	0.916	0.016	0.955
- *Other*	0.004	0.987	0.074	0.788
- *Admin*	[Baseline]		[Baseline]	
Duration of Service	0.003	0.905	-0.002	0.949
Employed June 2014	-0.327	0.129	-0.080	0.832
E-P Match				
- *Yes: NPS*			**0.449***	0.014
- *Yes: CRC*			**0.459***	0.020
- *Not Consulted*			0.172	0.225
- *No Match*			[Baseline]	
Constant	**2.784*****	0.000	**2.420****	0.008
No. of Observations	482		467	
R^2	0.0617		0.0744	

** = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001.*

In Model 5, 'E-P Match' – a categorical variable recording whether respondents' current employer is matched with the allocation preference they communicated to their Trust manager(s) prior to the organisational split (if consulted) – was added. Interestingly, the addition of this variable reduced the statistical significance of the relationship between

employer and value congruence. This implies that the relationship between employer and value congruence is mediated by whether respondents were allocated to their preferred organisation. It also indicates that employees' views regarding the NPS' and CRCs' values have not changed much in the past three years. The non-significance of the relationships between value congruence and role or duration of service is partial evidence against Hypotheses 5 and 6 (i.e. the part of those hypotheses that concerns value congruence).

Models 6 and 7 (shown in table 6) are MLR regression models with job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Both models show that employer does not have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. This is the case even in Model 6, which does not control for value congruence. Therefore, although (as advanced by Hypothesis 3) CRC employees do have, on average, significantly lower levels of job satisfaction (shown in Table 4), this is not simply because of their allocated employer. Interestingly, Model 6 shows that manager and SPO-grade respondents are expected to have a significantly higher level of job satisfaction ($p < .05$) than respondents from other roles, holding all other variables constant (result supportive of Hypothesis 5). Model 6 also shows that a positive E-P match has a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction ($p < .05$) in the case of pro-CRC preferences, in comparison with the baseline category of 'No Match', whilst matched pro-NPS preferences are also near the 5% level of significance, holding other variables constant.

Table 6*:* Regression models of Job Satisfaction

	Model 6		**Model 7**	
	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value
Age	-0.183	0.126	-0.094	0.391
Gender	-0.141	0.564	-0.200	0.369
Region	-0.024	0.578	-0.040	0.318
Employer	0.496	0.154	0.364	0.251
PSM	-0.261	0.305	-0.231	0.320
Role				
- *Manager/SPO*	**1.293***	0.035	1.067	0.056
- *PO*	0.133	0.809	0.197	0.694
- *PSO*	0.107	0.849	0.081	0.874
- *CA*	0.461	0.502	0.343	0.584
- *Other*	0.233	0.733	0.419	0.503
- *Admin*	[Baseline]		[Baseline]	
Duration of Service	0.052	0.467	0.023	0.722
Employed June 2014	-1.484	0.127	**-1.839***	0.039
E-P Match				
- *Yes: NPS*	0.895	0.056	0.521	0.224
- *Yes: CRC*	**1.038***	0.044	0.627	0.184
- *Not Consulted*	0.197	0.584	0.027	0.934
- *No Match*	[Baseline]		[Baseline]	
Value Congruence			**0.983*****	0.000
Constant	**7.350****	0.001	**5.849****	0.005
No. of Observations	386		386	
R^2	0.1157		0.2667	

** = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001.*

Value congruence was added as an independent variable in Model 7, and was found to have an extremely significant ($p < .001$) relationship with job satisfaction in the expected direction (higher value-congruence increases the expected value of job satisfaction). The inclusion of value congruence eliminates the statistical significance of E-P match observed in Model 6, implying the existence of collinearity between E-P match and value congruence. Once value congruence is controlled for, the statistical significance of occupying a manager/SPO role

falls marginally outside the 5% level of significance. Interestingly, Model 7 shows that, once value congruence is held constant, whether respondents were employed on the 1st of June 2014 has a significant relationship with job satisfaction ($p < .05$), with a (very substantial) 1.8-point decrease in job satisfaction expected amongst those who were in comparison with those who were not.

Hypothesis 4 – a TR context-specific proxy of Wright and Pandey's (2008) thesis of value congruence's mediating role on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction – is not supported by Models 6 or 7. This is because PSM was not found to have a significant relationship with job satisfaction in either model (i.e. even prior to the inclusion of value congruence in Model 7). Hypothesis 6 is again not supported by Table 6's results, as duration of service does not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction in either model, although this must be qualified with the observation that having been employed prior to June 2014 does. Model 7's relatively high R^2 value ($R^2 = 0.2667$) in comparison with Model 6's ($R^2 = 0.1157$) indicates that a fairly large proportion of the observed variation in job satisfaction is explained with the addition of value congruence. Separate analysis showed that value congruence alone explains 19.63% of the total observed variation in job satisfaction.

4. Discussion and Limitations

A. Discussion of Results

This study's most important result is that TR has not resulted in disparate levels of PSM between NPS and CRC employees, contra-Hypothesis 1. When considering both the scale and content of the TR reforms, this is a remarkable finding. What this implies is that, even in the context of the aftermath of aggressive NPM-style reforms that are widely thought to (and possibly intended to) undermine the public sector ethos (Koumenta 2011; Moynihan 2010), PSM is not vulnerable to reduction on account of adaptation processes. The CRCs' organisational context features virtually all of the characteristics that have been thought to be harmful to PSM, were it susceptible to diminution: involuntary transfer of staff (Wright, Christensen and Isett 2013) to a private sector setting engaged in the pursuit of profit (Houston 2011), publicly known inclusion of PbR in contractual arrangements (Deci et al. 1999; Bellé 2015), and the prevalence of cost-saving rather than quality-improving 'innovations', such as the introduction of ATM-style kiosks to facilitate further job cuts (Travis 2015) and the use of open-plan, privacy-eliminating interview rooms (Leftly 2016) to maximise the use of space (van Loon et al. 2015). TR is a prime example of a set of reforms that *should* affect PSM; and yet, it hasn't. Given this notable finding, it is concluded that PSM is not vulnerable to diminution on account of adaptation to an incompatible working environment.

