Motivation for public service : perspective of self-determination theory (SDT)

Xu, Chengwei

2017

Xu, C. (2017). Motivation for public service : perspective of self-determination theory (SDT).
Doctoral thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10356/72757>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10356/72757>

**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

SINGAPORE

**MOTIVATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE:
PERSPECTIVE OF SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY**

XU CHENGWEI

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

2017

**MOTIVATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE:
PERSPECTIVE OF SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY
(SDT)**

XU CHENGWEI

School of Social Sciences

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University in
partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

2017

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to convey my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Chen Chung-An, for his guidance. Prof. Chen provided me with great support throughout my PhD research project. I met and discussed about my research regularly while I was conducting it. Always patient and open-minded, he made me feel welcome and at ease. He has set a very positive example for my future career. With his direction, I managed to publish two papers in the third year of my study. Additionally, Prof. Chen also provided much financial support for me. I used to be a self-funded student in the first two semesters, after which he had hired me as a part-time research assistant, giving me much support. Hence, I am really grateful to Prof. Chen for both his academic, and financial support.

Next, I would like to say a big thank you to Prof. Yu Wenxuan and Prof. Wang Jue who are my thesis advisors. Prof Yu helped me a lot with my research and journal publications. PPGA professors, including Prof He Baogang, Prof Zhang Zhibin, Prof Christophor Holman, Prof Kim Soojin, and Prof Wu Wei, have been very approachable and helpful, providing me with valuable training and guidance.

Third, I would like to show my gratitude to my wife for accompanying me. She made my life with love and joy, making me more optimistic throughout this journey. I also want to thank my parents, and other family members for their constant support. Last but not the least, I would like to thank my friends from CPC, the HSS graduate students, and FES graduates' fellowship group for their encouragement and help over the past four years.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	6
Summary	7
Essay 1: Moving from public service motivation to motivation for public service.....	9
Introduction	9
Public service motivation research: success and failures	10
Critiques and reflection	16
Reorientation of public service motivation research by SDT	23
Conclusion.....	32
Essay 2: The motivations for job selection in public sector: Investigating the contents and typologies	36
Introduction	36
Literature Review	39
Understanding motivation for job selection through Self-Determination Theory.....	47
Methodologies.....	51
Study 1.....	53
Study 2.....	57
Study 3.....	65
Findings and Discussions	71
Conclusion.....	76
Essay 3: The motivations for public service: motivation typologies and integration.....	79
Introduction	79
Motivation for public service: a quick review.....	82
Using Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to Understand Motivation for Public Service Behavior	88
Methods.....	93
Results and Findings	98
Discussion and conclusion	107
References	112
Appendixes.....	138

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Self-Determination Theory (SDT).....	26
Table 2.1 Interviewees.....	55
Table 2.2 Motivations for job selection in public sector.....	56
Table 2.3 The distribution in different level of government.....	58
Table 2.4 Total Variance Explained.....	60
Table 2.5 Rotated Component Matrix ^a	62
Table 2.6 Descriptive statistics.....	70
Table 2.7 Comparison of different type of motivations.....	70
Table 3.1 Interviewees.....	94
Table 3.2 Gender.....	98
Table 3.3 Age group.....	98
Table 3.4 Tenure group.....	98
Table 3.5 Motivation factors for public service (CFA).....	100
Table 3.6 Measurement scale for AMPS ($\alpha=0.774$).....	103
Table 3.7 Correlation analysis.....	104
Table 3.8 Regression model for MJS and NS.....	105
Table 3.9 Regression model for Job satisfaction and MPS ^a	107

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Confirmatory factor analysis.....	67
Figure 3. 1 Confirmatory factor analysis on MPS.....	101
Figure 3. 2 The effects of MJS and NS on AMPS.....	103
Figure 3. 3 Interaction effect between NS and IMJS on AMPS.....	106
Figure 3. 4 Interaction effect between NS and CMJS on AMPS.....	106

Motivation for Public Service Behavior: Perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Summary

This thesis consists of three self-contained essays on motivational studies. In the first essay, I review and reflect on the existing literature that addresses the motivation for public service, and then debate the definitions of public service motivation (PSM) with relative concepts such as prosocial motivation, altruism, values, beliefs, attitudes, etc. Public service motivation (PSM), “the motivation to serve the public,” is a form of prosocial motivation. It was proposed in 1990 as a major research theme in public administration within the scope of altruism. PSM refers to people’s commitment to public interest, compassion, and interest in policy making. However, this is misleading as prosocial motivation is never purely altruistic in nature. For example, many high ranking public officials make public policies simply due to media pressure or public scrutiny. Therefore, I use the motivational typology in the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to debate the multi-dimension of motivation for public service. Based on SDT, a new construct, the motivation for public service (MPS), is proposed to analyze public employees’ motivations. Our new SDT-based approach shows that there cannot be a universal measurement tool for motivations. Scholars need to first identify a given public service behavior, and then develop measures for intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation for this behavior.

The second essay investigates the motivational factors that drive people to seek public sector jobs. Grounded in semi-structured interviews and a questionnaire, this study systematically investigates people’s motivation for job selection (MJS) in the government, through the lens of the Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Qualitative analysis shows that individuals’ MJS in public sector contain both altruistic

motives and non-altruistic motives. The factor analysis supports that MJS falls into the five motivation categories by SDT: internal motivation, identified motivation, instrumental motivation, introjected motivation and external motivation. Based on this, a measurement scale for MJS was proposed. The findings have the potential for future knowledge development and practical implications.

In the third essay, I examine street-level public employees' motivations for a public service career (MPS). Both interview and questionnaire are employed to test hypotheses. I obtain the following findings: First, employees stay in the public sector due to multiple reasons. In general, the reasons fall into five categories, as suggested in self-determination theory (SDT): intrinsic motivation (e.g. loving to serve people), identified regulation (e.g. valuing contribution to the society), instrumental regulation (e.g. easier to get married), introjected regulation (e.g. parents expecting me to stay), and external regulation (e.g., lacking opportunity or earning benefits). This finding shows that some employees voluntarily stay whereas some are compelled to stay. Second, those whose stay is voluntary, as expected, exhibit more positive work attitudes. By contrast, those who stay due to external pressure exhibit less positive work attitudes. Finally, in determining whether employees' stay is voluntary or compelled, perceived current working condition plays a crucial role. In cases where employees didn't demonstrate a strong interest in public service in initial job selection, the perception of high autonomy and high relatedness may in their current organization can even foster their intention of voluntary stay. I provide theoretical and practical suggestions based on these findings.

Essay 1: Moving from public service motivation to motivation for public service

Introduction

Over the past two decades, the motivation for public service has become a major focus of public administration research (Perry, 2014). It is generally expected that good public servants should have a high level of commitment to the civil service. Therefore, “knowing why people are willing to engage in public service is an urgent task”(Perry, 2014). The majority of motivation studies follow Perry and Wise’s approach (Perry & Wise, 1990): Public Service Motivation (PSM), which was defined as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations.” Compared to private employees, scholars believe that public employees have a higher willingness to contribute to the public interests or serve people (Kjeldsen, 2012; Perry, 2000). The study of PSM has achieved remarkable growth since 1990 (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Perry, 2014; Prebble, 2014; Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010). From 2000 to 2010, more than 125 articles were published in the peer-reviewed public administration journals (Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010). And this number doubled from 2011 to 2016 (Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016). When PSM literature kept growing in the U.S., scholars from Europe and Asia countries tried to introduce this theory to different cultures. Ritz and Brewer (2013) found that more than 43 countries have been involved in PSM research.

While PSM research has made significant progress, it has spawned a variety of critiques regarding its ambiguous definition (Bozeman and Su, 2014). For example, It has more than 23 definitions and 42 new measurements (Prebble, 2014). PSM is often interchangeable with altruistic motivation or prosocial motivation, and the measures of contemporary PSM (e.g., compassion) contain both values and attitudes (Taylor 2008), making PSM less likely to be a form of ‘motivation.’ With these flaws, I suggest that scholars investigate motivations for public service based on a mature motivation theory: Self-Determination Theory (SDT). In the following section, I will review the PSM literature, and discuss the success and deficiencies; then debate the conceptualization problem and propose a new approach for motivation study. In the last section, I will introduce SDT-based motivation typology and how to apply SDT in public service motivation study.

Public service motivation research: success and failures

Introduction of public service motivation research

The concept was firstly proposed by Rainey in 1982, and then defined by Perry and Wise in 1990. Only after Perry (1996) gave the measurement scale and made PSM a more scientific construct, PSM started to attract increasing attention from PA scholars. During the 1990s, PSM literature mainly focused on conceptualization and measurement development (Brewer, Selden, & Facer II, 2000; Francois, 2000;

Crewson, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996, 1997, 2000). After 2000, scholars started to test the validity of PSM construct and measurement from different types of empirical studies. Many studies made an effort to build a cross-cultural measure, such as Kim and his colleagues' 12-item scale (Kim et al., 2013). These studies also examined the casual factors and outcomes of PSM (Chen & Hsieh, 2015; Chen, Hsieh, & Chen, 2014; Moynihan, 2010; Liu, Tang, & Zhu, 2008; Kim, 2006; Vandenabeele, Scheepers, & Hondeghem, 2006; Scott & Pandey, 2005; Bright, 2005; Alonso & Lewis, 2001; Houston, 2000). Perry (2014) concludes that the longitudinal development embraces three waves. The first wave of studies focused on definition and measurement development; the second wave examined the theory by confirmation and international diffusion; now we are in the third wave, but the themes in this wave are still uncertain. During the past decade, researchers' primary interests include how PSM develops, and what effects PSM has on individuals and organizations. The literature on the PSM's antecedents shows that both individual factors and institutional factors influence a person's PSM level.

The individual factors include demographic characteristics, income, working duration, religious socialization, professional identification, and political ideology (Chen et al., 2014; Ward, 2014; Vandenabeele, 2011; Pandey & Stazyk, 2008; Perry, Coursey, Brudney, & Littlepage, 2008; Camilleri, 2007; DeHart-Davis, Marlowe, & Pandey, 2006; Bright, 2005; Perry, 1997). Institutional factors include membership in professional organizations, job characteristics, organizational culture,

organizational institutions, reward, leadership, management reform and organizational socialization (Bellé, 2014; Bellé & Ongaro, 2014; Taylor, 2008; Wright, 2007; Camilleri, 2007; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 2000). Furthermore, researchers also examined the effects of PSM on individual behaviors (Bright, 2008; Liu, 2009; Liu et al, 2008; Taylor, 2007; Wright and Pandey, 2008), such as its effect on job satisfaction, commitment, principled reasoning, volunteer behavior, and willingness to blow the whistle (Ertas 2014; Liu and Tang, 2011; Taylor and Westover 2011; Ritz, 2009; Pandey et al, 2008; Bright 2008; Camilleri and van derHeijden 2007; Houston, 2006; Camilleri 2006; Castaing 2006; Houston, 2005; Choi 2004; Brewer and Selden 1998). Additionally, evidence also demonstrates that PSM has positive effects on individual merits and organization performance (Bellé, 2013, 2014; Brewer, Selden, & Facer II, 2000; Kim, 2006; Ritz, 2009; Bright, 2007; Leisink & Steijn, 2009; Naff & Crum, 1999). Indeed, PSM research has attained good success. However, more and more critiques have risen recently. In the next section, I will discuss the challenges of the current public service motivation studies.

The problematic conceptualization of public service motivation

Empirical studies build on constructs and measurement scales. However, the definitions and measures of PSM have received increasing critiques. Several recent studies questioned whether PSM definitions are ambiguous so that the measurements tend to be very diversified as well (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Prebble,

2014; Ward, 2014; Sun & Gu, 2016). Utilizing Gerring's (1990) criteria for a good concept, Bozeman and Su (2015) evaluated the 23 different definitions of PSM and found that different aspects such as motives, beliefs, values, attitudes and actions, have been added to PSM, which violate the "familiarity" and "parsimony" criteria. Since it is often interchangeable with prosocial motivation and altruistic motivation, it is inconsistent with the criterion of "differentiation". This means that PSM should have unique characteristics so that it can be differentiated from other similar concepts. In the following sections, I will review the conceptualization and measures respectively.

The term, public service motivation, was firstly introduced by Rainey (1982). There was no clear definition at that time. It became a scientific concept only after Perry and Wise (1990) gave the definition that PSM is the predisposition to respond to motives primarily grounded in public organizations. Based on field survey, Brewer and his colleagues (2000) found that PSM has very diversified definitions, such as Samaritanism, communitarianism, patriotism and humanitarianism. Research shows increasing disagreements in PSM definitions as PSM literature keeps growing. At least different 25 definitions have been proposed by 2015 (Bozeman & Su, 2015). Except those studies which followed Perry's definitions (Carpenter, Doverspike, & Miguel, 2012; Perry et al., 2008; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Crewson, 1997; Perry & Wise, 1990), many defined PSM as altruistic motivations (Bright, 2008; Houston, 2006; Liu et al., 2008; Perry

& Hondeghem, 2008a; Francois, 2000; Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999), job preferences (Brewer, Ritz, & Vandenabeele, 2012; Clerkin & Coggburn, 2012; Christensen & Wright, 2011; Georgellis & Tabvuma, 2010; Liu et al., 2008; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008b), or prosocial motivations (Andersen, Jørgensen, Kjeldsen, Pedersen, & Vrangbæk, 2013; Braender & Andersen, 2013; Brewer et al., 2012; Clerkin, Paynter, & Taylor, 2009). A more integral explanation for PSM is “a mix of motives that drive an individual to engage in an act that benefits society” (Taylor, 2007). Moreover, scholars asserted that PSM is “characterized as a reliance on intrinsic rewards over extrinsic rewards” (Kim, 2006).

