ESSAYS ON MOTIVATION AND LEADERSHIP IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

PROF. DR. DOMINIK VOGEL

Kumulative Habilitationsschrift
zur Erlangung der Forschungs- und Lehrbefähigung
im Fach Betriebswirtschaftslehre

Eingereicht an der
Fakultät für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften
der Universität Hamburg

Dezember 2019

Prof. Dr. Dominik Vogel: *Essays on Motivation and Leadership in the Public Sector.*

This is for Mathilda

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I thank Prof. Dr. Rick Vogel for his constant support during my time as a Junior Professor at the University of Hamburg. I learned immensely from his theoretical insights and scholarly wisdom. Additionally, he has been constantly helpful with practical issues.

I also want to thank Prof. Dr. Silke Boenigk for her continuous willingness to support my work, foster my development at the University of Hamburg, and serve on my Habilitation committee. Furthermore, I thank the other members of my Habilitation committee. I thank Prof. Dr. Isabella Proeller for serving as a reviewer as well as Prof. Dr. Jetta Frost, Prof. Dr. Katharina Manderscheid, and Prof. Dr. Kai-Uwe Schnapp for their willingness to serve as committee members.

Special thanks go to my co-authors and colleagues Alexander Kroll, Jurgen Willems, Leisha DeHart-Davis, and Carolin Waldner. The great articles cumulated in this Habilitation—and many more—would not have been possible without their huge effort, dedication, and manifold skills.

I also want to thank the colleagues working or previously working at the Professorships of *Public Management* as well as *Management of Public, Private, & Nonprofit Organizations*. Their support and the cooperative working environment they created made many things easier.

Moreover, I am grateful for Matthias Döring's scholarly, practical, and mental support during my entire academic career.

Finally, I want to thank my wife Miriam for her endless patience, all her encouraging words after paper rejections, her willingness to listen to my endless talks about my work, and her incredible support in everything I do.

Hamburg, December 2019

Dominik Vogel

CONTENTS

I SYNOPSIS

- 1 INTRODUCTION 3
- 2 MOTIVATION AND LEADERSHIP 5
 - 2.1 Motivation 5
 - 2.2 Leadership 6
- 3 OVERVIEW OF STUDIES AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE LITERATURE 9
- 4 REFERENCES OF SYNOPSIS 15

II ARTICLES

- 5 ARTICLE 1: THE PSM-LEADERSHIP FIT: A MODEL OF PERFORMANCE INFORMATION USE 23
- 6 ARTICLE 2: THE STABILITY AND CHANGE OF PSM-RELATED VALUES ACROSS TIME: TESTING THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS AGAINST PANEL DATA 25
- 7 ARTICLE 3: THE EFFECTS OF MAKING PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES AWARE OF THEIR PROSOCIAL AND SOCIETAL IMPACT: A MICROINTERVENTION STUDY 27
- 8 ARTICLE 4: MECHANISMS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN ORGANIZATIONS: HOW TEAM COGNITION INFLUENCES EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT AND ENGAGEMENT 29
- 9 ARTICLE 5: AGREEING TO DISAGREE? EXPLAINING SELF-OTHER DISAGREEMENT ON LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR 31
- 10 ARTICLE 6: REPUTATION SPILLOVER EFFECTS FROM GRANT-PROVIDING INSTITUTIONS 33