A sceptic of this conclusion might argue that the absence of disparate levels of PSM between NPS and CRC employees following TR is in fact a consequence of the relatively weak PbR schemes that were ultimately agreed to in the CRCs' contracts, rather than a reflection of the underlying nature of PSM. Whilst this is an important point which merits further discussion, it is not a persuasive refutation of the aforementioned conclusion regarding PSM's resilient nature. It is true that the PbR component of the CRCs' contracts was ultimately far smaller

than the government originally made out (Phillips 2014). Just as had been observed in the 2012 failed PbR pilot in Leeds prison (HoC 2016), bidders for the CRCs were wary of taking on additional financial risk when already facing squeezed profit margins resulting from the competitive bidding process (Hedderman 2013). Ultimately, only £259m of the £3.79bn lifetime value of the 21 CRC contracts is expected to be paid out on account of PbR (based on a predicted 3.7% reduction of reoffending), meaning that PbR only accounts for about 7% of the CRCs' total contract value (NAO 2016). Comparison with the PbR arrangements employed in the Work Programme, for example, in which roughly 80% of payment to providers was contingent on outcomes (NAO 2014b), gives an indication of the relative leanness of TR's PbR elements. The PbR arrangements with the CRCs are also weakened by the fact that they only operate at the aggregate level (i.e. organisational performance), rather than at the individual level.

The problem with the sceptic's argument is that it neglects the evidence that CRC employees *did* change their behaviour to accommodate the financial incentives faced by their employer, indicating that the PbR arrangements were not so weak as to be ignored. For example, there is evidence of CRC probation officers being reluctant to (and being instructed not to) breach probationers (i.e. return them to court because of non-compliance) due to the financial penalties their employer would face as a result (Justice Committee 2017b; HM Inspectorate of Probation 2016). Further, a recent inspection of the CRCs' 'Through-the-Gate' resettlement services has revealed that the CRCs suffer from tunnel vision with respect to focusing only on those aspects of the service for which they are recompensed (completion of resettlement plans), diverting 'attention from making sure that any needs raised by prisoners were actually met' (HM Inspectorate of Probation & HM Inspectorate of Prisons 2017, p.40). The PbR financial incentives faced by the CRCs clearly mattered to senior figures at the CRCs (Webster 2016), and employees further down the professional hierarchy appear to have

been willing to modify their actions to accommodate them (to the detriment of service quality). Contrary to the argument that TR's PbR elements were too weak to have an effect, it is the case that CRC employees did modify their actions to optimise organisational performance against these incentives (albeit, perhaps begrudgingly) without reducing their underlying stock of PSM, thus indicating the resilience of PSM.

Furthermore, the fact that the CRCs' and the NPS' different organisational contexts *did* produce significantly different organisational means of value congruence and job satisfaction (Table 4) in the direction conjectured in Hypotheses 2 and 3 suggests that the organisational differences *are* significant enough to trigger a reduction of PSM *were it possible*. The fact that virtually identical organisational means for PSM were recorded indicates that PSM is *alieni generis* to dynamic psychological states like value congruence and job satisfaction. This conclusion is supported by Bellé and Ongaro (2014), who found that two decades of NPM reforms in the Italian public sector did not equalise levels of PSM across the public and private sectors, a result they interpreted as indicating 'a sort of 'resilience', the capacity of the public sector to 'absorb' a certain degree of NPM reforms without ultimately changing […] its motivational structure' (2014, p.394). In a similar way, the present study's results indicate that, while employees' job satisfaction and value congruence levels are susceptible to reduction due to a disagreeable work environment (indicating the dynamism of these states), PSM, on the other hand, seems to be less susceptible. It follows that, when prior studies found that levels of performance and effort in altruistic tasks could be altered through contextual manipulations (Bellé 2015; Georgellis et al. 2011), they were incorrect to infer that this indicates an actual change in participants' underlying stock of PSM, as the outcome was more likely due to a change in the participant's attitude towards the task (with his/her PSM left unaffected).

The second major outcome of this study is the result that, in the context of TR at least, PSM does not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction, irrespectively of the role of value congruence on that relationship. In other words, Hypothesis 4 – the TR context-specific proxy of the thesis of the mediating role of value congruence on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction (Wright and Pandey 2008; Caillier 2015; Bright 2008) – is not supported by results, although the disparate effects of TR on CRC and NPS employees' levels of value congruence (Hypothesis 2) and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 3) are. The non-significance of the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction found in this study is a difficult result to interpret, given the strong prior evidence that there is, under normal circumstances, a significant, positive relationship between the two (Andersen and Kjeldsen 2013; Taylor and Westover 2011). The key to interpreting the lack of support for Hypothesis 4 is found in Table 5 (the regression models of value congruence). Unlike the present study, previous research found that PSM is a significant determinant of value congruence (i.e. Bright 2008; Wright and Pandey 2008). The difference between the present study and these prior studies is that, whereas the latter were carried out under ordinary circumstances (i.e. in a context of organisational stability), the present study takes place in the aftermath of a highly-politicised reform agenda that was met with strong, ideological opposition from the workforce (Deering and Feilzer 2017).

The results shown in Table 5 indicate that, in a politically charged working environment like the post-TR probation service, the relationship between PSM and value congruence breaks down and is overshadowed by emergent factors that become more pertinent in the latter's determination: factors like political ideology, collective social sentiment, and job insecurity. The significance of employer in Model 4, and the non-significance of PSM, strongly supports this thesis. CRC staff may feel that the 'psychological contract' they formed pre-TR on entry to their Probation Trust (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler 2003; Rousseau 1989), pursuant to which

they agreed to provide their labour at a low price in exchange for opportunities to provide meaningful assistance to vulnerable people, was broken with the redesignation of the officer-probationer relationship as a market relationship (Burgess and Ratto 2003; Titmuss 1970), resulting in very low levels of value congruence and job satisfaction. That E-P match was found to have a significant relationship with value congruence in Model 5, even though the 'preference' referred to was one expressed to Trust managers over three years ago, indicates that (i) the factors that informed respondents' earlier organisational preferences (ideology, for example) remain relevant in the determination of value congruence three years later (and have likely not changed), and (ii) managers risk harming their staffs' levels of job satisfaction if they request preferences from them that they are not able to fulfil.

Reviewing prior surveys and interviews of probation workers provides insight into additional factors that may have contributed to CRC employees' lower job satisfaction. Robinson et al. (2016, p.168) report that many of the CRC employees they surveyed 'alluded to the idea of the NPS as 'the elite' organisation, casting the CRC in the role of 'second class' probation', and suffered a significant status anxiety on account of their allocation. Some CRC employees reported that they had resorted to describing themselves as being simply 'from probation' in meetings with external organisations, 'either to enable the other's understanding or to avoid feelings of stigma associated with being (1) not NPS and (2) a (quasi-private) 'company'' (Robinson et al. 2016, p.168). The prominent sense that the CRCs constitute a second-rate probation service has been attributed to, firstly, the fact that CRC staff are not subject to any training or qualification requirements following deregulation under TR (Clare 2015; Justice Committee 2017b), and secondly, because the CRCs are only responsible for medium-and low-risk cases. In his interviews with 20 male probationers, Kay (2016, p.165) found that the risk-based split at the core of TR had led to questioning amongst probationers as to 'the ability of CRC staff to successfully support [their] desistance efforts'. On account of their

allocation, CRC staff appear to have suffered from a sense of legitimacy-deficit (Deering and Feilzer 2017) and concerns that their professional status had been undermined by TR, contributing to their low job satisfaction.