Additionally, a number of PSM studies define PSM as beliefs, values or attitudes (Anderfuhren-Biget, Varone, Giauque, & Ritz, 2010; Perry et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2008; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008b; Wright & Pandey, 2008; Taylor, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2007). For example, Vandenabeele (2007) stated that PSM is the “belief, value 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.” Taylor (2008) believed that PSM is a group of motives, values and attitudes for contributing to public interests; Wright and Pandey agreed that PSM is work-related values; While Perry and Hondeghem (2008b) add components of value and belief into PSM construct. Recently Perry and his colleagues (2010) suggested a more integrated definition, that “PSM is a particular form of altruism or prosocial motivation that is animated by specific

dispositions and values arising from public institutions and missions”. PSM gradually became a complicated construct including altruistic or prosocial motivations, values, beliefs, attitudes, predisposition, etc..

With such confusing definitions, it is not surprised that the measures of PSM are inconsistent. More than 42 different measures have been used to measure the single concept (Prebble 2014). These measures can be classified into 3 types: single-item, a single dimension with multi-items, and multi-dimensions with multi-items. The first measurement scale was designed by Perry (1996), which includes 24 items in four dimensions: attraction to public policy making, commitment to public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice. PSM has attracted increasing attention, which has led to the development of more scales after 1996. Alonso and Lewis (2001) selected five items in the new measurement tool; while Brewer and his collaborators built a three-item scale and another 6-dimension scale with 40 items (Brewer, Selden, & Facer II, 2000; Brewer & Selden, 1998). New scales were also developed after the PSM concept had diffused into different cultures. For example, different measurements emerged in the UK and Germany (Vandenabeele et al., 2006), China (Liu & Tang, 2011; Liu et al., 2008), the Netherlands (Steijn, 2008), Australia (Taylor, 2008), Belgium (Vandenabeele, 2008), Korea (Kim, 2012) and Italie (Bellé, 2013). Scholars even collected data from 12 countries and built a universal scale (Kim et al, 2013). Prebble (2014) reviewed how researchers measured PSM and found that a majority of the studies utilized different scales.

Only five studies directly adopted the same scales by Perry (1996), and eight by Alonso & Leis (2001). It is hard to say that the scales are measuring the same concept, and these varying measures make the research findings incomparable.

Critiques and reflection

As mentioned above, PSM has been added with values, attitudes and beliefs (Bozeman & Su, 2015), which make the definitions complicated and confusing. However, is PSM a type of motivation? Does motivation share the same meaning with value, belief or attitude? Does PSM have to be altruistic or prosocial motivation? I will discuss these concepts in the following section.

Is PSM a type of motivation?

Motivation refers to the reasons for an action. From the Cambridge online dictionary, motivation is “the need or reason for doing something”. It originates from the Latin word “movere”, which means “all reasons for movement” (Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). In academic literature, it is usually defined as the driving factor of behavior (Madsen, 1974). Motivation never stands alone. It is only meaningful when it is linked to a specific behavior. Therefore, Scholars should identify a behavior before they start to investigate motivation.

Compared to motivation, value is more stable. It refers to “standards for judging a certain objective”. Value can be defined as “[the] human subjects’ perspectives and standards, judging whether or not objectives’ existence, nature, and changes are meaningful” (Li, 2014). It helps people or society to judge the meaning of an action

or an object (Cook & Ma, 2014), such as work values and ethical values. Work values refer to personal judgments or beliefs regarding working actions and outcomes, while ethical values refer to judgments towards “good” or “bad” (George & Jones, 2012).

Attitude refers to comprehensive judgment towards an object and contains three components: affect, behaviors tendency and cognition (Myers & Twenge, 2013).

Attitude was defined as a psychological predisposition to express agreement or disagreement by evaluating a given object (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). It helps people with judging objects, influencing behavior, and making a decision (Haddock & Maio, 2013).

From the Cambridge online dictionary and Webster’s online dictionary, belief is defined as “a kind of feeling of being certain that something exists or is good, bad, meaningful or valuable”. In academic literature, belief refers to “an individual’s representation of reality that has enough validity, truth, or credibility to guide thought and behavior” (Harvey, 1986). Belief is characterized by four features: existential presumption, alternatively, affective and evaluative loading, and episodic structure (Nespor, 1987). Beliefs include implicit beliefs and explicit beliefs. And a person may have contradictory beliefs at the same time (Pajares, 1992).

Based on the definitions above, I find motivation to be distinct from value, attitude, and belief. Motivation exists before behavior. Inquiry of motivation becomes

meaningful only when the behavior is specific. Usually, the phrase is like “motivations for a behavior” (motivations for public service). However, value, attitude, and belief do not have a symbiotic relation with behavior. They may exist without any actions even though they can influence behavior. Values, attitudes and beliefs cannot necessarily arouse or preserve actions. For instance, people often do something that is inconsistent with their values, beliefs or attitudes, which is quite different from motivation. PSM is unlikely to be a type of motivation if it was to be defined with values, beliefs and attitudes.

Does PSM relate to non-altruistic motivation?

If PSM is distinct from attitude, value and belief, and it is a type of motivation, then it should be understood as “the motivations for public service behavior”. Bozeman and Su (2015) found that almost all PSM studies narrowed down the scope to pure altruistic motives. Scholars also asserted PSM is a type of intrinsic motivation (Houston & Cartwright, 2007). Undoubtedly, the ultimate goal of public service is prosocial and is targeted at benevolence. In this way, public service behavior is a type of prosocial behavior. However, do motivations of prosocial actions exclude self-interest motives?

The answer is negative. Prosocial motivation is the willingness to do something that benefits others (Batson, 1987; Grant, 2007; Hickey, 2014). However, the motives for prosocial behaviors can either be altruistic, or self-interest as well (Batson & Shaw, 1991; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). For example, when someone

helps others with moving their luggage out of the lift, his motivation could either be selfless helping or that he just wants to reach his floor faster. Another case is when someone gives their seat to the elderly on the MRT, it may be because of compassion or out of fear over others' criticism. For public service behavior such as increasing the budget for community service, we are not sure whether the public employee's motivation is a one of their social responsibility to do good things for the community, or just to seek political power. The purpose may be to certify the division's legitimacy or in response to public pressure, which is then not altruistic. Furthermore, while self-sacrifice is one dimension of the PSM construct, is it holy altruistic? Probably not. In the battlefield, we cannot be sure whether the soldiers charge forward because they are driven by patriotism, or they just want revenge, or because the commander's gun forces them to do so.

If PSM is a sort of holy altruistic motive, how can we name the non-altruistic motives of public service behavior? Scholars simply exclude the self-interest motives and make PSM a superstition. This may be due to the misleading introduction proposed by Rainey and Perry at the very beginning. The early understanding of PSM was based on public ethics and public values but not motivation theories, and so the following researchers kept adding positive values and beliefs, making PSM less likely to be a motivation concept. The current PSM looks like a comprehensive framework which contains values, moral ethics, attitudes and beliefs. It does not include non-altruistic motives. This is why PSM

becomes confusing.

There are two fundamental problems with PSM conceptualization. Firstly, scholars did not identify a specific behavior when defining public service motivation. Secondly, self-interest and extrinsic motives can also drive public service actions. However, most studies simply see PSM as an integrated construct filled with good values and ethics, excluding non-altruistic and extrinsic motives. Subsequently, PSM has become purely altruistic, but biased and confusing as well.

The future of PSM research: time for change?

Increasing criticism on PSM conceptualization predict its potential reconstruction in the future. For most PSM researchers, it seems more acceptable to make slight adjustments or corrections. In reality, scholars have made much effort to refine PSM's definition in the last two decades. However, the understanding of PSM varies dramatically from public employees' motivation to it being a comparative construct that can be applied to both public and private sectors (Perry & Wise, 1990; Steijn, 2008), in reasons for job selection in public sector(Liu et al., 2011), or as altruistic motivation(Taylor, 2007). The measurement has been revised significantly as well (eg. Kim et al., 2013). Hence, the understanding of PSM has turned more and more ambiguous. The adjustments did not solve the conceptualization problems.

As mentioned before, the analysis on motivation becomes meaningless if there is no specific behavior. This means that we must identify the public service behavior

before discussing about public service motivation. However, there are many different types of public service actions, such as decision making, frontline service, etc.. Besides, does public service only refer to public sectors' service? If teaching in public school is a kind of public service, what about teaching in private schools? Public service is a plural notion for there are many different types of public service behaviors. Therefore, we ought not to expect a universal definition, where a global measurement scale would also be vagarious.

Does this mean that we should discard the PSM approach? Most PSM researchers will probably reject this idea, especially those who have made a lifelong effort in this field. Furthermore, we cannot deny PSM has exceptional contributions to the PA discipline. It became an emblematical theory developed in the PA domain where identity crisis has been a challenge (Perry & Vandenabeele, 2015; Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016). It has also been applied in other social sciences, such as management, economics, and political science. In addition to symbolism value, PSM represents an expectation that public servants should internally identify public service as a meaningful, valuable action, and that they should feel happy and satisfied when they serve the people. The performance could possibly be better when workers enjoy their job. Overall, I believe PSM has a unique value and necessity in PA research.

What, then, would be the future direction of PSM research if making adjustments or a universal definition is not plausible? A feasible solution is to keep motivation

for public service (MPS) as a research field while avoiding the use of PSM or Public Service Motivation. The motivation for public service (MPS) should not be added with any values or ethics. It must have a simple and straightforward meaning: **motivations for public service behavior**. Building on this conceptualization, we can discuss different types of motivations based on specific behaviors. In conclusion, future MPS studies should consider the following five aspects:

1. MPS is a neutral concept. It may contain both positive and negative motives (e.g. self-interest motives vs. altruistic motives).
2. Scholars should identify a particular type of public service behavior before studying motivation. Motivation is distinct from values, attitudes, and beliefs.
3. There are different types of public service behaviors. Therefore, we should not expect a universal measurement scale for MPS. Instead, researchers can design different measurements for the various types of public service behaviors.
4. SDT-based motivations have different categories, such as intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, or altruistic motivation and egoistic motivation. Therefore, MPS should not only include intrinsic and altruistic motivations, but also extrinsic and egoistic motivations.

Compared to PSM, the term “motivation for public service (MPS)” has a very different connotation. However, they are not contradictory. PSM theory found that employees in public sectors have stronger prosocial or altruistic predisposition than those in private sectors (Perry & Porter, 1982). Scholars focus on this

predisposition, and discuss how to promote and preserve this trait (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Perry, 1997). The new approach in the present study will not deny the existence and function of altruistic motivation. Nonetheless, I admit that in reality, egoistic motives and extrinsic motives are significant for the public servants' altruistic or prosocial behavior. Hence, MPS is more comprehensive.

5. MPS is different from the motivations for job selection in public sectors. MPS focuses solely on the motives for serving the public in public sectors. It is a type of work motivation. The job seeking behavior is not considered as a type of public service action. However, the motives for job selection should be included in the studies on public employees' motivations.

Based on the aforementioned new approach, I will discuss the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and its application in MPS research in next section. SDT may help scholars understand the motivation typology and why the motivation for public service includes both self-interest motivation and extrinsic motivation. I will also discuss how extrinsic motivations can be integrated into intrinsic motivation.

Reorientation of public service motivation research by SDT

There is a general dichotomy between motivation theories: content and process. There are many examples of content theories such as Theory X and Y, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Two Factor Theory, and Extrinsic – Intrinsic Motivation.

These theories target the connotation of motivation. The process theories investigate how motivation emerges, such as the Equity Theory, Goal Setting, and Expectation Theory. PSM is a content theory. We should introduce a mature content theory, the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), to reorient current public service motivation research.

SDT has been empirically tested in many ways. The SDT-based motivation typology was applied in a variety of disciplines and issues, such as athletes' behavior (Pelletier et al., 1995), marriage and interaction (Blais, Sabourin, Boucher, & Vallerand, 1990), smoking (Williams, Gagné, Ryan, & Deci, 2002), church worship (Baard, 1994), students' learning and performance (Hayamizu, 1997; Vallerand et al., 1992), etc.. Scholars also linked SDT to organizational variables such as leadership, performance, goal-setting, and work attitudes (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Sheldon, Turban, Brown, Barrick, & Judge, 2003; Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). Based on this, a variety of motivation measurement scales were developed to examine the construct in different countries (Gagné et al., 2015; Gagné et al., 2010; Tremblay, BlaNchard, Taylor, Pelletier, & Villeneuve, 2009).