Part I

SYNOPSIS

INTRODUCTION

The Habilitation focuses on two aspects vital for any organization: the motivation of its members and the leadership behavior of those responsible for supervising others. The two concepts—motivation and leadership—are studied in a specific type of organizations: public administrations. Both concepts have received increasing attention in recent years, but the literature still offers more questions than answers (Van Wart, 2013; Esteve & Schuster, 2019). One reason why motivation and leadership have been neglected for a long time is the fact that, according to a classical view on public administration, they should not matter. For a long time, processes and relationships within public administrations have been viewed from the perspective of Weberian bureaucracy (Terry, 1995; Van Wart, 2003). According to this view, public administration should be strictly legalistic, impartial, and impersonal (Vogel, 2006, p. 25). Structural aspects, written rules, and strict hierarchies guide the members of such an organization (Rainey, 2009, 28 ff.). Their motivation or how they are led does not matter. However, this is obviously not the case in the real world. Empirical research has extensively shown that motivated public servants produce better outcomes (Esteve & Schuster, 2019; Ritz et al., 2016) and that leaders have substantial impact on public employees' motivation (Avolio et al., 2004; Shamir et al., 1998; Wright et al., 2012), as well as the effectiveness of public administrations (Ritz, 2009; van Loon, 2016).

These conflicting perspectives of normative expectations and empirical evidence guide my interest in the motivation of employees and the role of leadership in public administration. The main research interests of this Habilitation are summarized in the following questions:

- What motivates public servants?
- What effects do different types of motivation have?
- How are public administrations led and what effects does leadership have?

The Habilitation contributes to the literature by focusing on the management of organizations, which are central to the welfare and prosperity of societies and people living in them. Public organizations are responsible for implementing policies, ensuring the safety of citizens, guaranteeing individual rights and much more (O'Toole & Meier, 2011, p. 1). Modern societies spend a significant part of their

national income on tasks provided by public administration. An average of 46.6 % of the GDP of EU member states comprises government expenses, and 25 % of all employees work for public organizations (Hammerschmid et al., 2018). It is, therefore, important to understand these organizations, study how they are managed, how their work might be improved, and what drives their members.

Additionally, the study of public administrations also informs the research on organizations in general (Willems, 2019). Public administrations are characterized by a multitude of stakeholders, resulting in high demands for accountability. They are also determined by extensive formal legal constraints and a high intensity of rules and regulations (Rainey, 2009, 82 ff.). What motivates people and how leadership is executed in such organizational settings enables us to compare them with other (for-profit) organizations and determine the influence of such settings.

To contribute to the wide sub-field of public management, and specifically the study of public servants' motivation and leadership in public organizations, this Habilitation combines six published articles. Chapter 2 defines the central constructs of this Habilitation—motivation and leadership. Chapter 3 introduces the Habilitation's six articles and clarifies how they relate to each other and how they contribute to both the overall management and public administration literatures. Part II consists of the six articles, and Part ?? includes my Curriculum Vitae, specifically an overview of all my publications and the courses I have taught in the past nine years at various institutions, including the University of Hamburg.

MOTIVATION AND LEADERSHIP

2.1 MOTIVATION

Motivation is a very broad concept, and everybody can relate to it to a certain degree. Defining motivation is, however, not very easy (Pinder, 2008). The term motivation is derived from the Latin word for “move” (*movere*), referring to the forces that move, arouse, and direct us (Rainey, 2009, p. 248). In management science and organizational psychology, researchers usually study these forces in the context of people’s work and refer to it as “work motivation.” Following Pinder (2008, p. 11), work motivation is defined as “[...] a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration.” Pinder (2008, 11 ff.) precisely points out various features and implications of this definition and highlights that work motivation is a latent construct and that the source of this “energetic forces” can be found within a person and outside himself/herself.

It is also important to point out the difference between performance and (work) motivation. Employees’ performance is mainly a function of an employee’s ability, his/her effort (i. e., motivation), and external factors (Campbell & Campbell, 1988; Pinder, 2008, 8 ff.). Work motivation is, therefore, only one antecedent of individual performance. The distinction is crucial and has been made since the early days of motivation research. Pinder (2008, p. 16) names Vroom (1964) as its inventor and shows that it was repeated extensively, for example, by Cummings and Schwab (1973), Lawler (1973), or Terborg (1977).