The third major outcome of this study are the results obtained regarding which sort of professional characteristics contribute to *intra*-organisational differences of PSM, value congruence, and job satisfaction. The results are generally supportive of Hypothesis 5, indicating that job role – in particular, placement within the professional hierarchy – has a significant relationship with PSM and job satisfaction (at least amongst managers in the latter case), albeit not with value congruence. Duration of service, on the other hand, was not found to have a significant relationship with PSM, value congruence, or job satisfaction, and therefore Hypothesis 6 should be rejected.

The significance of role for PSM is interpreted as confirmation of earlier studies (i.e. Christensen and Wright 2011) which found that person-job fit (fit between an individual's skills and values and the responsibilities of a role) is an important determinant of high-PSM individuals' employment decisions. It is an interesting finding that roles involving direct contact with probationers are correlated with having a significantly higher level of PSM than administrative positions, and that seniority in the probation professional hierarchy has a positive, linear relationship with PSM (Model 3). The fact that role was not found to have a significant relationship with value congruence is interpreted as confirmation of earlier research claiming that probation workers share a relatively universal set of values; namely, a belief that troubled individuals should be given help to make changes in their lives, and faith that this transformation is possible with the right support (Grant 2016; Deering 2011). If all staff are committed to the same values irrespectively of role, then the non-significance of the relationship between role and value congruence (shown in Models 4 and 5) is unsurprising. The increase in job satisfaction associated with occupying a manager or SPO role is

supported by Burke et al.'s (2017) finding that probation managers often seemed 'somewhat energized' (2017, p.196) at the prospect of developing new practices and being freed from bureaucracy. Waring and Bishop's (2011) study of an involuntary transfer of NHS employees to a privately-managed hospital found a similar result to the present study: doctors were found to have welcomed the changes, viewing them as a source of autonomy and freedom from bureaucracy, whereas those further down the professional hierarchy tended to be disempowered and disillusioned with the realities of commercial healthcare.

Duration of service, on the other hand, was not found to be a source of intra-organisational differences of PSM, value congruence, and job satisfaction, contra-Hypothesis 6. This is a surprising finding, given Mawby and Worrall's (2011; 2014) ethnological studies of probation sub-cultures which found that the different training regimes in place at the time of an employee's recruitment had resulted in generational differences of attitudes towards the probationer and the increasing use of computer-based risk assessment. The present result is interpreted as indicating that the significance of duration of service's relationships with PSM, value congruence, and job satisfaction is usurped by other factors when in the context of a workforce that has recently been subjected to rapidly-implemented and widely opposed reforms (Teague 2016). The one instance where organisational tenure *was* found to be significant – Model 7, in which having been employed by the probation service prior to the 1st of June 2014 was correlated with an expected 1.8-point decrease of job satisfaction (holding all other variables constant) – is interpreted as indicating that those who *voluntarily* entered the TR institutional framework are far more likely to be happy with current arrangements than those who were *involuntarily* transferred into it. From a practical perspective, the non-significance of the relationship between duration of service and PSM is a positive finding, as this indicates that the probation service has consistently managed to recruit individuals with a similar psychological profile despite frequent NPM-style reforms

(although none as significant as TR) over the last two decades (Mair and Burke 2012; Burke and Collett 2016).

B. Limitations

As with any voluntary survey, one possible limitation of the results is the risk of self-selection bias. That said, the demographic similarities between the respondent sample and that of Kirton and Guillaume (2015) suggest that either (i) both samples are representative of the total probation workforce, or (ii) self-selection bias has operated in a near-identical fashion in both surveys. It is not possible to conclusively determine which explanation is correct, due to the lack of available information on the demographic profile of CRC employees. However, comparison with recently published data on the demographic profile of NPS employees (MoJ 2016) confirms that the demographic profile of this study's NPS-based cohort is proportionate to the total NPS population in terms of age, gender, and role.

Care was taken to appear neutral with respect to attitude towards TR in the naming of the survey ('Measuring Transforming Rehabilitation's Impact on Public Service Motivation') and in the wording of the survey's cover note and questions. However, a risk remains of social desirability bias having artificially inflated PSM scores. The fact that most responses came from union members responding to a request from their union to participate in the study is another potential source of bias, given the unions' opposition to TR and earlier findings that union members were often amongst the most aggrieved with TR (Burke et al. 2017). Potentially, this may have resulted in artificial down-tariffing of value congruence and job satisfaction scores, or biased the results of the second set of questions outlined in section 2.B.IV.

It is unfortunate that the four-dimensional measure of PSM originally intended for this study had to be abandoned due to a lack of internal consistency in two of its dimensions. Multi-dimensional analysis promised to offer a more nuanced picture of how TR has impacted on employees' PSM than the global construct that was ultimately used (Wright, Christensen, and Pandey 2013). However, it should be noted that additional analysis was conducted in which Model 3 was duplicated with either the 'compassion' or 'self-sacrifice' dimension of PSM (both had acceptable α-scores) as the dependent variable instead of the global measure of PSM, and the output of these additional analyses was very similar to that of Model 3. This indicates that it is unlikely that the use of the global measure of PSM has resulted in different results than would have been observed using the four-dimensional measure.

A four-dimensional measure of PSM would likely have been achievable if more items had been included in the survey for each dimension (i.e. more than four). This would have allowed for the possibility of removing individual items with low levels of inter-item correlation whilst still having acceptable α-scores for each dimension (Streiner 2003). The limited number of items per dimension was motivated in part by the need to keep the survey brief in order to attract maximum responses, but it had the unintended consequence of compromising the intended four-dimensional construction of PSM. Furthermore, the need to gather responses within a short time period lead to the publication of the survey prior to the decision being made (based on a review of the literature that was ongoing at the time) to include items measuring value congruence and job satisfaction. Consequentially, whereas all responses featured values for PSM (n = 517), fewer responses included values for value congruence (n = 482), and fewer still for job satisfaction (n = 398).