Why is SDT a better tool than other motivation theories to reorientate the current public service motivation research? Firstly, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Theory X – Y and Two Factor Theory do not have enough empirical evidence. Taking Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs for example, an individual may desire self-esteem, even if his safety needs are not met. Secondly, the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy is

over-simplified even if it can include controlled and self-interest public service motives. Additionally, these theories do not answer how motivation changes. For example, how controlled motivations, like forced helping, become autonomous motivations.

On the contrary, SDT has been tested by a number of empirical studies which confirm its motivation typology. Most importantly, SDT explains how extrinsic motivations can be internalized into intrinsic motivations. Therefore, SDT will be a good tool for the reconstruction of public service motivation.

SDT and Motivation Typology

SDT has a long history of development. In the early stages, it discussed about internal motivation, and how external control influences autonomy and internal motivation (Deci, 1971). The first integrative framework was proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) thirty years ago. SDT is distinct from traditional motivation theory. Researchers used to classify motivation by the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. Intrinsic motivation means that an individual does something because of internal interests and the pleasure he or she can experience by doing this action. Extrinsic motivation means that people act because of external rewards or punishments, like physical punishments or monetary rewards. However, the dichotomy of motivation typology is too crude. For example, should we define the motivation for promotion and career development as extrinsic motivation? In some cases, people seek promotion because of honor and self-esteem. This should belong to internal

regulation. To further investigate external motivation, Chen and Bozeman (2013) classified extrinsic motivation into four types: identified regulation, instrumental regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Motivation	Extrinsic				Intrinsic
Regulation	External	Introjected	Instrumental	Identified	Internal
Locus of control	Strong external	Somewhat external	In between	Somewhat internal	Strong internal
Self-determination	-2	-1	0	+1	+2

Source: adapted from Chen and Bozeman (2013)

Identified regulation means that the individual identifies the action as valuable and meaningful. For example, students are driven by internal regulations if they learn mathematics because they like it. However, many students do not like mathematics. They learn it simply because they find math is important for their future career in Engineering or Economics (external conditions). They still have a positive attitude while learning math. Both internal regulation and identified regulation belong to autonomous motivation because personal autonomy is not controlled by external conditions in both cases. In the original SDT motivation typology, there is a type of regulation between internal regulation and identified regulation which is called integrated regulation. However, many studies removed this type as scholars found it difficult to distinguish between identified regulation and integrated regulation (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Gagné et al., 2010). The present study will follow this amendment as well.

Instrumental regulation means that individuals see the action as an instrument to achieve another goal. Instrumental regulation falls into a blurry zone between autonomous regulation and controlled regulation (De Cuyper & De Witte 2008). For example, students learn math because they think it is important when learning economics. Learning math is an instrument to attain another goal.

People falling into introjected regulation do something not because they identify with the value of the activity or the external rewards and punishment, but to avoid anxiety, shame and pressure (Vallerand & Ratelle, 2004). For example, typically, people will not be punished if they do not go to church on Sunday, but for Christian families, it seems impious if they do not go. Those driving by this reason fall into introjected regulation. Another example is giving up seats on the bus. There is no punishment if people do not give seats. However, many people still give up their seats even if they would not like to. This is because they are afraid that other passengers may criticize that they do not have compassion for the weak. They do this in order to avoid anxiety.

External regulation refers to external control, and it can be either reward or punishment. Some managers choose to use contingent performance-based pay, which then becomes an external control of employees (Georgellis, Iossa, & Tabvuma, 2011). Hence, employees are motivated by external regulations. Another example is that students may learn mathematics because they fear their teachers' punishment. People falling into introjected regulation, instrumental regulation, and

external regulation cannot perceive autonomy. That is why these three types of regulations are called controlled motivation (Frey & Jegen, 2001).

These five types of regulation are not mutually exclusive and may exist simultaneously. People may have high internal regulation and identified regulation at the same time (autonomous motivation). Others could have introjected regulation and external regulation in the meantime (controlled motivation). There are, however, very few people seem to have both high internal motivation and external motivation simultaneously as these two can offset each other. Once the autonomous motivation goes up, controlled motivation goes down, which is namely the “motivation crowding” effect (Frey & Jegen, 2001). To capture the collective effects of different types of regulations, the self-determination index (SDI) was developed (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Chen & Bozeman, 2013). Internal regulation has the highest self-determination and is followed by identified regulation. Therefore, they are assigned by +2 and +1 respectively. -2 is assigned to external regulation whereas -1 is assigned to introjected regulation due to a stronger external locus of control attached to external regulation. Instrumental regulation is not included since it lies between autonomous regulation and controlled regulation. Then the equation of SDI is written as:

$$SDI = 2 * (intrinsic\ motivation) + 1 * (identified\ regulation) - 1 * (introjected\ regulation) - 2 * (external\ regulation)$$

SDI has a strong potential in public service motivation study. It can be used in both

recruitment and training of public servants. This is similar to the overall score of PSM. However, the absolute value of SDI is meaningless unless it is used in comparison with different employees. For example, we can compare the SDI of different public managers when they make policies; or compare the teachers' SDI in public schools and private schools. SDI also has the potential to be used in casual analysis. We can investigate why some people tend to be more autonomous in public service, or whether those with a higher SDI would have higher job satisfaction and better wellbeing.

Apply SDT-based motivation typology to study public service behavior: The example of policy-making

Policy-making is a typical type of public service behaviors. In the PSM measurement scale, attraction to public policy-making is an important component. How can we understand the motivation for policy-making through SDT? First of all, policy-makers can be motivated by internal motivation, which means they feel happy when making policies or the job itself is interesting to them. Nevertheless, not every employee is really interested in their work. Some of them may believe policy-making is valuable to the public; or they may find that the job can improve their capability of managing and planning, which would be meaningful for career advancement in the future. People with these motives fall into identified regulation. The people falling into instrument motivation make policies for a separate purpose. Government leaders make many policies due to instrumental motives. For example,

a mayor might increase the budget for city infrastructure because he just wants to make his performance more visible for his upper level leaders.

Furthermore, some policy-makers try to make policies in order to avoid internal anxiety. Anxiety may arise from their compassion when they see that the poor are suffering; or they might just want to avoid the citizens' criticism and change the government's negative image (eg. public servants are lazy and self-interested). The purpose of their actions is to avoid anxiety, which belongs to identified regulation. Lastly, it is also possible that some public officials make policies because of personal interest (rewards). Alternatively, they may be driven by their superior leaders, or even the pressure from citizens and media (punishment). For example, the public officials may be afraid of being blamed or punished if they do not solve problems. This type of motives belongs to external regulation.

The public service behavior could be driven by internal and external motives or egoistic and altruistic motives simultaneously. When a public manager would like to make a good policy, his or her motivation could be that he or she wants to get more experience to improve personal competence (identified regulation); at the same time, he or she also wants to avoid public criticism through the new policy (external regulation). Then, the SDI would be a good tool to investigate how autonomous the policy-makers would be (self-determination). The most interesting issue will be to analyze whether internal motivation will go up when external motivation goes down. Researchers call this phenomenon "internalization", which

is “an active, natural process in which individuals attempt to transform socially sanctioned mores or requests into personally endorsed self-regulations” (Deci & Ryan 2000).

Motivation internalization and its application in public administration agenda

Empirical studies have provided substantial evidence that autonomous motivations predict positive behaviors, and improve performance or morale (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Hayamizu, 1997; Blais et al., 1990). SDT argues that an individual’s motivation for an activity is not constant but may gradually internalize the external regulations into self. For a particular action, the controlled motivation could be integrated into autonomous motivation through internalization. This internalization only occurs when the basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) are supported (Deci & Ryan, 2000). On the contrary, internal motivation moves towards external motivation when the needs are thwarted.

The three basic needs can be linked to many public management issues. Autonomy means the volition to have the freedom of choices and to self-organize actions (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, Witte, Soenens, & Lens, 2010). The public employees’ autonomy is often restricted by external conditions such as political interference, laws and regulations, media supervision, hierarchical control, and red tape (Bozeman & Feeney, 2011). For example, merit pay could thwart the employees’ autonomy and crowd-out internal motivation. Therefore, future studies could investigate the effects of red tape, hierarchical control and merit pay on

internalization and autonomous motivation.

The second agenda would be competency and internalization. Students may find learning math is tough when they do not have any basic knowledge, especially when they are forced to learn it. Learning math can become interesting after the students gain the basic knowledge, which means external regulations could be internalized. The new recruits in public organizations may not really like the service job at the beginning of their career (controlled regulation). After they get enough training, and get familiar with the job content, they may then become autonomous. Future studies can discuss how training courses influence the autonomous motivation of public employees.

Lastly, relatedness refers to an individual's desire to feel connected to other people who are important to him or her (Van den Broeck et al., 2010; Deci & Ryan 2000). For front-line public employees, the relatedness with citizens may affect their motivation. Their relatedness feeling will decrease if the citizens are dishonest, harsh and mean (Blau, 1960). Internal motivation would then go down and the regulation focus would turn to controlled motivation. Future research can investigate how public trust influences the motivations for public service and internalization process.

Conclusion

Motivation study has become one of the key issues in PA research. And PSM has become the dominant approach and has received recognition from economics,

psychology and political science (Perry et al., 2010; Perry & Vandenabeele, 2015). In the first section, I reviewed the longitudinal development of PSM literature and discussed its problematic definition. I found PSM conceptualization has two main flaws: analyzing motivations without an identified behavior and narrowing the motivation of public service down to altruistic and intrinsic motivation. Next, I discussed whether it is reasonable to accept the current PSM definition and make adjustments. Then I concluded that the best strategy is to reorient the concept through SDT. Future studies should try not to use PSM or Public Service Motivation terms so as to avoid confusion. Instead, the phrase, motivation for public service (MPS), should be used, which is understood as motives to do public service. MPS is a type of motivation. It includes both intrinsic motivations and extrinsic motivations. Future researchers should identify a type of public service behavior before starting to address motivations. There are a variety of public service behaviors, and hence, there cannot be a universal measurement scale fit for all public service actions.

The new approach based on SDT has obvious advantages over PSM. Firstly, it has a clear scope. Building on SDT, the new approach, possibly named, “motivation for public service”, must identify a specific behavior prior to investigating motivation. This should not be confused with attitudes, values, beliefs, intrinsic motivation, or prosocial motivation. Secondly, SDT has classified motivation into five types in a continuum. MPS can be either self-interested or extrinsic. This new approach will

be more comprehensive and inclusive than PSM. PSM was created from certain ideal expectations such as altruism, and other-oriented values and motives. It is purely intrinsic. PSM studies usually ignore the dark-side of public employees, causing PSM to disconnect from reality (Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016). MPS builds on SDT and defines public employees' motivations as a type of general human motivations. MPS includes both intrinsic motivations and various external motivations. It sees motivations as a whole, which not only include altruistic motives but also non-altruistic motives. Hence, MPS has better capability to understand reality than PSM.

Thirdly, SDI is a powerful tool in understanding how autonomous a public employee will be when he or she is delivering services for citizens. It estimates the collective effect of internal regulation, identified regulation, instrumental regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. Comparing this with PSM's overall score, which only includes autonomous motives, the SDI value is more inclusive and applicable. Lastly, SDT defines motivation as a continuous spectrum. Controlled regulations can be internalized into autonomous regulations if the basic psychological needs are supported. Public managers can improve the performance and employees' subjective wellbeing by facilitating this internalization process. The internalization theory and the three basic needs have much potential in PA research topics such as red tape, hierarchical control, merit pay, training, and public trust, etc.

In all, through this study, the author urges scholars to apply SDT in analyzing public employees' motivations. In order to avoid confusion, the future studies should use MPS instead of PSM. MPS has much more potential in theoretical development and practical application.

Essay 2: The motivations for job selection in public sector: Investigating the contents and typologies

Introduction

People commonly believe public employees should have high commitment to the civil service (Camilleri, 2006; Perry & Wise, 1990). To guarantee a high quality of public service delivery, it is necessary to understand why people would like to work in public sectors (Wright 2001). This question has been a key concern for both researchers and public managers (Lewis & Frank, 2002; Van de Walle, Steijn, & Jilke, 2015). The motivation studies fall into two categories.

Studies in economics and organizational psychology emphasize on self-interested and external motives. Economists assert that job applicants are more likely motivated by the nature of the job or good working conditions, such as income, pension, insurance, job security and low pressure (Barsoum, 2015; Bullock, Stritch, & Rainey, 2015; Delfgaauw & Dur, 2008; Dur & Zoutenbier, 2014; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Gunderson, 1979; Niskanen, 1971; Tansel, 2004). Furthermore, risk-averse people are more likely to apply public sector jobs (Bellante & Link, 1981; Buurman, Delfgaauw, Dur, & Van den Bossche, 2012). Organization psychologists found that institutional factors have significant effects on job selection in the public sector. For example, a country's economy condition and career-based employment have positive effects on individuals' preferences in public sector positions (Taylor & Taylor, 2015; Van de Walle et al., 2015). Even

some studies show that dishonest people tend to work in public sectors of countries with high corruption (Barfort, Harmon, Hjorth, & Olsen, 2015), while lazy workers can be recruited when individual effort is not verifiable (Delfgaauw & Dur, 2008). Researchers also found that individual demographic characteristics influence sector preferences. For example, women, the higher-educated, and older people are more likely to work in public sector (Blank, 1985; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Van de Walle et al., 2015).