Research on motivation in the public sector was long driven by stereotypes of lazy bureaucrats and researchers’ efforts to empirically assess (and disprove) these stereotypes (Rainey, 2009, 241 ff.). In this context, public management scholars also began to study motivational factors that might be special for public servants (e. g., Rainey, 1982). However, it was not before the beginning of the 1990s that this idea was developed into a unifying conceptual framework. This was done by Perry and Wise (1990) in their seminal work on “public service motivation” (PSM).

Perry and Wise (1990, p. 368) defined public service motivation as “the individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations.” The concept was well-received and Perry (1996) continued his work by developing a measurement scale for public service motivation. Based on

theoretical considerations, Perry (1996) defined four dimensions that constitute public service motivation: (1) attraction to policy making, (2) commitment to public interest, (3) compassion, and (4) self-sacrifice. With such conceptual clarity and a measurement instrument at hand, the research on public service motivation has since grown vastly (Ritz et al., 2016). While many studies focused on outcomes of public servants' PSM, studies on antecedents and conceptional work were less prominent (Ritz et al., 2016).

Four out of the six articles in this Habilitation deal directly with public service motivation. Article 1 (Kroll & Vogel, 2014) falls within the category of outcome studies and tests the role of public service motivation in managers' use of performance information. Contrary to previous work, it further theorizes on this relationship, showing that the effect of PSM on performance information use is amplified by supervisors' use of transformational leadership behavior. The article, thus, functions as a bridge between the two overarching themes of this Habilitation. Article 2 (Vogel & Kroll, 2016) contributes to the theoretical understanding of public service motivation by investigating its temporal stability. Thus, it helps to understand that public service motivation is more of a stable trait than a flexible state. Article 3 (Vogel & Willems, 2020), taking public service motivation as a starting point, combines it with job characteristics and employees' awareness of two specific job characteristics: prosocial and societal impact. Article 4 (Kroll et al., 2019) goes beyond public service motivation and focuses on work engagement (Maslach et al., 2001) as a specific type of work motivation.

2.2 LEADERSHIP

What is leadership? Again this is an important but difficult question. More than 25 years ago, Rost (1993) had identified 221 definitions of leadership in 587 different articles (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 110). The variety of definitions has not changed much (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 23). One definition developed to unify those interested in leadership in an organizational context is the one by House et al. (2002). It is the result of discussions among 54 leadership researchers from various countries in the "GLOBE project". They defined leadership as:

[...] the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members (House et al., 2002, p. 5).

The definition also guides this Habilitation. It emphasizes certain characteristics of leadership that, in my opinion, are essential to understand this social phenomenon: it focuses on individuals, emphasizes the means of leadership (influence, motivate, enable) and its goal (ef-

fectiveness and success) and addresses leadership in an organizational setting. A more detailed discussion of the definition and its appropriateness for studying leadership in public administration can be found in Vogel (2016, 35 ff.). However, it has to be noted that “ability” has not been chosen carefully, as it indicates a trait-like aspect of leadership, which is not supported by the state of research (DeRue et al., 2011). Instead, “skill” is more appropriate.

From a public sector perspective, it is further helpful to differentiate between political leadership, executed by elected leaders and directed towards development and implementation of policies; community leadership, aiming at collaboration between sectors; and administrative leadership, focusing on the work of appointed leaders within public administrations (Van Wart, 2013).

In this Habilitation, I am mainly interested in administrative leadership, especially the leadership behavior of managers at lower hierarchical levels. As already mentioned, Article 1 (Kroll & Vogel, 2014) studies how mid-level managers’ transformational leadership behavior moderates the relationship between managers’ public service motivation and their use of performance information. Article 5 (Vogel & Kroll, 2019) picks up previous findings (Ham et al., 2015; Jacobsen & Andersen, 2015; Vogel, 2016) on relatively large differences between self and other-perceptions of leadership behavior in public administration, especially when comparing it with private sector organizations (Lee & Carpenter, 2018). Finally, Article 6 (Willems et al., 2019) widens the focus of the Habilitation and includes an aspect of community leadership, therefore taking external stakeholders into account. The article studies the effects of government collaborations between non-profit organizations and public administrations on the reputation of the non-profit partner and, therefore, informs the study of community leadership about reputational effects (Willems et al., 2016) of collaborations and sparks further research on leadership strategies that consider such effects.