Finally, it is acknowledged that a longitudinal research design would have been the ideal methodology for evaluating how changeable PSM is (Perry et al. 2010; Ward 2013), but this research design was not possible due to time constraints. Carrying out a cross-sectional

survey in the post-TR context was deemed to be a good alternative, due to the near-random nature of the allocation process which created the context of a natural experiment (Kirton and Guillaume 2015). However, a longitudinal research design, had one been possible, may have improved the quality of the data because baseline levels of PSM (i.e. pre-TR) would have been known, meaning that changes in PSM since 2014 could be measured independently for NPS and CRC employees, rather than using NPS employees' current PSM as the baseline from which to compare CRC employees' PSM. A shortcoming of the adopted research design is, therefore, that it assumes there has been no change in the PSM of those employees allocated to the NPS since the organisational split, which may not be the case.

5. Conclusion

This study was prompted by a need to address two gaps in the PSM-theory literature. The first gap concerned the possibility that PSM may be vulnerable to reduction on account of adaptation to a work environment that is incompatible with public service values. The second gap concerned the possibility that the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction may be mediated by a third variable – value congruence – rather than being directly related as is often assumed (Wright and Pandey 2008; Naff and Crum 1999).

Several hypotheses were devised to test the above PSM-theory gaps in a carefully selected context; the current English and Welsh probation service, which has recently undergone a major set of NPM-style reforms known as TR. The reforms can be considered as an exogenous source of variation, splitting up the public sector workforce of the former Probation Trusts in a near-random allocation process into newly established, public and private sector organisations. Academically speaking, TR is a natural experiment that has resulted in an unusual service provision landscape (Webster 2016) which, with its public sector 'control' group (NPS) and its private sector 'treatment' group (CRCs), is ideal for testing hypotheses related to PSM. The six hypotheses evaluated in this study, and their outcomes, are shown in Table 7, below.

Table 7: Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Tested in Models no.	Supported by Results?
1: CRC employees' PSM levels will be lower than NPS employees' PSM levels.	1,2,3	No
2: CRC employees' levels of value congruence will be lower than NPS employees'.	4,5	Yes
3: CRC employees' levels of job satisfaction will be lower than NPS employees'.	6,7	Yes
4: PSM will have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction, but the extent of this relationship's statistical significance will decrease once value congruence is controlled for	6,7	No
5: Job role will have a statistically significant effect on employee levels of PSM, value-congruence, and job satisfaction.	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	Mixed
6: Duration of service will have a statistically significant effect on employee levels of PSM, value-congruence, and job satisfaction.	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	No

As shown in Table 7, the hypothesis advanced to test the possibility of PSM's vulnerability to reduction (Hypothesis 1) was not supported by results. CRC employees' PSM levels are not significantly lower than their NPS counterparts (in fact, the mean PSM of the two groups are extraordinarily close), indicating that PSM is not vulnerable to reduction through negative adaptation processes. The results show that PSM is a much more resilient, stable (or, at least, very slow moving) variable than psychological states like value congruence or job satisfaction.

Having regard to the possibility that PSM's relationship with job satisfaction is mediated by value congruence (tested in the evaluation of Hypothesis 4), the results do not support this proposition, although they do not conclusively reject it either. No statistically significant relationship between PSM and job satisfaction was found, which was interpreted as indicating the breakdown of the PSM-job satisfaction relationship in a post-reform, politically charged, working environment in which reforms efforts have not been well received, as is the case in the current English and Welsh probation service. In this context, it seems that PSM ceases to matter for job satisfaction, with the latter, instead, being closely related to employees' levels of value congruence with their employer. This result does not necessarily indicate that value congruence does not mediate the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction; it is possible that it still does, but that in these extreme working contexts value congruence becomes so significant in the determination of job satisfaction that it usurps the significance of PSM's relationship with job satisfaction.

The two main theoretical contributions of this study are, accordingly, as follows. Firstly, it is concluded that PSM is not vulnerable to diminution on account of adaptation to a working environment that is not supportive of public service values. It remains possible that NPM-style reforms, for example, may still gradually reduce the PSM of a public sector workforce through ASA-processes (i.e. pre-existent workers' PSM may not change, but new recruits

may have lower PSM), although the available evidence (Bellé and Ongaro 2014) suggests that this is unlikely. Secondly, it is concluded that in the context of post-reform, fractious working environments, value congruence becomes a very significant determinant of job satisfaction at the expense of PSM. It remains undecided whether this result is conclusive evidence against Wright and Pandey's (2008) thesis of the mediating role of value congruence on the relationship between PSM and job satisfaction, or whether the results are but a reflection of this theorised role operating in extreme circumstances.

Bibliography

Alonso, P. and Lewis, G. B. (2001) “Public service motivation and job performance: Evidence from the federal sector”, in *American Review of Public Administration* 31: 363-380.

Andersen, L. B. and Kjeldsen A. M. (2013) “Public Service Motivation, User Orientation, and Job Satisfaction: A Question of Employment Sector?”, in *International Public Management Journal* 16(2): 252-274.

Andersen, L. B., Pallesen, T., Pedersen, L. H. (2011) “Does Ownership Matter? Public Service Motivation Among Physiotherapists in the Private and Public Sectors in Denmark”, in *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 31(1): 10-27.

Andersen, L. B., Heinesen, E., Pedersen, L. H. (2014) “How Does Public Service Motivation Among Teachers Affect Student Performance in Schools?”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research* 24: 651-671.

Annison, J., Burke, L., Senior, P. (2014) “Transforming Rehabilitation: Another example of English ‘exceptionalism’ or a blueprint for the rest of Europe?”, in *European Journal of Probation* 6(1): 6-23.

Bakker, A. B. (2015) “A Job Demands-Resources Approach to Public Service Motivation”, in *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 723-732.

Baron, J. (2007) *Thinking and Deciding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Barzelay, M. (2001) *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Boardman, C., Bozeman, B., Ponomariov, B. (2010) “Private Sector Imprinting: An Examination of the Impacts of Private Sector Job Experience on Public Managers’ Work Attitudes”, in *Public Administration Review* 70(1): 50-59.

Bellé, N. (2013) “Experimental Evidence on the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Performance”, in *Public Administration Review* 73(1): 143-153.

Bellé, N. (2015) “Performance-Related Pay and the Crowding out of Motivation in the Public Sector: A Randomized Field Experiment”, in *Public Administration Review* 75(2): 230-241.

Bellé, N. and Ongaro, E. (2014) “NPM, administrative reforms and public service motivation: improving the dialogue between research agendas”, in *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 80(2): 382-400.

Bland, J. M. and Altman, D. G. (1997) “Statistics Notes: Cronbach’s Alpha”, in *British Medical Journal* 314(7080): 572

Bonett, D. G. and Wright, T. A. (2015) “Cronbach’s alpha reliability: Interval estimation, hypothesis testing, and sample size planning”, in *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 36: 3-15.

Boyne, G. A. (2002) “Public and Private Management: What’s the Difference?”, in *Journal of Management Studies* 39(1): 97-122.