However, theorists from PA argue that civil servants are more likely to be motivated by intrinsic and altruistic motives. Different theories were used to investigate the motivations of public employees, such as public service motivation (PSM), work motivation, reward preferences, and prosocial motivation (Delfgaauw & Dur, 2008; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Perry & Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982; Wittmer, 1991; Bradley E Wright, 2001). Among these, public PSM is the most dominant doctrine. Perry and Wise (1990) defined PSM as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily and uniquely in public institutions and organizations”. Individuals with high PSM are more willing to work in government (Lewis & Frank, 2002; Perry et al., 2010; Perry & Wise, 1990; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008a; Wright, 2008; Wright & Christensen, 2010).

These perspectives, however, are inconsistent. Some scholars suggest combining these different types of thoughts (Delfgaauw & Dur, 2008; Van de Walle

et al., 2015). For example, Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) pointed out that both self-interested and altruistic workers are attracted to public service, where lazy workers are driven by external incentives while intrinsic factors motivate the dedicated employees. Another most recent study from Van de Walle, Steijn and Jilke (2015) found both PSM (intrinsic) and extrinsic motivations have a significant influence on individuals' sector employment preference.

However, studies integrating various motivation styles are still underdeveloped. PSM researchers tend to be reluctant to external motives (Bozeman & Su, 2014; Perry & Wise, 1990; Wright, 2008). When the PSM construct was narrowed down to purely intrinsic and altruistic motivations, it became problematic for knowledge communication and became disconnected with reality (Bozeman & Su, 2014; Prebble, 2014; Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016).

To address these deficiencies, some scholars suggested linking mature motivation theories with public service motivation research, such as SDT (Chen, 2014; Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Pedersen, 2015; Vandenabeele, 2007, 2014b). Xu and Chen (2016) advised that SDT is a useful tool in analyzing public employees' motivation for job selection. They proposed a new framework, Motivation for Public Service (MPS), to integrate different types of motivations. Based on SDT motivation typology, MPS provides an integrative analytic framework, which includes five dimensions: internal motivation, identified motivation, instrumental motivation, introjected motivation, and external motivation. This inclusive

framework has the potential to be used to analyze public employees' motivations for various actions. Although seeking a public service job and doing public service are distinct, scholars generally do not differentiate them when discussing public employees' work motivation. Probably this is because selecting a public service career is the precondition for conducting public service. In this regard, selecting a public service job can be regarded as a special type of public service behaviors.

Therefore, SDT-based MPS framework is used to address the motivation for job selection (MJS) in public sectors. More specifically, I will try to identify the various motives that drive public employees' job selection behavior in government through interviews, and then empirically test the SDT-based motivation typology. Another purpose of this study is to develop a measurement scale for motivation for job selection.

Literature Review

In the following section, I will briefly review the relative literature such as public choice theory, PSM, Confucianism, SDT, and other relative theories. Methodologies, including the interviews and surveys, will then be presented; and the fourth section displays the data analysis and results. Lastly, the implications of our findings and limitations are discussed.

Public Choice and Job Selection

The public choice theory (PCT) opposes the spirit of PSM. Based on PCT,

public employees are rational, self-interested, and utility maximizing (Mueller, 1976; Williamson, 1985; Schwartz, 1994). PCT studies usually view individuals' behavior as analogous to the market. Since all individuals are egoistic, they can mutually benefit from exchange. To guarantee voluntary exchange, laws and property right protection become necessary with regards to public service. However, the provision of collective goods requires resource inputs. Everyone will be better off if everyone contributes. However, one member may try to maximize his or her net benefits if he or she does not contribute (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971). So, free riding inevitably exists. Linking PCT to job selection, personal interests are the main consideration. Individuals cannot be expected to act voluntarily for public goods (Olson, 2009). According this view, external factors such as income, job security, and power are important driving forces for public employees to participate in public service.

PSM was created to challenge PCT in that the public choice may not be true, where many empirical studies show that people may also be altruistic and voluntary under certain circumstances (Perry, 1990; Perry, 1986). In the following section, I will briefly introduce public service motivation.

Public Service Motivation

Public service motivation is distinct from extrinsic or self-interested motives, and is more likely a particular form of intrinsic or altruistic motivation (Delfgaauw & Dur,

2008; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010; Perry & Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982; Rainey & Steinbauer, 1999; Wright, Perry, & Hondeghem, 2008). Public service motivation contains four sub-dimensions: attraction to public policy, commitment to public interest, compassion and self-sacrifice (Perry, 1996). According to definition, these four dimensions should be positively linked to public employees' motivation for job selection which has been confirmed by many empirical studies (Lewis & Frank, 2002; Perry et al., 2010; Perry & Wise, 1990; Steijn, 2008; Vandenabeele, 2008a; Wright, 2008; Christensen, 2009; Wright & Christensen, 2010). PSM usually predicts the possibility of joining public service (Tschirhart et al 2008; Wright & Christensen 2010). However, the findings are somewhat mixed. Some scholars find that PSM and extrinsic motives are both important to public sector preference (Van de Walle, Steijn, & Jilke, 2015). PSM may not directly lead to public sector preference but to service-oriented jobs (regardless of sector) (Christensen & Wright, 2011). Gabris and Simo (1995) indicate that individuals' motivations to work in public sector are not exclusively different. People do not have predisposed career intention in choosing jobs. But they are selecting jobs based on their latent motivational needs (Gabris & Simo, 1995). And many individuals select public sector jobs by chance (Lewis & Frank, 2002). Public employees show equal motivational needs as non-profit and private counterparts such as money, career advancement, and job security (Lewis & Frank, 2002; Gabris & Simo, 1995). Individuals with high PSM prefer public service jobs.

But the effect is somewhat weak (Lewis & Frank, 2002).

Public service motivation studies usually regard public service behavior as a whole. Few studies distinguish the motivation for selecting public service jobs from the motivations for serving the public. In the most pioneering article of PSM, the motives of individuals “to join and remain with public organizations” are the same thing (Perry, 1990). In the early stage of PSM development, it is more likely a kind of value or characteristic of those job applicants and public employees. It shapes peoples’ action when they decide to apply public service jobs as well as when they are serving the citizens. Based on the discussion above, PSM, as a type of intrinsic motivation and altruistic motivation, may have positive effects on job selection in public sectors.

Reciprocal Determinism Theory

According to the reciprocal determinism theory (EDT) and the social learning theory, behavior is not unidirectional and jointly determined by person, behavior and environment (Bandura, 1978). Observational learning has significant effects on observers’ behavior (Bandura, 1977). This is consistent with SDT and MPS analytic frameworks proposed by Xu and Chen (2016). Internal motives and identified motives can be person factors. Behavior factors are reflected by introjected motives. For example, many job applicants choose public employment due to the influence of their friends or relatives who have been in the government. Environmental factors are more likely reflected by

external motives. I think that both SDT and EDT are effective analytic approaches for MJS and MPS.

However, MJS is rather unidirectional in this thesis. MJS is not a continuous action, such as studying math or delivering public service. It is rather a one-time-purchasing behavior. The action starts from filling the job application forms, and ends when the application forms are submitted. MJS action could even end once the decision of applying the public service job is made. In this thesis, I investigate individual's MJS by asking "Why did you decide to apply for public service jobs?" People usually choose to apply for a government job based on limited information. For example, the applicants may have no idea about the job contents, structure or the work environment. Therefore, factors such as position, job structure, and maturity levels may not be the real factors influencing MJS.

According to EDT, MJS can be influenced by personal factors, behaviors, and external environment. For instance, MJS can be driven by interests, power pursuit, sunk cost, or peer pressure. Interest and love of power reflects personal factors. While sunk cost reflects the experience of his or her efforts in applying for the job such as participating in tutorials, preparing for examinations and interviews. The higher the sunk cost an individual pays, the more willingness he or she has to apply for the job. Peer pressure from the environment is considered as an introjected motivation by SDT. A person is more likely to

apply for a public service job when the majority of his or her friends, or colleagues, do the same thing. Therefore, I assume public employees' motivation is a neutral and inclusive concept, which contains both personal and environment motives.

Self-Determination Theory and motivation for job selection

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) views motivation as a continuum from intrinsic motivation, to different types of extrinsic motivation, to amotivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Extrinsic motivations include integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Amotivation means that individuals completely lack motivation or act passively, do not value an activity and consequently do not believe that it will yield the desired outcome. In the present study, amotivation is not included because people making efforts to apply for public sector jobs are unlikely to be amotivated. Intrinsic motivation, integration, and identification are defined as self-determined motivations while amotivation, introjected motivation, and external regulation are non-self-determined motivations (Tremblay et al 2009). The SDT-based motivation typology is introduced in the first essay (see Table 1.1).

A number of empirical studies show that autonomous motivations lead to better performance and psychological wellbeing (Deci & Ryan, 2008). For example,

intrinsic motivation and identified motivation have positive effects on job satisfaction and affective commitment, and negative effects on turnover intention. Introjected motivations have a positive influence on affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention. External motivation has negative consequences on satisfaction and commitment, but positive effects on turnover intention (Chen & Bozeman, 2013).

An individual's motivation for a certain action is not changeless. Under certain circumstances (e.g., being satisfied with the basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness), extrinsic regulations can be gradually internalized as intrinsic regulations through integration (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013). For example, someone trying to apply for a public position due to their parents' pressure at the beginning may find the job fascinating later. In this case, the regulation style moves from external regulation to internal regulation.

Based on SDT, individuals' motivation of job selection can be categorized into five types: internal regulation, identified regulation, instrumental regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. Based on different levels of autonomy (or self-determination), all these motivations can be categorized into autonomous motivations and controlled motivations. Autonomous motivations contain intrinsic motivations and identified regulation, while controlled motivations include introjected regulation, and external regulation.

Chinese Culture and Job Selection

Confucian philosophy has significant cultural and behavioral influence on the Chinese job preference, as well as those in the East –Asian countries that share the same cultural roots (Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Yum, 1988; Frederickson, 2002). Confucius' social philosophy largely emphasizes filiality, compassion, and loving others. Several golden rules for Confucians include: “Never do anything to others if you do not wish for yourself”, and “Since you yourself desire standing then help others achieve it, since you yourself desire success then help others attain it”¹. To maintain harmonious relations, people should fulfill obligations according to their family roles in the vertical generation lines. Meanwhile, people also should play roles in the extended family, such as community and political bureaucracy. Devotion and caring for others' well-being, social order, and ritual forms of and rules of propriety are highly emphasized. This is consistent with civic duty or altruism in PSM studies (Perry, 1996; Yung, 2014). Yung (2014) indicates that Confucianism shares three traits with PSM: compassion, self-sacrifice, and a commitment to public interest.

Confucianism also emphasizes on respecting and maintaining social hierarchy, which has great influence on social psychology these days (Huntington, 1991). People on the top of the hierarchy enjoy great privilege and power. This becomes an important incentive for people at the bottom to pursue advancement. For

¹ <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/confucius/>

Confucians, public service is the prime job for well-educated people (Frederickson, 2002; Yung, 2014). In China, Japan, and Korea, both the government and families view education as an investment that would bring social and economic benefits (Frederickson, 2002). Working in the government means privilege, respect and social status. Education and becoming an official has long been the only way for the underprivileged to move upwards. Now, public employment is the most attractive job in China. In 2016, only one person out of a hundred can succeed in the competition for public employment. It can be assumed that Chinese culture, rooted in Confucianism, has significant influence on individuals' job preferences.

Understanding motivation for job selection through Self-Determination Theory

Though most existing studies focus on one or two types of motivations, SDT suggests a more inclusive and comprehensive approach. Those government job applicants can be driven by both intrinsic and extrinsic motives. Individuals may apply government jobs because they like the job contents (intrinsic motivation), or because they cannot find a better job after graduating (external motivation). In the following paragraphs, I will use SDT and MPS to deconstruct individuals' motivation for selecting public service jobs.

Intrinsic motivation

PSM theory argues that intrinsic motivation is a key reason for a particular

group of people to pursue employment in public service. For example, some people feel happy and satisfied when delivering public services. For these people, working in the public sector itself is a reward, and is a good fit for their preference. They are internally motivated when they apply for the public position. As aforementioned, public servants driven by internal motivation may have higher job satisfaction, better performance, organization commitment, a healthier life, and greater intention to retain job. This situation is ideal for both the employers and employees.