OVERVIEW OF STUDIES AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE LITERATURE

This chapter gives an overview of the articles presented in Part II, outlines their contribution to the literature, and explains how they are related.

Table 3.1 summarizes the six articles included in this Habilitation. It also notes the ranking of the journal in which the articles have been published. Two rankings are included: the VHB-JOURQUAL₃ (JQ₃) ranking (<https://vhbonline.org/vhb4you/jourqual/vhb-jourqual-3/>), which dates back to 2015 and the Impact Factor (IF), according to the 2018 Clarivate Journal Citation Report (<https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/solutions/journal-citation-reports/>). All articles are published in international, peer-reviewed journals included in the Social Science Citation Index. The impact factor of the journals ranges from 1.9 to 3.4.

Articles 1, 2, 3, and 4 focus on the motivation of public servants. They also reflect the development of motivation research in public administration over time. While Articles 1 and 2 strongly focus on public service motivation, Article 3 uses it as a starting point to integrate public administration research with concepts and theories from management science and social and organizational psychology. Article 4 does not relate to public service motivation and instead focuses on work engagement and organizational commitment.

Articles 5 and 6 (as well as Article 1) focus on the leadership aspect of this Habilitation. While Articles 1 and 5 are interested in the leadership behavior of managers within the organization (*administrative leadership*), Article 6 is related to the *community leadership* perspective.

The six articles represent a wide variety of research designs and statistical methods. Articles 1, 4, and 5 use cross-sectional designs where the data consists of public servants' responses to questionnaires. Article 2 also uses survey data but, in this case, the data were collected at multiple time points (panel data). Finally, Articles 3 and 6 respond to the call for a "Behavioral Public Administration" (Bhanot & Linos, 2019; Grimmelikhuijsen et al., 2017) and use experimental designs. The applied statistical methods reflect this multitude of research designs, ranging from simple group comparisons (*t*-test and ANOVA) and linear regressions to hierarchical linear models and panel regressions.

The articles also reflect my crowning effort for more open and rigorous research in management science (Starbuck, 2016) and public administration research (Perry, 2017; Zhu et al., 2018). For all my articles, I use non-profit and university repositories to self-archive

Table 3.1: Overview of articles in this Habilitation

No.	Article	JQ ₃	IF
1	Kroll, A., & Vogel, D. (2014). The PSM-leadership fit: A model of performance information use. <i>Public Administration</i> , 92(4), 974–991. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12014	B	2.600
2	Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2016). The stability and change of PSM-related values across time: Testing theoretical expectations against panel data. <i>International Public Management Journal</i> , 19(1), 53–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2015.1047544	B	1.915
3	Vogel, D., & Willems, J. (2020). The effects of making public service employees aware of their prosocial and societal impact: A microintervention study. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> , 30(3), 485–503. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muz044	A	3.407
4	Kroll, A., DeHart-Davis, L., & Vogel, D. (2019). Mechanisms of social capital in organizations: How team cognition influences employee commitment and engagement. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i> , 49(7), 777–791. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019851894	C	2.602
5	Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2019). Agreeing to disagree? Explaining self–other disagreement on leadership behaviour. <i>Public Management Review</i> , 21(12), 1867–1892. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1577910	B	3.162
6	Willems, J., Waldner, C. J., & Vogel, D. (2019). Reputation spillover effects from grant-providing institutions. <i>Nonprofit Management and Leadership</i> , 30(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21357	B	1.917

Note: JQ₃ = VHB-JOURQUAL₃ ranking; IF = Impact Factor according to the 2018 Clarivate Journal Citation Report

the accepted manuscripts and make them available to everyone (i. e., green open access), regardless of their access to scientific journals. If copyright agreements do not allow for this method of self-archiving, I use my personal website. Additionally, I publish the data and analysis code of my articles wherever possible, as I have for Articles 3 and 6. Additionally, I have begun to preregister my research questions, hypotheses, and analyses, which can be seen in Article 3. In this way, I contribute to a stronger separation of confirmatory and exploratory research and help readers assess which results were intended to test *a priori* and which results have been found by exploring the collected data.