Brewer, G. A. (2013) “Public service motivation and performance”, in R. M. Walker, G. A. Boyne, G. A. Brewer (Eds.) *Public Management and Performance* (p.152-177). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Brewer, G. A. and Selden, S. C. (1998) “Whistle Blowers in the Federal Civil Service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(3): 413-439.

Brewer, G. A. and Selden, S. C. (2000) “Why Elephant Gallop: Assessing and Predicting Organizational Performance in Federal Agencies”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 685-711.

Bright, L. (2008) “Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on the Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees?”, in *The American Review of Public Administration* 38(2): 149-166.

Bullock, J. B., Stritch, J. M., Rainey, H. G. (2015) “International Comparison of Public and Private Employees’ Work Motives, Attitudes, and Perceived Rewards”, in *Public Administration Review* 75(3): 479-489.

Burgess, S. and Ratto, M. (2003) “The Role of Incentives In The Public Sector: Issues and Evidence”, in *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 19(2): 285-300.

Burke, L. (2014) “Maintaining professionalism in a house divided”, in *Probation Journal* 61(3): 229-233.

Burke, L. and Collett, S. (2016) “Transforming Rehabilitation: Organizational bifurcation and the end of probation as we knew it?”, in *Probation Journal* 63(2): 120-135.

Burke, L., Millings, M., Robinson, G. (2017) “Probation migration(s): Examining occupational culture in a turbulent field”, in *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 17(2): 192-208.

Camilleri, E. (2007) “Antecedents affecting public service motivation”, *Personnel Review* 36(3): 356-377.

Caillier, J. G. (2015) “Towards A Better Understanding of Public Service Motivation and Mission Valence in Public Agencies”, in *Public Management Review* 17(9): 1217-1236.

Carpenter, J., Doverspike, D., Miguel R. F. (2012) “Public service motivation as a predictor of attraction to the public sector”, in *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 80: 509-523.

Cheng, K-T. (2015) “Public service motivation and job performance in public utilities: An investigation in a Taiwan sample”, in *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 28(4/5): 352-370.

Christensen, R. K. and Wright, B. E. (2011) “The Effects of Public Service Motivation on Job Choice Decisions: Disentangling the Contributions of Person-Organization Fit and Person-Job Fit”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research of Theory* 21: 723-743.

Clare, R. (2015) “Maintaining professional practice: The role of the probation officer in community rehabilitation companies”, in *Probation Journal* 62(1): 49-61.

Coursey, D. H. and Pandey, S. K. (2007) “Public service motivation measurement: Testing an abridged version of Perry’s proposed scale”, in *Administration and Society* 39(5) 547-568.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M. and Kessler, I. (2003) “The employment relationship in the U.K. public sector: a psychological contract perspective”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13(2): 213-230.

Crewson, P. E. (1997) “Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499-518.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., Ryan R. M. (1999) “A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation”, in *Psychological Bulletin* 125(6): 627-668.

Deering, J. (2011) *Probation Practice and the New Penology: Practitioner Reflections* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Deering, J. and Feilzer, M. Y. (2017) “Questions of Legitimacy in Probation Practice after Transforming Rehabilitation”, in *The Howard Journal* 56(2): 158-175.

Deering, J., Feilzer, M. Y., Holmes, T. (2014) “The transition from public to private in probation: Values and attitudes of managers in the private sector”, in *Probation Journal* 61(3): 234-250.

DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J., Pandey, S. K. (2006) “Gender Dimensions of Public Service Motivation”, in *Public Administration Review* 66(6): 873-887.

Dias, J. J. and Maynard-Moody, S. (2007) “For-Profit Welfare: Contracts, Conflicts, and the Performance Paradox”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(2): 189-211.

Dolbier, C. L., Webster, J. A., McCalister, K. T., Mallon, M. W., Steinhardt, M. A. (2005) “Reliability and Validity of a Single-item Measure of Job Satisfaction”, in *American Journal of Health Promotion* 19(3): 194-198.

Dominey, J. (2016) “Fragmenting probation: Recommendations from research”, in *Probation Journal* 63(2): 136-143.

Evans, E. (2016) “The expected impacts of Transforming Rehabilitation on working relationships with offenders”, in *Probation Journal* 63(2): 153-161.

Frank, S. A. and Lewis, G. B. (2004) “Government Employees: Working Hard or Hardly Working?”, in *American Review of Public Administration* 34(1): 36-51.

Georgellis, Y. and Tabvuma, V. (2010) “Does Public Service Motivation Adapt?”, in *Kyklos* 63: 176-191.

Georgellis, Y., Iossa, E., Tabvuma, V. (2011) “Crowding Out Intrinsic Motivation in the Public Sector”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21: 473-493.

Grant, S. (2016) “Constructing the durable penal agent: tracing the development of habitus within English probation officers and Scottish criminal justice social workers”, in *British Journal of Criminology* 56: 750-768.

Hartl, L. (2016) *The dark side of PSM – An analysis of the relationship between the level of PSM and the level of stress*. Available from: http://essay.utwente.nl/70330/ [Accessed: 28th June 2017].

Hebson, G., Grimshaw, D., Marchington, M. (2003) “PPPs and the changing public sector ethos: case-study evidence from the health and local authority sectors”, in *Work, Employment and Society* 17(3): 481-501.

Hedderman, C. (2013) “Payment by Results: Hopes, Fears and Evidence”, in *British Journal of Community Justice* 11(2-3): 43-58.

Herzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell).

HM Government (2010) *The Coalition: Our Programme for Government* (London: The Stationary Office).

HM Inspectorate of Probation (2017) *The work of probation services in courts* (Manchester: HMIP).

HM Inspectorate of Probation (2016) *Transforming Rehabilitation: Early Implementation 5* (Manchester: HMIP).

HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2017) *An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Prisoners Serving 12 Months or More* (Manchester: HMIP).

Homberg, F., McCarthy, D., Tabvuma, V. (2015) "A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Satisfaction", in *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 711-722.

House of Commons: Committee of Public Accounts (2016) *Transforming Rehabilitation*, HC 2016-17, HC 484 (London: The Stationary Office).

House of Commons: Justice Committee (2014) *Crime reduction policies: a co-ordinated approach? Interim report on the Government's Transforming Rehabilitation programme*, HC 2013-14, HC 1004 (London: The Stationary Office).

House of Commons: Justice Committee (2017a) *Oral evidence: Transforming Rehabilitation (Q1-128)*, HC 2016-17, HC 1018 (London: The Stationary Office).

House of Commons: Justice Committee (2017b) *Oral evidence: Transforming Rehabilitation (Q129-231)*, HC 2016-17, HC 1018 (London: The Stationary Office).