Identified regulation

Identified regulation concerns how much the job applicants perceive public service as a valuable activity or a behavior consistent with their value system (Chen, 2014). There are two sub-types of identified motivation: identified values for self and identified values for the community, society, or country. Firstly, individuals may value public service because the job titles bring them reputation (Jurkiewicz, Massey, & Brown, 1998; Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2006). For example, people in many Asian countries believe that public servants have a higher social status and reputation. Hence, they make efforts to apply for public positions because they identify values for themselves. Secondly, individuals may apply for public jobs because they believe government service is meaningful to society. They may find that ‘having the power to make a difference in the community’ and ‘doing work that is consistent with one’s moral values’ captures the altruistic value embedded in public service (Lyons et al., 2006; Mann, 2006).

Instrumental regulation

Job applicants driven by instrumental motives may have no interest in public service itself. However, they may see the public service job as a stepping stone that helps them attain a more meaningful goal. For example, many people may hope to work for the government because the career has a high level of job security and good social welfare (Van de Walle et al., 2015). In this case, the job applicants do not actually like public service but see the job as an instrument to pursue stability or other benefits, such as work-life balance.

Introjected regulation

Introjection represents how social norms and institutions shape individuals' behavior. Government employment is still very popular amongst the Asian society. For example, more than 1,400,000 Chinese people applied for public service jobs when the central government opened 22,000 positions in 2015². Many young people seek government jobs because they find that their friends or relatives are doing well in the government, while social comparison with peers influences their perceptions and attitudes (Buunk, Collins, Taylor, VanYperen, & Dakof, 1990; Festinger, 1954). Parents' attitudes have a significant impact on individuals' job selection as well. Many parents hope that their children will work in the government because they believe public servants have a higher social status. Their children, not wanting to let their parents down, may try to do what their parents

² <http://www.chinanews.com/gn/2014/11-30/6828456.shtml>

want. Sunk cost is another case of introjected motivation. Due to fierce competition, the job applicants will usually be required to pay a huge cost – both time and money – for preparation. This sunk cost deters them from giving up the chance.

External regulation

Behaviors are regulated by external motivations when people do something to avoid punishment or pursue external rewards. In the case of job selection, a forced decision often stems from one's lack of job choices (Bozeman & Ponomariov, 2009; Feeney, 2008). Many graduates do not know what kind of job they can do since they have no idea of what the job contents are. Conversely, they could have failed in the career options they wanted, and hence, could have resorted to applying for government jobs. Experienced private sector workers usually apply for jobs in the public sector because they do not like the competition or workload in the private sector. Financial benefits are another type of external regulations. In some developing countries, many applicants from the small cities are attracted to the high salary offered to public servants. Moreover, when corruption is prevalent in an economy and public servants seem to be wealthier, the applicants will be motivated by these possible intangible benefits.

Based on the public choice theory, public service motivation, the reciprocal determinism theory, and the Self-Determination Theory discussed above, the motivation for job selection (MJS) in public sectors is a very much inclusive construct that contains both intrinsic motivations and external motivations. The

Self-Determination Theory provides a comprehensive analytic approach when analyzing MJS. MJS can be categorized into five types: internal regulation, identified regulation, instrumental regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. In the following sections, surveys and factor analysis will be used to examine and validate the MJS construct.

Methodologies

From the discussion above, people selecting public jobs can be driven by both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The motivation for job-selection (MJS) in the public sector falls into five styles: internal motivation, identified motivation, instrumental motivation, introjected motivation, and external motivation. Therefore, based on the literature, the current study conducts interviews through questions that capture different dimensions of public employees' motivation for job selection. Then I empirically test whether public employees' motivations for job selection fall into the expected categories of SDT and how strong they are.

Public service jobs are popular in most Asian countries, especially in East – Asian countries that share the same cultural roots (Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Yum, 1988). Initially I planned to conduct this study in Singapore. However, I realized that it would be very difficult to collect data from the Singapore government after I interviewed three public servants in early 2015. Hence, I turned to my home country, China, due to data availability and budget. China could be a very good

case to investigate public employees' motivation for job selection. Government jobs are the most popular among young Chinese graduates, and more than one million job applicants compete for the limited job openings each year. In 2016, 1,998,000 applicants competed for 15659 positions³ in the public sector. Currently, the Chinese government has the largest number of public servants in the world. Recently, an increasing number of motivation studies are collecting data from China (Bangcheng, Chun, Jin, Wensheng, & Xinli, 2011; Bangcheng, Ningyu, & Xiaomei, 2008; Kim et al., 2013; Li & Wang, 2014; Liu, 2009; Liu, Zhang, & Lv, 2014). Based on SDT, public employees' motivations for job selection can be categorized into five continuous motivational types. Whichever cultures people come from, SDT is a universal tool in analyzing motivations. It even caters to people who emphasize on different types of motivation. For example, people in North America may emphasize on internal motives like PSM, while East-Asians may emphasize on external motivations such as family expectation, power, worship of officialdom, etc. (Liu, Tang, Zhu, 2008; Russell, 1969). I believe that China is a suitable location for data collection, to build a universal theory. China is not only a reprehensive setting for studying motivation for job selection in the East-Asian context, but also a case for SDT-based motivation studies at large.

The data collection was conducted from 2015 to 2016. To investigate job applicants' MJS, three studies are conducted. Firstly, I conducted 50 interviews

³ Source: http://www.chinagwy.org/html/xwsz/zyxw/201601/21_136979.html

with semi-structured questions. Based on content analysis on the data collected from interviews, 21 motivation items were extracted. These 21 items were carefully read and categorized by researchers. Seven dimensions are proposed. Then, the 21 motivation items were translated into questionnaires and 178 responses (the response rate is 80.9%) were utilized to run EFA. EFA results show that six dimensions are extracted. Lastly, I conducted second round of questionnaire survey with same methods. 313 samples were used for CFA analysis. The detailed methods will be introduced in the following section.

Study 1

In study 1, two rounds of interviews were conducted. The first round of interviews was conducted between July and October 2015, where 37 public servants were interviewed. At the end 2016, I interviewed another group of 13 new recruits and job applicants. I stopped interviews until there was no new information could be added. The targeted interviewees were public servants from five cities, including a provincial capital city and two county-level cities. These interviewees were from various departments, so as to reduce sampling bias.

Firstly, I designed the semi-structured questions based on our research inquiries (see as Appendix 2). Then, I brought our questions to the Government Service Centers (GSC)⁴ in different sites. Luckily, all the 6 GSCs I visited permitted us to interview their staff during the weekdays. In most cases, there

⁴ In China, the daily public services are mainly delivered by the Administrative Service Center in each city, such as taxation, social welfare, marital registration, etc.

were 60 to 100 employees from different departments working at the GSCs. I randomly approached those who were free during our visits, and asked if they could help us. If they could, I invited them and talked to them in a separate meeting room so that they do not need to share their minds in front of their supervisors or colleagues. Before starting the interview, I informed them how long the interview would take and how I were going to keep their information confidential. The consent forms were signed before the interviews started (Appendix 1). Almost all the interviewees did not want to be recorded except for one. Therefore, I made quick notes when they were answering questions.

The key questions asked include their age, education, work experience, job description (public service behavior), reasons for taking public service jobs, etc. Each interview took about 30 to 45 minutes. To address the social desirability issues, I did not directly begin by questioning what their motivations were to apply for government jobs. Instead, I began with questions like “How long have you been working here?”, “What are your job contents?” etc. Once I felt that the interviewee had become more relaxed, I asked my main question – “Why did you decide to apply for the government job?” I continued interviewing them until no more new information could be collected. Overall, I interviewed 50 public servants. Immediately after the interviews, I translated all the notes into an Excel table.

Table 2 displays the distribution of the interviewees. I interviewed 21 male and 16 female public servants. Most of them were in their 30s and had a college

degree. Most informants were recruited from county level departments since public service is mainly delivered at this level. 11 interviewees had been working in the government for less than four years, 17 interviewees for between four and seven years, and 7 interviewees had been working for eight years or longer.

Table 2.1 Interviewees

Gender	Age		Education		Hierarchy		Tenure	
Male	21	1970s	5	High school or equivalent	5	Township	1	1 to 3 years
Female	16	1980s	28	College or university	25	County	29	4 to 7 years
		1990s	2	Master	5	City	4	8 or 7 longer
		1960s	2			Province	3	

After I completed all the interviews, I built an excel table which contains all the interview results. All the answers to the questions about motivation for job selection were translated into motivation items. Subsequently, two researchers (one is from Xi'An Jiaotong University and one is from Nanyang Technological University) read and categorized the motivation items based on five SDT-based motivation styles. Eventually, 21 motivation items were extracted. The 21 items represent different types of MJS in the public sector. Using content analysis, 21 motivation items were identified. I then compared them to SDT-based motivation styles and found that they can be categorized into seven dimensions: internal motivation, identified motivation (achievements), identified motivation (reputation), instrumental motivation, introjected motivation, external motivation (constraints), and external motivation (rewards) (see Table 2.2). To address content validity, I

invited experts to double check each item and discussed if all the MJS items were exactly in the correct categories.

Table 2.2 Motivations for job selection in public sector

No.		Motivation items	Min.	Max.	M	SD
MJS1	<i>Internal motivation</i>	<i>Internal1</i> Serving people is a source of my happiness, and I truly think it is more blessed to give than to receive.	1	5	3.22	.975
MJS2		<i>Internal2</i> Serving people is a calling, and I do it without a reason.	1	5	3.11	.971
MJS3		<i>Internal3</i> The internal satisfaction originating from helping others is just indescribable.	1	5	3.43	.926
MJS4	<i>Identified motivation</i> <i>1-(achievement)</i>	<i>IdenAchi1</i> Being a public servant, especially in high level, gives me a chance to make important policies so as to make a difference to the society.	1	5	3.29	.981
MJS5		<i>IdenAchi2</i> Doing public service is a kind of patriotism and responsibility	1	5	3.28	.908
MJS6		<i>IdenAchi3</i> Public employment could help me fulfilling my potential and seeking self-actualization	1	5	3.27	.878
MJS7	<i>Identified motivation</i> <i>2-(reputation)</i>	<i>IdenRepu1</i> The power of high-level officials is what I'm longing for because power means accomplishment or success	1	5	2.84	1.017
MJS8		<i>IdenRepu2</i> Being an official means fame and prestige in this society	1	5	3.15	1.012
MJS9		<i>IdenRepu3</i> Working in government make me feel proud and brings glory to my family	1	5	3.15	.992
MJS10	<i>Instrumental motivation</i>	<i>Instru12</i> The real income of public servants is quite reasonable which includes some welfare and benefits such as medical insurance, transportation subsidy, children's education, etc.	1	5	2.93	.955
MJS11		<i>Instru3</i> The government job is quite stable, and I won't lose my job	1	5	3.68	.811
MJS12		<i>Intro1</i> My parents and many of my relatives want me to be a public servant. It's a face-saving job. I don't want to let them down	1	5	3.56	.916
MJS13	<i>Introjected motivation</i>	<i>Intro2</i> Many of my friends are doing quite well as a public servant. I feel the peer pressure that I should try the same thing	1	5	2.97	.906
MJS14		<i>Intro3</i> I have invested too much in preparing for the civil service examination. It is very unwise to give up. The sunk cost is too high	1	5	2.71	1.026
MJS15		<i>Intro4</i> People believe that public servant is easier to be married	1	5	3.39	.944

MJS16	<i>External motivation-1 (constraint)</i>	<i>ExterConst1</i> I don't like a competitive environment. Public service work is probably a better fit	1	5	2.94	.988
MJS17		<i>ExterConst2</i> I do not have much choice in job selection (e.g., because of my college major)	1	5	3.10	1.091
MJS18		<i>ExterConst3</i> I don't have any specialties or any particular interest. I don't really know what is best for me; by chance, I took the civil service exam. Luckily, I passed	1	5	3.09	1.051
MJS19		<i>ExterConst4</i> I could not find a job when I graduated. Just took the government job temporally and might look a new job later	1	5	2.84	1.069
MJS20	<i>External motivation-2 (reward)</i>	<i>ExterRew1</i> My family members or relatives who are working in government could help me with job application and career development	1	5	2.34	.921
MJS21		<i>ExterRew2</i> Being a public servant would benefit my family business	1	5	2.16	.887

Study 2

The purpose of this study is to investigate the structure of the MJS in the public sector. Following the methods in Li and his colleagues' study on volunteer motivation scale (Li, Wu & Kee, 2016) both EFA and CFA will be used. Therefore, I designed two rounds of survey. The two respective surveys were conducted in March and June of 2016.

Data

In study 2, I translated the 21 MJS items from the interview into questionnaire. The questionnaires also contain demographic questions. Each motivation item is measured by a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Due to a limited budget, I used the convenience sampling method. The questionnaires were distributed online, and as hard copies as well. First, I contacted the staff I interviewed before, and asked whether or not they can help with our

survey. Second, I went to the GSCs by appointment. For those who preferred the online survey, I sent the questionnaire link to them by email, Wechat, or mobile message. 76 soft copies and 144 hard copies were sent out. Finally, I received 197 samples.