ARTICLE 1 (Kroll & Vogel, 2014) examines the use of performance information by public managers. Public administration reforms in the past decades aimed at improving the performance of public administrations and strongly emphasized the use of performance data by public managers (Kroll, 2015; Schedler & Proeller, 2010). Since enforcing the use of performance information is challenging and might have adverse effects, it has to be considered as extra-role behavior; it requires additional effort on the part of the managers and is not extrinsically rewarded. It is, therefore, important to study why public managers nevertheless use performance information. The article sheds light on one potential antecedent of performance information use—users' motivation. It argues that high levels of data use can be observed if managers driven by public service motivation work under transformational leaders. Using a needs–supply perspective on supervisors and followers, the article suggests that there is a PSM–leadership fit, which fosters the performance of this extra-role behavior. The article is based on data from German local governments.

ARTICLE 2 (Vogel & Kroll, 2016) is a response to calls in prior research urging the use of longitudinal analyses to better understand the foundations of public service motivation and related prosocial values (Wright & Grant, 2010). It is widely agreed that sorting out whether public service motivation is stable or developable is crucial for theory-building as well as to tailor hiring practices and human resource development programs. The article summarizes existent theoretical expectations, which turned out to be partially conflicting, and tests them against multiple waves of data from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP), which covers a period of 16 years. It finds that PSM-related values of public employees are stable rather than dynamic, but tend to increase with age and decrease with organizational membership. The article also examines cohort effects neglected in prior work, and finds moderate evidence that there are differences between those born during the Second World War and later generations.

ARTICLE 3 (Vogel & Willems, 2020) relates to practitioners' and scholars' contemporary discussion of what people want in their jobs

and how public and private organizations can succeed in the war for talent (Beechler & Woodward, 2009; Rosso et al., 2010). In this context, it has become obvious that people not only seek high salaries and career opportunities, but also meaningfulness in their daily tasks. Although many public service jobs offer meaningfulness through an opportunity to help others (prosocial impact) or contribute to society (societal impact), employees tend to become accustomed to these positive aspects of their work or forget about them in daily routines. The article tests whether a micro-intervention (Luthans et al., 2006; Thiese, 2014) that emphasizes employees' prosocial or societal impact can increase their well-being, intention to stay in the job, and willingness to recommend their job to others. The combined results of three preregistered experiments reveal that micro-interventions can indeed have these effects, particularly if they focus on creating awareness of the public service jobs' societal impact.

ARTICLE 4 (Kroll et al., 2019) focuses on organizational social capital, which is defined as the structure and quality of relationships between organizational members (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Leana & Van Buren III, 1999). While previous research has shown that organizational social capital benefits organizations and creates performance gains, most of the work examined the relationship at the macro-level based on organizational aggregates. The article studies organizational social capital effects at the micro-level, that is, its impact on important work-related attitudes of employees within organizations. It argues that individual perceptions of organization-wide social capital matter in determining employee attitudes such as work engagement and organizational commitment. It also points to the critical role of team cognition in shaping individual perceptions of social capital in organizations. Using an organizationally representative sample of nearly 1,200 individuals from two local government organizations in North Carolina, it finds support for the indirect effect of team cognition on employee work attitudes. The findings suggest that a promising way to increase the social capital of organizations is through interventions at the team level.