Houston, D. J. (2006) "'Walking the Walk' of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood, and Money", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(1): 67-86.

Houston, D. J. (2011) "Implications of Occupational Locus and Focus for Public Service Motivation: Attitudes toward Work Motives across Nations", in *Public Administration Review* 71(5): 761-771.

Jöreskog, K. G. **(**1993) "Testing structural equation Models", in K. A. Bollen and J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (p294-316). (Newbury Park, CA: Sage).

Kay, C. (2016) "Good cop, bad cop, both? Examining the implications of risk based allocation on the desistance narratives of intensive probationers", in *Probation Journal* 63(2): 162-168.

Kim, S. (2005) "Individual-Level Factors and Organizational Performance in Government Organizations", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(2): 245-261.

Kim, S. and Vandenabeele, W. (2010) "A Strategy for Building Public Service Motivation Research Internationally", in *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 701-709.

Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Wright, B. E., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R. K., Desmarais, C., Koumenta, M., Leisink, P., Liu, B., Palidauskaite, J., Pedersen, L. H., Perry, J. L., Ritz, A., Taylor, J., De Vivo, P. (2013) "Investigating the Structure and Meaning of Public Service Motivation across Populations: Developing an International Instrument and Addressing Issues of Measurement Invariance", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23: 79-102.

Kirton, G. and Guillaume, C. (2015) *Employment Relations and Working Conditions in Probation after Transforming Rehabilitation*. Available from: https://www.napo.org.uk/sites/default/files/BR%20112-2015%20Appendix%20A%20-%20Gill%20Kirton%20Report.doc [Accessed: 4th of June 2017].

Kjeldsen, A. M. and Jacobsen C. B. (2012) "Public Service Motivation and Employment Sector: Attraction or Socialization?", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23: 899-926.

Koumenta, M. (2011) "Modernization, Privatization, and the Public Service Ethos in the United Kingdom", in D. Marsden (Ed.) *Employment in the Lean Years: Policy and Prospects for the Next Decade* (Chapter 14). (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., Johnson, E. C. (2005) "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit", in *Personnel Psychology* 58(2): 281-342.

Lee, C. and Kim, S. (2014) "Making the quality of government better: the possibility of public service motivation (PSM) change", in *International Review of Public Administration* 19(2): 107-125.

Leftly, M. (2016) "Sodexo is ruining probation centres, officers claim – 'There is no privacy'", in *The Independent*, 8th February 2016. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/sodexo-is-ruining-probation-centres-officers-claim-there-is-no-privacy-a6859946.html (Accessed: 4th July 2017).

Leisink, P. and Steijn, B. (2009) "Public service motivation and job performance of public sector employees in the Netherlands", in *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 75(1): 35-52.

Mair, G. and Burke, L. (2012) *Redemption, rehabilitation and risk management: a history of probation* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Mawby, R. C. and Worrall, A. (2011) *Probation workers and their occupational cultures*. Available from: https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/documents/Final_report_Nov_2011%20-17%20Nov%202011.pdf [Accessed: 13th July 2017].

Mawby, R. C. and Worrall, A. (2014) "Probation worker cultures and relationships with offenders", in *Probation Journal* 61(4): 346-357.

Ministry of Justice (2012) *Proven Re-offending Statistics: Quarterly Bulletin January to December 2010, England and Wales* (London: The Stationary Office).

Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform*, CP(R)16/2013 (London: The Stationary Office).

Ministry of Justice (2016) *National Offender Management Service: Workforce Statistics Bulletin, 31st March 2016* (London: The Stationary Office).

Moynihan, D. P. (2010) "A Workforce of Cynics? The Effects of Contemporary Reforms on Public Service Motivation", in *International Public Management Journal* 13(1): 24-34.

Moynihan, D. P. and Pandey, S. K. (2007) "The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation", in *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 40-53.

Mullins, L. J. (2010) *Management and Organisational Behaviour (9th edition)* (Harlow, New York: Prentice Hall/Financial Times).

Naff, K. C. and Crum, J. (1999) "Working for America: does public service motivation make a difference?", in *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 19(4): 5-16.

Napo (2015) *More CRC's join the Job Cuts stampede*. Available from: https://www.napo.org.uk/blogs/more-crcs-join-job-cuts-stampede [Accessed: 28th July 2017].

Napo and UNISON (2014) *The Truth about Transforming Rehabilitation: Voices from the Frontline*. Available from: https://www.napo.org.uk/sites/default/files/The%20Truth%20About%20Transforming%20Rehabilitation%202.pdf [Accessed: 25th June 2017].

National Audit Office (2014a) *Probation: Landscape Review*, Session 2013-14: HC1100 (London: The Stationary Office).

National Audit Office (2014b) *The Work Programme*, Session 2014-15: HC266 (London: The Stationary Office).

National Audit Office (2016) *Transforming Rehabilitation*, Session 2015-16: HC 951 (London: The Stationary Office).

National Careers Service (2017) *Probation officer*. Available from: https://nationalcareersservice.direct.gov.uk/job-profiles/probation-officer [Accessed: 13th August 2017].

New Philanthropy Capital (2015) *The Transforming Rehabilitation Tier 1 Tendering Process: The Voluntary Sector Perspective*. Available from: http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/transforming-rehabilitation-the-voluntary-sector-perspective/ [Accessed: 3rd June 2017].

Oberfield, Z. (2014) "Motivation, Change, and Stability: Findings from an Urban Police Department", in *American Review of Public Administration* 44(2): 210-232.

Pandey, S. K. and Stazyk, E. C. (2008) "Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation", in J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.) *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service* (Chapter 5) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P. (2008) "Public service motivation and interpersonal citizenship behaviour in public organizations: Testing a preliminary model", in *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 89-108.

Pedersen, M. J. (2015) "Activating the Forces of Public Service Motivation: Evidence from a Low-Intensity Randomized Survey Experiment", in *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 734-746.

Perry, J. L. (1996) "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1): 5-22.

Perry, J. L. (1997) "Antecedents of Public Service Motivation", in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(2): 181-197.

Perry, J. L. and Hondeghem, A. (2008) "Directions for Future Theory and Research", in J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.) *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service* (Chapter 14) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Perry, J. L. and Vandenabeele, W. (2015) "Public Service Motivation Research: Achievements, Challenges, and Future Directions", in *Public Administration Review* 75(5): 692-699.

Perry, J. L. and Wise, L. R. (1990) “The Motivational Bases of Public Service”, in *Public Administration Review* 50(3): 367-373.

Perry, J. L., Hondeghem, A., Wise, L. R. (2010) “Revisiting the Motivational Bases of Public Service: Twenty Years of Research and an Agenda for the Future”, in *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 681-690.