Of the valid samples, 49.7% are female and 50.3% are male. 64% of the samples are under 31 years old. 79.2% of the samples are members of the Chinese Communist Party. Almost all of the informants have a college degree or a postgraduate degree (97%). 96.9% of them have been working in the government for more than 2 years. 49.2% respondents are working in their hometown. For 44.2% of the samples, the public service position is their first job. 52.1% of them have applied for government jobs twice or more. 63 % of the public servants earn 4,000 CNY monthly or less, while 78% of them claimed that their salary should be more than 5,000. Table 3 shows the samples from different levels of local government. 74% of the respondents are from county and city level departments.

Table 2.3 The distribution in different level of government

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Township	26	13.2	16.1	16.1
	County	50	25.4	31.1	47.2
	City	69	35.0	42.9	90.1
	Province	16	8.1	9.9	100.0
	Total	161	81.7	100.0	
Missing	System	36	18.3		
Total		197	100.0		

Methods

To determine the structure these 21 motivation items, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used. Firstly, using survey data, statistics shows that the

21-item measurement had good internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha is 0.814). EFA results show that *ExterConst2* equally loaded on two factors. Therefore, *ExterConst2* was dropped. Next, I examined the 20-item scale's convergent and discriminant validity.

The Appendix 3 shows that correlation coefficients between items within each dimension are larger than those cross dimensions. And correlation coefficients between items of different dimensions are less than 0.5 except $r_{\text{Internal3*IdenAchi1}}$, $r_{\text{Internal3*IdenAchi2}}$, and $r_{\text{Internal2*IdenAchi2}}$. This indicates this measure for MJS has acceptable discriminant validity and convergent validity. However, I found the three items of identified motivation (achievement) have relatively higher correlation with the items of internal motivation. The coefficients, $r_{\text{IdenAchi1*Internal3}}$, $r_{\text{IdenAchi2*Internal1}}$, $r_{\text{IdenAchi2*Internal2}}$, $r_{\text{IdenAchi2*Internal3}}$, and are larger than $r_{\text{IdenAchi1*IdenAchi2}}$, $r_{\text{IdenAchi1*IdenAchi3}}$, $r_{\text{IdenAchi2*IdenAchi3}}$. These indicate that the items of identified motivation (achievement) have low convergent and discriminant validity. And identified motivation (achievement) may not be statistically distinct with internal motivation. Based on SDT, different types of motivation from internal to external motivation are deemed as a continuous spectrum. This means any two adjacent motivations are more correlated than distant ones. And identified motivation (achievement) may have high correlation with internal motivation. Therefore, I decided to further investigate this issue by using EFA.

Exploratory factor analysis

I use the remaining 20 items to run EFA. Following existing studies' methodology (eg. Li et al 2016), the current sample size is adequate (sample item ratio is around 10:1). KMO value is 0.769 (>0.5) and the significant *p* value of Bartlett's Test is lower than 0.001, which support the use of EFA. The results are displayed in Table 2.4 and 2.5.

Table 2.4 Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.645	23.224	23.224	4.645	23.224	23.224	3.438	17.189	17.189
2	3.070	15.352	38.576	3.070	15.352	38.576	2.383	11.914	29.103
3	1.768	8.840	47.416	1.768	8.840	47.416	1.989	9.943	39.046
4	1.624	8.118	55.534	1.624	8.118	55.534	1.985	9.923	48.970
5	1.269	6.346	61.881	1.269	6.346	61.881	1.931	9.654	58.624
6	1.058	5.291	67.172	1.058	5.291	67.172	1.710	8.548	67.172
7	.828	4.138	71.309						
8	.795	3.977	75.286						
9	.665	3.326	78.612						
10	.659	3.293	81.905						
11	.558	2.790	84.695						
12	.465	2.326	87.021						
13	.457	2.287	89.308						
14	.421	2.103	91.411						
15	.372	1.862	93.274						
16	.332	1.662	94.936						
17	.287	1.435	96.371						
18	.266	1.329	97.700						
19	.242	1.211	98.911						
20	.218	1.089	100.000						

Based on the Eigenvalues of each component, I extracted 6 factors explaining 67.17% of the total variance. The six factors have Eigenvalues greater than 1 (ranging from 1.058 to 4.645). The factor loadings are between 0.543 and 0.896. Results show that the 17 out of 20 items load onto the target factors: 3 items onto

internal motivation, 3 items onto identified motivation (reputation), 3 items onto instrumental motivation, 4 items onto introjected motivation, 3 onto external motivation (constraints), and 2 onto external motivation (rewards). It is unexpected that IdenAchi1, IdenAchi2 and IdenAchi3 loaded on internal motivation (see as Table 2.5b).

Table 2.5 Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Internal1</i> Serving people is a source of my happiness, and I truly think it is more blessed to give than to receive.	.799					
<i>Internal2</i> Serving people is a calling, and I do it without a reason.	.876					
<i>Internal3</i> The internal satisfaction originating from helping others is just indescribable.	.850					
<i>IdenAchi1</i> Being a public servant, especially in high level, gives me a chance to make important policies so as to make a difference to the society.	.577					
<i>IdenAchi2</i> Doing public service is a kind of patriotism and responsibility	.774					
<i>IdenAchi3</i> Public employment could help me fulfilling my potential and seeking self-actualization	.543					
<i>IdenRepu1</i> The power of high-level officials is what I'm longing for because power means accomplishment or success		.694				
<i>IdenRepu2</i> Being an official means fame and prestige in this society		.822				
<i>IdenRepu3</i> Working in government make me feel proud and brings glory to my family		.858				
<i>Instru12</i> The real income of public servants is quite reasonable which includes some welfare and benefits such as medical insurance, transportation subsidy, children's education, etc.			.775			
<i>Instru3</i> The government job is quite stable, and I won't lose my job			.757			
<i>Intro1</i> My parents and many of my relatives want me to be a public servant. It's a face-saving job. I don't want to let them down				.542		
<i>Intro2</i> Many of my friends are doing quite well as a public servant. I feel the peer pressure that I should try the same thing				.684		
<i>Intro3</i> I have invested too much in preparing for the civil service examination. It is very unwise to give up. The sunk cost is too high				.719		
<i>Intro4</i> People believe that public servant is easier to be married				.582		
<i>ExterConst1</i> I don't like a competitive environment. Public service work is probably a better fit					.547	
<i>ExterConst3</i> I don't have any specialties or any particular interest. I don't really know what is best for me; by chance, I took the civil service exam. Luckily, I passed					.858	
<i>ExterConst4</i> I could not find a job when I graduated. Just took the government job temporally and might look a new job later					.833	
<i>ExterRew1</i> My family members or relatives who are working in government could help me with job application and career development						.809
<i>ExterRew2</i> Being a public servant would benefit my family business						.896

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

It is unexpected that factor 1 has six items: “Internal1”, “Internal2”, ”Internal3”, “IdenAchi1”, ”IdenAchi2” and “IdenAchi3”, which contains both internal motivation and identified motivation (achievements). The first three items represent intrinsic satisfaction and pleasure to do public service. The last three items represent identified motivation (achievements). However, this is not exceptional because of two reasons. First, both internal motivation and identified motivation are autonomous motivation. According SDT, these two adjacent motivation styles may be highly correlated. Second, there is no consensus that whether achievements should be classified into internal motivation or identified motivation. Several existing studies have classified autonomous motives to accomplish/achieve something as intrinsic motivation (Deci 1975; Deci and Ryan 1985; Vallerand et al 1992). Also, PSM studies usually see “attraction to policy-making”, and “patriotism and social responsibility” as intrinsic motivation (Perry, 1996; Perry & Wise, 1990). However, there is another group of studies that include “achievement” into identified motivation (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Lyons et al., 2006). Individuals doing such actions are not doing them because of pleasure or satisfaction, but because they find their actions to be meaningful. For example, “making a difference in the society” (IdenAchi1), and “patriotism and social

responsibility”(IdenAchi2) represent that individuals have identified their behaviors as “meaningful to the society” (identified motive). So, these three item including “IdenAchi1”,”IdenAchi2”, and “IdenAchi3” are extracted as a sub-dimension of identified motivation. I will examine whether these three items are distinct through CFA in later section.

The second factor includes three items: IdenRepu1 (success), IdenRepu2 (fame and prestige), and IdenRepu3 (self-actualization), which represent identified motivation (reputation). The third factor includes Instru12 and Instru3. These two items represent motives that serve as instruments to pursue other separate goals, such as income, welfare, and job security. Therefore, Factor 3 is named as “instrumental motivation”. Factor 4 has four items Intro1, Intro2, Intro3, and Intro4, which represent motives to avoid anxiety, shame, or pressure. This is introjected motivation.

The last two factors represent different types of external motivation: constraints and rewards. The external motivation (constraints) includes three items: ExterConst1 (dislike competition), ExterConst3 (no specialty) and ExterConst4 (lack choice). The external motivation (rewards) includes ExterRew1 and ExterRew2. ExtrRew1 reflects many people’s choices. These people may not have interest in public service. They chose public service positions mainly because it was easier for them to be recruited with their

parents' or relatives' help, and they have a higher possibility to be promoted in the future. Therefore, this item seems like a reward. ExterRew2 represents another type of external reward. Government connections may have significant influence on his or her family. In sum, the EFA results support the motivations for job selection (MJS) falling into the motivational categories by SDT.

This six factor model is inconsistent with our hypothesized 7-factor model, which reveals Identified motivation (achievement) may be not distinct with internal motivation. In following section, I will use CFA to further examine the factorial structure and discriminant validity issue.

Study 3

This study is to validate the seven-dimension of MJS scale. I used the same methods as the study 2 to conduct the second survey. The survey questions are the same as study 2. According to the suggestions of Rhemtalla, Brosseau-Liard, and Savalei(2012) on categorical variables, I changed the 5-point Likert scale to six-point scale with score from strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), somewhat disagree (3), somewhat agree (4), agree (5), to strongly agree (6). The six-point scale removed the neutral answers. To enhance the participation, I prepared small gifts and lucky draw for hand-writing answers and online response. Finally, 394 hard copies and 178 online responses were collected. The response rate was almost 100%, but only 70.8% out of the 572 samples are useable.

I used CFA to test the original seven-factor model and six-factor model respectively. Results rendered a better fit for the seven-factor model than six-factor fit: root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) =0.077(90% confidence interval RMSEA=0.068,0.086). comparative fit index (CFI)=0.834, Tucher-Lewis index (TLI) =0.789, standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR)=0.078, coefficient of determination (CD)=0.996. The standardized item-factor loadings are over than 0.3 (ranging from 0.34 to 0.85). The values of factorial covariance are ranging from $\text{cov}(\text{ExterConst}, \text{Internal}) = -0.05$ to $\text{cov}(\text{Instru}, \text{ExterConst}) = 0.58$. These indicate that the seven-factor model has marginal good fit. Results suggested that the latent variable of denAchi1, 2, and 3 is distinct from internal motivation ($\text{Cov}(\text{Internal}, \text{IdenAchi})=0.29$).

Consequently, the construct validity of this seven-factor model was deemed as adequate. The final model was displayed in Figure 2.1. Hence, the first research inquiry was responded. People select public service jobs due to seven categories of motives which confirmed the SDT-based motivation typology.

Figure 2.1 Confirmatory factor analysis*

Descriptive analysis on multi-dimensional MJS

Another research query is whether MJS includes non-altruistic motivations, and whether both extrinsic motives and intrinsic motives exist. To investigate this question, I divided all the motivation items into two groups: non-altruistic motivation and altruistic motivation. Then, I used descriptive statistics to compare the different values respondents placed on both types of motivations. Through content analysis, results revealed that only 5 out of the 21 motivation

* Internal=internalmotivation; IdenAchi= identified motivation(acheivements); IdenRepu= identified motivation(reputation); Instrum=instrumental motivation; Introjected=introjected motivation; ExterRew=external motivation (rewards); ExterConst=external motivation (constraints)

items are not self-interested motives (MJS1, MJS2, MJS3, MJS4, MJS5). Descriptive statistics shows that individuals place a higher value on MJS11 (“The government job is quite stable, and I won’t lose my job”) and MJS12 (“My parents and many of my relatives want me to be a public servant. I don’t want to let them down”) than any other motivation items (see Table 2.2). This result has also been supported by T-test. Therefore, I conclude that self-interested motivations are even more crucial than altruistic motives.

The answer of whether or not MJS contains both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations is also positive. EFA and CFA confirmed that individuals seek jobs in public sectors not only because of intrinsic motives, but also because of extrinsic motives. For example, some people choose government jobs because they believe that “Serving people is a source of happiness, and it is more blessed to give than to receive” (intrinsic motive). In contrary, some people take the government job because they “couldn’t find a good job when they graduate” or “their family members tried a lot to convince them to apply” (extrinsic motive). In most cases, motivations behind an action are not single but may include a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic motives. For example, Mr L became a public servant of the Culture Bureau in 2011. When I asked him why he chose this job, he said:

“Government job is stable, the payment is not bad, and the working

hours are very flexible.”