ARTICLE 5 (Vogel & Kroll, 2019) focuses on the perception of leadership behavior and combines puzzling results from previous research with conceptual thoughts. It starts with the observation that leadership research tends to treat differences among ratings of the same leaders as measurement error (Fleenor et al., 2010) and makes such varying perceptions of leadership behavior the main phenomenon of investigation. The article conceptualizes divergent leadership ratings based on the difference between managers' self-ratings and team members' assessments of leadership behavior. Using data from three German public organizations on 51 teams and 190 leader-follower dyads, it finds that divergent leadership ratings are a function of managers' motivation, their use of managerial reflection routines, and team members'

personality. The findings point to the importance of using multisource feedback and developing managers' self- and other-awareness.

ARTICLE 6 (Willems et al., 2019) states that there is a broad academic discussion about the impact of funding grants from a foundation or government department on individual support intentions toward the nonprofit organization receiving the grant (Lu, 2016). However, the role of the grant provider's reputation has frequently been overlooked. This study experimentally tests whether there is a reputation spillover effect of a grant-providing organization. Based on a real-life example, citizens were asked to rate their willingness to donate to a nonprofit organization, and the available information on funding sources were experimentally manipulated. The article tests this for both a government department and a foundation as a grant provider. The results suggest that citizens' awareness about the funding organization, rather than the act of receiving a grant—at least in the case of a foundation—has an impact on support intentions. In contrast, for a prominent government department as a grant provider, the study did not find support for a reputation spillover effect.

REFERENCES OF SYNOPSIS

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2002.5922314> (cit. on p. 12)
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951–968. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.283> (cit. on p. 3)
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY, Free Press. (Cit. on p. 6).
- Beechler, S., & Woodward, I. C. (2009). The global “war for talent”. *Journal of International Management*, 15(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2009.01.002> (cit. on p. 12)
- Bhanot, S. P., & Linos, E. (2019). Behavioral public administration: Past, present, and future. *Public Administration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13129> (cit. on p. 9)
- Campbell, J. P., & Campbell, R. J. (1988). *Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass. (Cit. on p. 5).
- Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1973). *Performance in organizations: Determinants and appraisal*. Glevview, IL, Scott, Foresman. (Cit. on p. 5).
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x> (cit. on p. 7)
- Esteve, M., & Schuster, C. (2019). *Motivating public employees*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press. (Cit. on p. 3).
- Fleenor, J. W., Smither, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Braddy, P. W., & Sturm, R. E. (2010). Self–other rating agreement in leadership: A review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 1005–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.006> (cit. on p. 12)
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S., Olsen, A. L., & Tummers, L. G. (2017). Behavioral public administration: Combining insights from public administration and psychology. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12609> (cit. on p. 9)

- Ham, S.-H., Duyar, I., & Gumus, S. (2015). Agreement of self–other perceptions matters: Analyzing the effectiveness of principal leadership through multi-source assessment. *Australian Journal of Education*, 59(3), 225–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944115603373> (cit. on p. 7)
- Hammerschmid, G., Palaric, E., & Thijs, N. (2018). *A comparative overview of public administration characteristics and performance in EU28*. Luxembourg, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union. (Cit. on p. 4).
- House, R. J., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1), 3–10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516\(01\)00069-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(01)00069-4) (cit. on p. 6)
- Jacobsen, C. B., & Andersen, L. B. (2015). Is leadership in the eye of the beholder? A study of intended and perceived leadership practices and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, 75(6), 829–841. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12380> (cit. on p. 7)
- Kroll, A. (2015). Drivers of performance information use: Systematic literature review and directions for future research. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 38(3), 459–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2015.1006469> (cit. on p. 11)
- Kroll, A., DeHart-Davis, L., & Vogel, D. (2019). Mechanisms of social capital in organizations: How team cognition influences employee commitment and engagement. *American Review of Public Administration*, 49(7), 777–791. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019851894> (cit. on pp. 6, 10, 12, 29)
- Kroll, A., & Vogel, D. (2014). The PSM–leadership fit: A model of performance information use. *Public Administration*, 92(4), 974–991. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12014> (cit. on pp. 6, 7, 10, 11, 23)
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA, Brooks/Cole. (Cit. on p. 5).
- Leana, C. R., & Van Buren III, H. J. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 538–555. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202136> (cit. on p. 12)
- Lee, A., & Carpenter, N. C. (2018). Seeing eye to eye: A meta-analysis of self–other agreement of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(2), 253–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.06.002> (cit. on p. 7)
- Lu, J. (2016). The philanthropic consequence of government grants to nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 26(4), 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21203> (cit. on p. 13)

- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological capital development: Toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3), 387–393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.373> (cit. on p. 12)
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397> (cit. on p. 6)
- O'Toole, L. J., & Meier, K. J. (2011). *Public management: Organizations, governance, and performance*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press. (Cit. on p. 3).
- Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303> (cit. on pp. 5, 6)
- Perry, J. L. (2017). Practicing what we preach! Public administration review promotes transparency and openness. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 5–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12705> (cit. on p. 9)
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976618> (cit. on p. 5)
- Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work motivation in organizational behavior* (2nd ed.). New York, NY, Psychology Press. (Cit. on p. 5).
- Rainey, H. G. (1982). Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic. *American Review of Public Administration*, 16(4), 288–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027507408201600402> (cit. on p. 5)
- Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass. (Cit. on pp. 3–5).
- Ritz, A. (2009). Public service motivation and organizational performance in Swiss federal government. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(1), 53–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852308099506> (cit. on p. 3)
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public service motivation: A systematic literature review and outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 414–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12505> (cit. on pp. 3, 6)
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001> (cit. on p. 12)
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY, Praeger. (Cit. on p. 6).
- Schedler, K., & Proeller, I. (2010). *Outcome-oriented public management: A responsibility-based approach to the new public management*. Charlotte, NC, Information Age Pub. (Cit. on p. 11).

- Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 387–409. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257080> (cit. on p. 3)
- Starbuck, W. H. (2016). 60th anniversary essay. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839216629644> (cit. on p. 9)
- Terborg, J. R. (1977). Validation and extension of an individual differences model of work performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18(1), 188–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(77\)90028-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(77)90028-9) (cit. on p. 5)
- Terry, L. D. (1995). *Leadership of public bureaucracies: The administrator as conservator*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage. (Cit. on p. 3).
- Thiese, M. S. (2014). Observational and interventional study design types; an overview. *Biochemia medica*, 24(2), 199–210. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2014.022> (cit. on p. 12)
- van Loon, N. M. (2016). Is public service motivation related to overall and dimensional work-unit performance as indicated by supervisors? *International Public Management Journal*, 19(1), 78–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2015.1064839> (cit. on p. 3)
- Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 214–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00281> (cit. on p. 3)
- Van Wart, M. (2013). Administrative leadership theory: A reassessment after 10 years. *Public Administration*, 91(3), 521–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12017> (cit. on pp. 3, 7)
- Vogel, D. (2016). *Führung im öffentlichen sektor: Eine empirische Untersuchung von Einflussfaktoren auf das Führungsverhalten*. Potsdam, Germany, Universitätsverlag Potsdam. <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:kobv:517-opus4-89214>. (Cit. on p. 7)
- Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2016). The stability and change of PSM-related values across time: Testing theoretical expectations against panel data. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(1), 53–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2015.1047544> (cit. on pp. 6, 10, 11, 25)
- Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2019). Agreeing to disagree? Explaining self–other disagreement on leadership behaviour. *Public Management Review*, 21(12), 1867–1892. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1577910> (cit. on pp. 7, 10, 12, 31)
- Vogel, D., & Willems, J. (2020). The effects of making public service employees aware of their prosocial and societal impact: A microintervention study. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(3), 485–503. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muzu044> (cit. on pp. 6, 10, 11, 27)