Phillips, J. (2014) “Probation in the News: Transforming Rehabilitation”, in *British Journal of Community Justice* 12(1): 27-48.

Rainey, H. G. (1982) “Reward Preferences Among Public and Private Managers: In Search of the Service Ethic”, in *American Review of Public Administration* 16(4): 288-302.

Rainey, H. G. (1993) “A theory of goal ambiguity in public organizations”, in J. L. Perry (Ed.) *Research in public administration* (p. 121-166) (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press).

Ritz, A. (2011) “Attraction to Public Policy-Making: A Qualitative Inquiry into Improvements in PSM Measurement”, in *Public Administration* 89(3): 1128-1147.

Robinson, G. (2016) “Patrolling the Borders of Risk: The New Bifurcation of Probation Services in England and Wales”, in M. Bosworth, C. Hoyle, L. Zedner (Eds.) *Changing Contours of Criminal Justice* (Chapter 4) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Robinson, G., Burke, L., Millings, M. (2016) “Criminal Justice Identities in Transition: The Case of Devolved Probation Services in England and Wales”, in *British Journal of Criminology* 56(1): 161-178.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989) “Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organizations”, in *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 2: 121-139.

Schneider, B. (1987) “The people make the place”, in *Personnel Psychology* 40: 437-453.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., Smith, D. B. (1995) “The ASA framework: An update”, in *Personnel Psychology* 48: 747-773.

Senior, P. (2016) “Privatising Probation: The Death Knell of a Much-Cherished Public Service?”, in *The Howard Journal* 55(4): 414-431.

Squires, P. (2016) “Crime and Criminal Justice”, in H. Bochel and M. Powell (Eds.) *The Coalition Government and Social Policy: Restructuring the Welfare State* (Chapter 13) (Bristol: Policy Press).

Steijn, B. (2008) “Person-Environment Fit and Public Service Motivation”, in *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 13-27.

Streiner, D. L. (2003) “Starting at the Beginning: An Introduction to Coefficient Alpha and Internal Consistency”, in *Journal of Personality Assessment* 80(1): 99-103.

Strickland, P. (2016) “Contracting out probation services 2013-2016”, *House of Commons Briefing Paper 06894* (London: The Stationary Office).

Sturgess, G. L., Cumming, L. M., Dicker, J. (2011) *Payment by Outcome: A Commissioner’s Toolkit* (London: 2020 Public Services Trust at the RSA).

Taylor, J. (2007) “The Impact of Public Services Motives on Work Outcomes in Australia: A Comparative Multi-Dimensional Analysis”, in *Public Administration* 85(4): 931-959.

Taylor, J. (2008) “Organizational Influences, Public Service Motivation and Work Outcomes: An Australian Study”, in *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 67-88.

Taylor, J. (2013) “Public Service Motivation, Relational Job Design, and Job Satisfaction in Local Government”, in *Public Administration* 92(4): 902-918.

Taylor, J. and Westover, J. H. (2011) “Job Satisfaction in the Public Service”, in *Public Management Review* 13(5): 731-751.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2012) “Root and Branch Restructuring to Achieve Major Cuts: The Social Policy Programme of the 2010 UK Coalition Government”, in *Social Policy and Administration* 46(1): 61-82.

Teague, M. (2016) “Probation, People and Profits: The Impact of Neoliberalism”, in *British Journal of Community Justice* 14(1): 133-138.

Titmuss, R. M. (1970) *The Gift Relationship: From Human Blood to Social Policy* (London: Allen and Unwin).

Travis, A. (2013) “Probation officers face social media gag as outsourcing row rumbles on”, *The Guardian*, 21st March 2013. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2013/mar/21/probation-officers-social-media-gag-outsourcing [Accessed: 18th June 2017].

Travis, A. (2014) “Two companies to run more than half of privatised probation services”, *The Guardian*, 29th October 2014. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/oct/29/justice-probation-contracts-private-companies [Accessed: 4th July 2017].

Travis, A. (2015) “Probation officers face redundancy in plan to replace them with machines”, *The Guardian*, 30th March 2015. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/mar/30/probation-officers-face-redundancy-in-plan-to-replace-them-with-machines [Accessed: 23rd July 2017].

van Loon, N. M., Vandenabeele, W., Leisink, P. (2015) “On the bright and dark side of public service motivation: the relationship between PSM and employee wellbeing”, in *Public Money and Management* 35(5): 349-356.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007) “Towards a Theory of Public Service Motivation: An Institutional Approach”, in *Public Management Review* 9(4): 545-556.

Vandenabeele, W. (2008a) “Government Calling: Public Service Motivation as an Element in Selecting Government as an Employer of Choice”, in *Public Administration* 86(4): 1089-1105.

Vandenabeele, W. (2008b) – “Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry’s Measurement Instrument”, in *International Public Management Journal* 11(1): 143-167.

Vandenabeele, W. (2014) “Explaining Public Service Motivation: The Role of Leadership and Basic Needs Satisfaction”, in *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 34(2): 153-173.

Vaske, J. J., Beaman, J., Sponarski, C. C. (2017) “Rethinking Internal Consistency in Cronbach’s Alpha”, in *Leisure Sciences* 39(2): 163-173.

Vinzant, J. C. (1998) “Where Values Collide: Motivation and Role Conflict in Child and Adult Protective Services”, in *American Review of Public Administration* 28(4): 347-366.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., Hudy, M. J. (1997) “Overall Job Satisfaction: How Good are Single-Item Measures?”, in *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(2): 247-252.

Waring, J. and Bishop, S. (2011) “Healthcare Identities at the Crossroads of Service Modernisation: The Transfer of NHS Clinicians to the Independent Sector”, in *Sociology of Health and Illness* 35(3): 661-676.

Ward, K. D. (2013) “Cultivating Public Service Motivation through AmeriCorps Service: A Longitudinal Study”, in *Public Administration Review* 74(1): 114-125.

Webster, R. (2016) *Payment by Results: Lessons from the Literature*. Available at: http://www.russellwebster.com/payment-by-results-lessons-from-the-literature [Accessed: 29th May 2017].

Weibel, A., Rost, K., Osterloh, M. (2009) “Pay for Performance in the Public Sector – Benefits and (Hidden) Costs”, in *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(2): 387-412.

Whitehead, P. (2015) “Payment by results: the materialist reconstruction of criminal justice”, in *Internal Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 35(5/6): 290-305.

Wise, L. R. (2000) “The Public Service Culture”, in R. D. Stillman (Ed.) *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases 7th edition* (p.342-353) (Boston: Houghton Mifflin).

Wright, B. E. (2007) “Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter?”, in *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 54-64.