For Miss U, the private sector seemed more attractive to her when she graduated from college. However, she became a public servant in 2008 because:

“It’s difficult to find a job when I graduated,” “my parent believe public servants have higher social status and hope me to do that”, and “public employment is more stable.”

Both of them chose public service jobs because of non-intrinsic motivations. To compare the values of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, I computed the value of the five motivation types from the arithmetic average value of the sub-scales of each dimension.

Table 2.6 displays the mean of each motivation type. It shows that public servants placed the highest value on instrumental motivation (extrinsic motivation), followed by internal motivation, identified motivation, introjected motivation, and external motivation. Then I employed T-test to analyze whether intrinsic motivations are more significant than the four types of extrinsic motivations (see Table 2.7). Results show that job applicants place a higher value on internal motivation than introjected motivation and external motivation. However, it does not demonstrate a significant difference between internal motivation and identified motivation or instrumental motivation. Therefore, there is no evidence that shows that individuals place a higher value

on intrinsic motivation or extrinsic motivation, meaning both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are equally important.

Table 2.2 Descriptive statistics

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Internal motivation	1.00	5.00	3.1923	.60290
Identified motivation	1.00	5.00	3.1624	.64975
Instrumental motivation	1.00	5.00	3.2322	.71896
Introjected motivation	1.00	5.00	3.0829	.71222
External motivation	1.00	4.43	2.8093	.57433

Table 2.7 Comparison of different type of motivations

		Paired Differences								
				Std. Error	95% CI of the Difference				Sig.	
		Mean	SD.	Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	(2-tailed)	
Pair 1	Internal	-								
	External	.38305	.76577	.05456	.27545	.49064	7.021	196	.000	
Pair 2	Internal	-								
	Identified	.02989	.27667	.01971	-.00898	.06877	1.516	196	.131	
Pair 3	Internal	-								
	Instrumental	-.03990	.81333	.05795	-.15418	.07438	-.689	196	.492	
Pair 4	Internal	-								
	Introjected	.10942	.75187	.05357	.00377	.21506	2.043	196	.042	
Pair 5	Identified	-								
	Instrumental	-.06980	.81181	.05784	-.18386	.04427	-1.207	196	.229	
Pair 6	Identified	-								
	Introjected	.07953	.72699	.05180	-.02262	.18167	1.535	196	.126	
Pair 7	Identified	-								
	External	.35315	.77951	.05554	.24363	.46268	6.359	196	.000	

Findings and Discussions

This study found that individuals choose public sector jobs due to various motivations. When economists asserted that people working in government are mainly self-interested or motivated by external rewards, such as income, pension, insurance, job security and low pressure (Barsoum, 2015; Bullock et al., 2015; Delfgaauw & Dur, 2008; Dur & Zoutenbier, 2014; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Gunderson, 1979; Niskanen, 1971; Tansel, 2004), PSM theorists argued that altruistic motives, which include attraction to public policy making, commitment to public interest, self-sacrifice and compassion, are more important. However, based on both qualitative and quantitative evidence, the present study found that people's MJS includes both altruistic and non-altruistic motivations. MJS can also be classified into five categories based on SDT: internal motivation, identified motivation, instrumental motivation, introjected motivation, and external motivation.

Summary

Firstly, 21 motivation items were extracted from fieldwork. These items include both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation – 5 items belong to altruistic motives, and the other 16 items to non-altruistic motives. To further examine the structure of these motives, Factor analysis was employed and 21 were confirmed as MJS content. Then, seven factors were extracted from the 20

items. These are consistent with the motivation typology based on SDT.

Next, a measurement scale for motivation for job selection (MJS) can be constructed. The newly developed measurement instrument includes 20 motivation items falling into seven dimensions: internal regulation (intrinsic motivation), identified regulation (achievement), regulation (reputation), instrumental regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation (constraint), and external regulation (rewards). The reliability and validity were addressed by various methods. Statistics show the good reliability of this scale (Cronbach's Alpha=0.822). This new scale has much potential to be used in future motivational studies, especially for those wanting to investigate the motivations of job applicants in East-Asian cultures.

Thirdly, MJS can be a sub-field of motivation studies in public administration. Since public service behavior is not a mono-dimension concept but instead contains numerous different actions, the motivations for different types of public service actions should be diverse. For example, MJS in policy making can be different with emotional work. I roughly sorted public service into two categories: emotional work (street-bureaucrats) and policy-making (public managers). The present study investigated the MJS of the street-bureaucrats and some mid-level managers. I assumed that the high-level officials may have different MJS, which would merit future inquiries.

Fourthly, several factors of motivation for job selection reflect the Chinese culture characteristics. Culture and values have significant influence on people's job selection decisions (Judge & Bretz, 1992). Chinese society is characterized by respect for discipline, ordering people by social status (Bian et al, 2005; Sun & Yang, 2008). Among China's cadre-dominated social hierarchies, becoming a government official meant a life success for a person (Pelled & Xin, 1997). It would bring reputation, glory, and even wealth to his whole family (eg. MJS7, MJS8, MJS9, MJS15). Additionally, Chinese society historically value collective actions and filial morality (Earley, 1989). That's why many young graduates need to consider their parents' concerns and experience more peer-pressure when seeking jobs (MJS12, MJS13).

Lastly, motivation may be dynamic. During our interviews, many participants mentioned that their motivation changed after they worked for several years. This is consistent with existing theories such as the concept of reciprocal determinism concept of social learning theory, and SDT. One interviewee Mr C claimed:

"I was ambitious and wanted to make a difference to the society when I applied for the government job", but "I found I was too naïve after I started working," "Now I want to quit but I'm not sure I could find a job in the private sector."

In this case, the interviewee's motivation changed from identified motivation to external motivation. Why? What happened after he started his career? Which motivations drive him away from retaining his current job? This merits future exploration.

Limitations and future studies

This study has limitations. First, due to a limited budget, I did not employ a random sampling method. The samples did not cover all the different kinds of public services. Most informants in this study were frontline public servants and middle level managers. Therefore, our samples lacked those who applied for high managerial positions (e.g., many professors and corporate managers become senior government leaders). Another limitation on data collection is that the informants may not have been able to recall all their reasons for deciding to apply for public service jobs. In this study, I tried to use larger interviewee samples to balance this deficiency. I kept recruiting more interviewees until no new items could be added. I also interviewed 13 new recruits in the second round of survey to make sure our results were inclusive. Third, this study does not link MJS to any casual factors. We do not know why some people are more internally motivated while others are externally motivated, and how different types of MJS influence public employees' service

behaviors and other performance variables such as job satisfaction, performance, and turnover intention.

Several research topics merit further investigation. First, future research should collect larger samples including both frontline workers and policy-makers. It is necessary to compare the difference between emotional workers' and public managers' motivations. Second, future studies should pay attention to the work motivations behind people choosing to stay in the public sector (even if they have turnover intention). This is important because the different work motivations may lead to diversified levels of performance and job satisfaction. For example, employees who are motivated by external motives may have a high turnover intention. Third, future studies could investigate how different levels of need satisfaction, including autonomy, relatedness and competence, influence public servants' work motivation. By SDT, external regulations can be integrated into internal regulations when the three basic needs are supported (internalization). For example, a person may apply for public service career as a temporary job because he cannot find a job when he graduates (external motivation-constraint). Eventually, he may decide to retain because he realizes his job as meaningful to the public who come for help (identified motivation). Fourth, how different types of MJS influence individuals' performance, job satisfaction, and turnover intention could be

another research avenue. Current PSM studies have found positive links between intrinsic motives, job satisfaction and performance. We may want to know how extrinsic regulation styles affect those outcome variables. The last recommendation is how to integrate the self-determination index (SDI) into PA topics. To capture the collective impact of motivations, scholars created SDI by first assigning positive values to autonomous motives and negative values to controlled motives*. SDI has been used to predict various outcome variables, such as work motivation, wellbeing, etc. (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Chen & Lee, 2014; Marylene Gagné, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987). The future studies could pay attention to whether or not a higher SDI predicts positive outcomes.

Conclusion

Based on interviews and survey, I investigated public employees' motivations for job selection (MJS) in the public sector. Firstly, I extracted 21 motivation items from interviews. Inconsistent with current PSM studies, the content analysis showed that these 21 motivation items contain both altruistic motives and non-altruistic motives. Five items belong to altruistic motives, and the other 16 items are non-altruistic motives. Second, based on SDT, the reliability and

* Scholars measure one's overall levels of self-determination by using the following formula: *Overall self-determination (SDI) = 2 (intrinsic motivation) + (identified regulation) + 0 (instrumental regulation) – (introjected regulation) – 2 (external regulation)*(Chen, 2014).

validity of MJS typology was examined. Questionnaires and factor analysis confirmed that MJS includes five motivation types: internal motivation, identified motivation (2 sub-dimensions), instrumental motivation, introjected motivation and external motivation (2 sub-dimensions). The results also suggested a measurement scale for MJS, which includes 7 dimensions and 20 items. Although this study has limitations, the findings are still significant for current motivation research. It provides empirical evidence to show that motivations for seeking public employment include both extrinsic and non-altruistic motives. The SDT-based MJS structure can enrich the motivation research in the PA field. Finally, several future research directions are proposed: to investigate the motivation for job retaining (motivation for public service), as well as the linkage between MJS, SDI and other antecedents and outcomes.

These findings may have several practical implications. Firstly, based on SDT studies, individuals with autonomous motivation would benefit both the organization and themselves (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Therefore, public managers may want to recruit those who are internally motivated by the job contents in the public sector. To guarantee the best person-organization match, the MJS scale would be a useful tool when selecting new recruits.

Second, the MJS scale can be used in public servant training. Public

mangers and public administration scholars probably want to build high organization identity and commitment. The MJS scale can be used to measure the new recruits' motivation status. Based on the measurement results, the trainers or lecturers could then design different learning programs for those in different motivation groups. The MJS scale can also be a useful tool in evaluating the effectiveness of the training programs.

Finally, public mangers can build a need-supportive work environment to facilitate employees' autonomous motivation. Based on SDT and the social learning theory, motivation is dynamic. The work environment has significant influence on a person's motivation status. Individuals tend to be internally motivated if the basic needs of autonomy, relatedness, and competence are supported. Otherwise, individuals' motivation tends to move from autonomous motivation to external motivation.

Essay 3: The motivations for public service: motivation typologies and integration

Introduction

Public employees' motivation has been one of the fundamental issues in public administration research. Scholars believe that motivation analysis is meaningful in recruiting, training, and retaining employees (Behn, 1995; Wittmer, 1991a; Wright, 2001). Dozens of peer-reviewed journal papers have been published each year since 2008 (Ritz et al., 2016). Scholars have developed a variety of theories to explain public employees' motivation, such as reward preference (Crewson, 1997; Davis & West, 1980; Rainey, 1982; Snyder & Osland, 1996; Wittmer, 1991a), goal theory (Perry & Porter, 1982; Wright, 2001), need-based theories (Graham & Renwick, 1972; Rhinehart, Barrell, DeWolfe, Griffin, & Spaner, 1969), work motivation (Wright, 2001), and public service motivation (Perry, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2010; Perry, 2014; Perry, Hondeghem, & Wise, 2010; Perry & Wise, 1990), to name a few.

Most studies conclude that public employees place a higher value on intrinsic motivation and less value on monetary incentives than private employees. However, some empirical evidence shows that public employees may also value financial rewards (Hotchkiss, Banteyerga, & Tharaney, 2015), and may also be strongly motivated by job security and stability, status, prestige,

the opportunities to learn new things, a high salary, the prospect for advancement (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jurkiewicz, Massey Jr, & Brown, 1998; Snyder & Osland, 1996) and work-family balance (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007). Some scholars found that public service jobs with intrinsic rewards but lower pay may attract those with lower ability (Delfgaauw & Dur, 2010). After the 1990s, public service motivation (PSM) approach has become a dominant method in motivation literature. A number of empirical evidence of PSM have confirmed the four dimensions of motivations, which include attraction to public policy, commitment to public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice (Chen, Hsieh, & Chen, 2013; David J. Houston, 2000; Kim et al., 2013; Perry, 1996; Sangmook, 2011).

We find that many assertions about the motivations of public employees are questionable. Firstly, many researchers failed to differentiate the motivation for job selection (MJS) from the motivation for public service behaviors (MPS). Instead, they use vague terms such as public service motivation or public sector motivation. Based on the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), motivation is only meaningful when it is linked to behavior. In other words, motivation must be paired with a specific behavior. The motivation for seeking a job in the public sector must be distinguished from the motivation for serving in public positions. Secondly, most scholars did not make distinctions between public managers'

motivations and the frontline employees' motivations, though their public service behaviors are different. Several studies have demonstrated that public supervisors and frontline workers place different values on the same motivation factors (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998). For instance, the political appointees and higher ranking officials usually have higher salaries, better compensations, and more power (Farazmand, 2001). They are more likely to be motivated by these external incentives than lower level employees. Thirdly, many measurement scales of motivation were designed within a limited sample scope. For example, PSM scales were developed from its literature and survey but without enough field observation. Fourthly, the current PSM research is also debatable (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Prebble, 2014; Ritz et al., 2016). Although Perry tried to build a more comprehensive theory of public service motivation (Perry, 2000; Perry & Wise, 1990), the PSM scope has been narrowed down to a pure type of altruistic motivation (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Xu & Chen, 2016).