- Vogel, R. (2006). *Zur Institutionalisierung von New Public Management: Disziplinardynamik der Verwaltungswissenschaft unter dem Einfluss ökonomischer Theorie* (1st ed.). Wiesbaden, Germany, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag. (Cit. on p. 3).
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY, Wiley. (Cit. on p. 5).
- Willems, J. (2019). Leadership, performance, and reputation: A multi-method empirical view on the public and nonprofit sectors [Habilitation synopsis]. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/np9e3>. (Cit. on p. 4)
- Willems, J., Jegers, M., & Faulk, L. (2016). Organizational effectiveness reputation in the nonprofit sector. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 39(2), 454–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2015.1108802> (cit. on p. 7)
- Willems, J., Waldner, C. J., & Vogel, D. (2019). Reputation spillover effects from grant-providing institutions. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21357> (cit. on pp. 7, 10, 13, 33)
- Wright, B. E., & Grant, A. M. (2010). Unanswered questions about public service motivation: Designing research to address key issues of emergence and effects. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 691–700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02197.x> (cit. on p. 11)
- Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review*, 72(2), 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x> (cit. on p. 3)
- Zhu, L., Witko, C., & Meier, K. J. (2018). The public administration manifesto II: Matching methods to theory and substance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muy079> (cit. on p. 9)

Part II

ARTICLES

ARTICLE 1: THE PSM–LEADERSHIP FIT: A MODEL
OF PERFORMANCE INFORMATION USE

Kroll, A., & Vogel, D. (2014). The PSM–leadership fit: A model of performance information use. *Public Administration*, 92(4), 974–991. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12014>

Open access version:
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:517-opus4-100853>

ARTICLE 2: THE STABILITY AND CHANGE OF
PSM-RELATED VALUES ACROSS TIME:
TESTING THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS
AGAINST PANEL DATA

Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2016). The stability and change of PSM-related values across time: Testing theoretical expectations against panel data. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(1), 53–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2015.1047544>

Open access version:
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:517-opus4-397783>

ARTICLE 3: THE EFFECTS OF MAKING PUBLIC
SERVICE EMPLOYEES AWARE OF THEIR
PROSOCIAL AND SOCIETAL IMPACT: A
MICROINTERVENTION STUDY

Vogel, D., & Willems, J. (2020). The effects of making public service employees aware of their prosocial and societal impact: A microintervention study. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(3), 485–503.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muz044>

Open access version: <https://vogel-online.info/publication/20-jpart-prosocial-societal-impact/>

ARTICLE 4: MECHANISMS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN ORGANIZATIONS: HOW TEAM COGNITION INFLUENCES EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT AND ENGAGEMENT

Kroll, A., DeHart-Davis, L., & Vogel, D. (2019). Mechanisms of social capital in organizations: How team cognition influences employee commitment and engagement. *American Review of Public Administration*, 49(7), 777–791.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019851894>

Open Access version: <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/utrmn>

ARTICLE 5: AGREEING TO DISAGREE?
EXPLAINING SELF-OTHER DISAGREEMENT
ON LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Vogel, D., & Kroll, A. (2019). Agreeing to disagree? Explaining self-other disagreement on leadership behaviour. *Public Management Review*, 21(12), 1867–1892.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1577910>

Open access version: <https://vogel-online.info/publication/pmr-self-other-agreement/>

ARTICLE 6: REPUTATION SPILLOVER EFFECTS FROM GRANT-PROVIDING INSTITUTIONS

Willems, J., Waldner, C. J., & Vogel, D. (2019). Reputation spillover effects from grant-providing institutions. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(1), 9–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21357>

COLOPHON

This Habilitation was typeset in L^AT_EX using the fonts *Palatino* and *AMS Euler* (chapter numbers) by Hermann Zapf and Donald Knuth. It uses the typographical look-and-feel `classicthesis` developed by André Miede and Ivo Pletikosić. The style was inspired by Robert Bringhurst's seminal book on typography "*The Elements of Typographic Style*". `classicthesis` is available for both L^AT_EX and L^YX:

<https://bitbucket.org/amiede/classicthesis/>

Final Version as of July 11, 2020.