Wright, B. E. and Grant, A. M. (2010) “Unanswered Questions about Public Service Motivation: Designing Research to Address Key Issues of Emergence and Effects”, in *Public Administration Review* 70(5): 691-700.

Wright, B. E. and Pandey, S. K. (2008) “Public Service Motivation and the Assumption of Person-Organization Fit: Testing the Mediating Effect of Value Congruence”, in *Administration and Society* 40(5): 502-521.

Wright, B. E., Christensen, R. K., Isett, K. R. (2013) “Motivated to Adapt? The Role of Public Service Motivation as Employees Face Organizational Change”, in *Public Administration Review* 73(5): 738-747.

Wright, B. E., Christensen, R. K., Pandey, S. K. (2013) “Measuring Public Service Motivation: Exploring the Equivalence of Existing Global Measures”, in *Internal Public Management Journal* 16(2): 197-223.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Napo, UNISON (Police and Justice Service Group), the Probation Institute, the Criminal Justice Alliance, Clinks, Russell Webster, and the Probation Matters blog for their assistance in promoting and circulating the survey.

Appendix 1: Information on Postings of Survey

Publicizing Agent	Mode of Communication	Date	Link to Communication
Clinks	Survey promoted on Twitter.	27/06/2017	https://twitter.com/Clinks_Tweets/status/879648472252731392
Criminal Justice Alliance	Link to survey and short brief included in bi-weekly email bulletin.	30/06/2017	N/A
Napo	Link to survey and short brief sent in an email to roughly 5000 union members.	14/07/2017	N/A
Probation Institute	Link to survey and short brief included in the PI 'July News' email circular.	07/07/2017	N/A
Probation Matters Blog	Link to survey and short brief included in 'News Roundup 10'	17/06/2017	http://probationmatters.blogspot.co.uk/2017/06/news-roundup-10.html
Russell Webster	Survey promoted on Twitter.	16/06/2017	https://twitter.com/russwebt/status/875710705416249344
UNISON (Police and Justice Service Group)	Link to survey and short brief sent in an email to roughly 3500 union members.	12/07/2017	N/A

Appendix 2: Sources of Items used in Survey

PSM			
Variable Name	Item	Source	Dimension
PSM 1	'Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.'	Vandenabeele (2008)	APP
PSM 2	'Ethical behaviour of public officials is as important as competence.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 22	APP
PSM 3	'The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me.' (R)	Perry (1996) – PSM 27	APP
PSM 4	'I respect public officials who can turn a good idea into law.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 15	APP
PSM 5	'Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself.'	Vandenabeele (2008)	CPV
PSM 6	'When public officials take an oath of office, I believe they accept obligations not expected of other citizens.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 14	CPV
PSM 7	'I do not believe that government can do much to make society fairer.' (R)	Perry (1996) – PSM 20	CPV
PSM 8	'To me, patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 8	CPV
PSM 9	'I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged.' (R)	Perry (1996) – PSM 2	C

PSM 10	'To me, helping people who are in trouble is very important.'	Vandenabeele (2014)	C
PSM 11	'I am often reminded by daily events about how dependent we are on one another.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 13	C
PSM 12	'I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don't know personally.' (R)	Perry (1996) – PSM 10	C
PSM 13	'I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 26	S-S
PSM 14	'I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 19	S-S
PSM 15	'Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds.' [R]	Perry (1996) – PSM 6	S-S
PSM 16	'Serving citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.'	Perry (1996) – PSM 12	S-S

'APP' = Attraction to Public Participation; 'CPV' = Commitment to Public Values; 'C' = Compassion; 'S-S' = Self-Sacrifice

Value Congruence		
Variable Name	**Item**	**Source**
VC1	'I find that my values and the values of the organisation I work for are very similar.'	Wright and Pandey (2008), who developed the item from one used in O'Reilly and Chatman (1986).
VC2	'If the values of the organisation I work for were different from what they are now, I would not be as attached to it.'	Wright and Pandey (2008), who developed the item from one used in O'Reilly and Chatman (1986).

Note – both items were slightly re-worded from the items used in Wright and Pandey (2008).

Job Satisfaction		
Variable Name	**Item**	**Source**
Jobsat	'All things considered, how satisfied are you with your current job on a scale of 1 to 10?'	Derived from a measure used in Dolbier et al. (2005)

Appendix 3: MLR Regression Models with Responses to Questions Outlined in Section 2.B.IV as the Dependent Variables

	Cream		Humanist		Performance		Bureaucracy	
	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value	β-coefficient	*p*-value
Age	0.002	0.966	-0.003	0.952	0.034	0.478	-0.011	0.850
Gender	-0.042	0.720	0.018	0.859	0.139	0.162	**-0.339****	0.004
Region	0.012	0.555	0.008	0.663	-0.004	0.842	0.001	0.957
Employer	-0.020	0.859	**0.199***	0.042	-0.180	0.061	0.167	0.134
PSM	-0.212	0.080	0.156	0.138	-1.66	0.108	**0.338****	0.005
Role								
- *Manager/SPO*	**-0.579***	0.045	-0.040	0.872	0.448	0.069	**0.807****	0.005
- *PO*	-0.486	0.058	0.262	0.238	-0.042	0.846	**0.736****	0.004
- *PSO*	-0.491	0.062	0.362	0.112	-0.081	0.718	**0.618***	0.018
- *CA*	0.271	0.405	0.496	0.078	0.309	0.264	0.382	0.235
- *Other*	-0.301	0.350	0.298	0.284	0.346	0.207	0.122	0.701
- *Admin*	[Baseline]		[Baseline]		[Baseline]		[Baseline]	
Duration of Service	0.009	0.781	-0.023	0.435	0.007	0.817	0.026	0.434
Employed June 2014	0.245	0.372	-0.237	0.319	-0.061	0.794	-0.155	0.569
Value Congruence	0.028	0.663	**-0.124***	0.027	**0.257*****	0.000	-0.122	0.056
Job Satisfaction	0.007	0.801	**-0.122*****	0.000	0.045	0.051	**-0.089****	0.001
Constant	**2.59****	0.001	**4.760*****	0.000	**1.295***	0.048	**3.624*****	0.000
No. of Observations	398		398		398		398	
R^2	0.0586		0.1617		0.1601		0.1400	

** = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001.*

'Cream': 'I am more likely to concentrate my efforts on a client with a smaller risk of reoffending than a larger risk of reoffending'.
'Humanist': 'The humanistic underpinning of probation work has been lost as a result of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms'.
'Performance': 'Operational performance has improved since June 2014'.
'Bureaucracy': 'Being so bound up in bureaucracy makes it difficult for me to perform my job'.
All four dependent variables took the form of five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)