Therefore, several recent studies have suggested reorienting public service motivation research through SDT (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Ritz et al., 2016; Xu & Chen, 2016). Chen and his colleagues empirically examined the motivation typology of SDT by collecting data from public and non-profit

managers. Following their findings, the current study will use SDT to further investigate the motivations of frontline public employees. In the first section, I will briefly review the existing literature. The successes and deficiencies will be discussed. In section two, I will propose a theoretical framework to analyze the motivation for public service (MPS). The third section will introduce methodologies on how to examine the motivation model. The methods include both interviews and questionnaires. The fourth section will discuss the outcomes of the different types of MPS, and how MJS and the need satisfaction shape autonomous work motivation.

Motivation for public service: a quick review

Motivation for public service

The motivation for public service (MPS) refers to the motives or reasons that drive individuals to continue staying and serving in public sectors. MPS only predicts behavior but not intentions or goals (Wright, 2001). Rainey (1982) listed the following motivation factors for public servants: the sense of accomplishment, development of abilities, respect and friendliness from colleagues, opportunity to do meaning social service, feeling meaningful in doing public service to society and to the organization, recognition (awards and praise), high pays, promotions, job security, social status and prestige. Work conditions, goal clarity, and teamwork are also important (Baldwin, 1987;

Emmert & Taher, 1992; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Khojasteh, 1993; Wright, 2001), with good social relations in work place predicting intrinsic work motivation (Emmert & Taher, 1992). Evidence from Latin American adds several institutional factors, including the impact of national development, job market in other sectors, public image of public employees, and work itself, referring to the duties performed (Snyder & Osland, 1996). Additionally, the person-organization fit is also a factor of job retention (De Cooman et al., 2009).

Jurkiewicz (1998) examined 15 motivation factors and found that the top 10 motives are job security, the opportunity to learn new things, the chance to use own special abilities, a high salary, the chance for advancement, a variety of assignments, teamwork, the chance to make important decisions, friendly and congenial colleagues, and a chance to benefit society. However, higher level managers and lower level employees place different values on some motive items. For instance, the top five motivation items for supervisors contain the opportunities to contribute to important decisions, a stable and secure future, the chance to exercise leadership, the chance to use their special abilities, and the chance to learn new things. The top five for non-supervisors however, are a stable and secure life, the chance to learn new things, a high salary, the chance to use their special abilities, and the chances for career advancement. Chen and

Bozeman (2013) established 12 motivation factors for public servants, including the ability to serve the public, desire for increased responsibility, desire for less bureaucratic red tape, a low conflict environment, pension or retirement plans, medical and insurance benefits, relatively low cost of living in the region, employment chance for spouse/partner, et al^{*}. From the discussion above, we can conclude that MPS includes both intrinsic and extrinsic motives (Xu & Chen, 2016). However, the intrinsic motives are very limited, comprising of the ability or chance to serve the public or to benefit the society, the sense of accomplishment, and a variety of assignments. Most motivational factors listed by scholars belong to extrinsic motivation.

Motivation differences between public and private employees

Most comparative studies argue that public employees place lesser value on extrinsic rewards than private sector employees (Crewson, 1997; Houston, 2000; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Khojasteh, 1993; Wittmer, 1991a). For example, public servants are more likely to be motivated by job content and work-life balance,

^{*} In Chen and Bozeman's study, they proposed 12 motivation factors which include: the ability to serve the public interest; Opportunity for advancement within the organization's hierarchy; Opportunity for training and career development; Desire for more responsibility; Desire for less bureaucratic red tape; Desire for a low conflict work environment; Job security; The organization's pension or retirement plan; Benefits (medical, insurance); Few, if any, alternative job offers; Relatively low cost of living in the region; Employment opportunities for spouse or partner

but are less likely to be motivated by monetary rewards, career development, and a supportive environment (Rashid & Rashid, 2012). Only a few scholars asserted that public employees do not actually value the opportunities to help or benefit others (Gabris & Simo, 1995; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998) and show similar interests on extrinsic motives, such as power, job security, social status, etc. (Bogg & Cooper, 1995; Crewson, 1997; Gabris & Simo, 1995; Maidani, 1991; Snyder & Osland, 1996). Some researchers even show that public servants are less committed to work than private employees, and still have a high willingness to retain in the public sector when they get older (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007). Moreover, some studies found that a tenure may have negative effects on altruistic motivation (Buurman, Delfgaauw, Dur, & Van den Bossche, 2012; De Cooman et al., 2009; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Job content and salary are less likely to be motivating factors for public employees, while self-development and responsibility seem to work only for higher level public managers (Wright and Davis 2003; Aryee 1992). Some researchers challenge that sector difference may not matter with regards to motivational differences, but the hierarchical level, job characteristics (eg. autonomy, feedback, variety, task significance, goal content, challenge, etc.), and the choice of work-life balance could explain the motivation differences between people (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Wright, 2001).

Public service motivation

Public service motivation was initially defined as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations”(Perry & Wise, 1990). This attracted much attention after a measurement scale was developed as it primarily focuses on intrinsic motivation or altruistic motivations. The literature witnessed a fast growth after 2005, with more than 294 peer-reviewed articles being published between 2006 and 2014(Ritz et al., 2016). PSM include four elements: commitment to public interest, compassion, self-sacrifice and attraction to public policy making (Perry, 1996). Scholars examined many consequences of PSM and found that it has positive effects on job satisfaction, performance, commitment, organizational citizen behavior, work effort, and intrinsic work preferences (Bellé, 2013, 2014; Brewer & Selden, 1998; Brewer, Selden, & Facer II, 2000; Bright, 2007, 2008, 2016; Camilleri, 2006; Camilleri & van der Heijden, 2007; Castaing, 2006; Chen et al., 2013; Choi, 2002; Houston, 2006; Leisink & Steijn, 2009; Liu, 2009; Liu, Tang, & Zhu, 2008; Naff & Crum, 1999; Pandey, Wright, & Moynihan, 2008; Ritz, 2009; Sangmook, 2006; Taylor, 2007; Taylor & Westover, 2011; Wright & Pandey, 2008; Yousaf, Zafar, & Ellahi, 2014). Based on the definitions and measurements, I found that PSM has been

narrowed down to intrinsic and altruistic motivations after it was added with values, attitudes and beliefs (Bozeman & Su, 2015; Prebble, 2014; Sun & Gu, 2016; Ward, 2014a; Xu & Chen, 2016). PSM has gradually become less of a motivation, and is disconnected from reality (Xu & Chen, 2016). Ritz and his colleagues (2016) suggest that future studies ought to embrace the non-altruistic motives.

I find it is very difficult to get a full picture of the motivation for public service from the existing literature. The discussion above reveals that most motivation studies that took place before 2000 mainly focused on the motivational differences and similarities between public and private employees, and many of them lacked empirical evidence. Only a few empirical studies conducted fieldwork before proposing the motivational items. More importantly, there was no consensus about which factors were motivating public servants. After the 1990s, the public service motivation theory (PSM) became the dominant approach in motivational studies in the public administration field. However, several recent studies have pointed out that PSM studies are problematic because they lack non-intrinsic motives. Due to these gaps in the existing literature, scholars have suggested employing SDT to understand public employees' motivations (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Xu & Chen, 2016). In the following section, I will discuss how SDT can be used to analyze MPS.

Using Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to Understand Motivation for Public Service Behavior

Based on the autonomy degree of behaviors, SDT views individual's motivation as a continuous spectrum, ranging from autonomous motivation to controlled motivation. Autonomous motivation includes internal motivation and identified regulation. Controlled motivation includes introjected regulation and external regulation (see as Table 1.1) (Chen & Bozeman, 2013; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Autonomous motivation

The first type of autonomous motivation is internal motivation. Internal motivation implies that a behavior is initiated for "its inherent satisfaction rather than separable consequence" (Ryan & Deci 2000). People with this type of motivation see themselves as initiators who can select their own desired goals, and the means to achieve them (Deci and Ryan 1987). Intrinsically motivated people show real interest in actions and their consequences. For example, some employees do public service because they really like the job and feel satisfied when serving the public. They enjoy the highest level of self-determination.

The second type of autonomous motivation is identified regulation which

is the most autonomous form of extrinsic motivation. An individual with this type of motivation has identified the value or meaning of a behavior, and integrates the regulation into self. For example, many people may choose to maintain in the public service for self-advancement, or because they believe that the public service job is meaningful to society. They may not like the public service behavior itself but they identify the value, and feel the full control of this action. Both intrinsic motivation and identified motivation belong to autonomous motivation (Chen & Bozeman, 2013).

Controlled motivation

Controlled motivation includes introjected regulation and external regulation. Individuals with introjected regulation conduct an action to avoid anxiety, shame or pressure (Vallerand & Ratelle, 2004; Chen & Bozeman, 2013). The behavior driven by this type of regulation is not associated with self-endorsement but is controlled by extrinsic conditions. A public manager may try his best to make policies to reduce air pollution so that he would feel less pressure from the public or media. In this case, the policy-making itself is not the motivating factor. Rather, his main concern is to relieve own stress caused by the citizens. Another example is that some employees may choose to retain in the public sector because their parents hope for them to stay. The

employees in both cases initiate actions in order to avoid anxiety and pressure.

The most controlled motivation is external regulation. People falling into this category perform a behavior for external rewards or to avoid punishment. They perceive an external locus of control. For example, studies found that older public employees have a higher intention to stay because they have very limited opportunities in the private sector. They do not have confidence over their own knowledge and skills. These constraints leave them with no choice but to retain. This type of regulation displays the least autonomy. External motivation, introjected motivation and instrumental motivation belong to controlled motivation.

Instrumental regulation

Instrumental regulation is a blurry zone between autonomous and controlled motivation (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2008). For example, many new college graduates seek temporary jobs in the government as a stepping stone which might help them get a better career in the future. The temporary job here serves as an instrument while the behavior itself is controlled by external conditions (Von Hippel, Mangum, Greenberger, Heneman, & Skoglund, 1997). As Rashid and Rashid (2012) found in their study, many public employees choose to stay in the public sector because it can provide a better work-life balance than a job

in the private sector. Hence, public service jobs only serve as an instrument to guarantee their life style.

In many studies, amotivation is also included. It means to lack a sense of personal causation or intention to act. When amotivated, an individual will not value the action and not feel competent to conduct it. He or she will not believe that the behavior will yield the desired outcomes. Amotivated people often feel helpless and doubt the usefulness of the action he does. Therefore, they have a high possibility of quitting their current activities or jobs. For example, public servants who feel that their job is meaningless may have a high turnover intention. They do not know why they still retain their current job, and may leave immediately after they get good opportunities in private or non-profit organizations. In this study, public employees who choose to retain in public sector have evident intentions. Therefore, amotivation will not be included in this analysis of MPS.

Autonomy and internalization

The motivation categories in SDT can be differentiated from each other through their level of autonomy or self-determination. Self-determination increases gradually when motivation types move from external motivation, introjected motivation, instrumental motivation, identified motivation, to internal

motivation. The behavior and attitude outcomes of the five motivation styles resemble “a spectrum, moving from strongly positive to strongly negative.” (Chen & Bozeman, 2013). Autonomous motivations, including internal and identified regulation, may lead to strong behavioral persistence and personal well-being, while external motivation and amotivation lead to negative outcomes. Theorists proposed that controlled regulations can be taken into a person’s value system through internalization and integration (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). This internalization process may happen when the three basic needs (autonomy, relatedness, and competence) are supported.

This study will focus on the motivations of frontline public employees in local governments, and try to identify the specific motives for public service behavior by asking the employees what are “the reasons to retain and serve in public sectors”. Based on SDT, I will examine the following research inquiries:

- 1) I will conduct literature review and semi-structured interviews to investigate the various motivation factors that drive the frontline public employees to retain and serve in public sectors; then
- 2) test whether these motivation factors fall into the SDT-based motivation categories and
- 3) whether the perceived relatedness and autonomy could integrate the controlled motivation into autonomous motivation; and
- 4) Lastly, the relationship between employees’ MPS and job satisfaction will also be addressed. In the following section, interview,

questionnaires, and data analysis will be discussed.

Methods

To investigate public employees' MPS, the author conducted both interviews and questionnaires. Firstly, I selected 37 public employees from different government hierarchies and carried out face-to-face interviews. Following this, I used the content analysis method to identify and categorize the motivation items, which were then translated into a questionnaire. The third step was piloting the survey and factor analysis. This led to the final construct and a measurement scale for MPS. Finally, the relationship between need satisfaction and MPS was tested.

Interview

All the interviews were conducted between July and October 2015. I designed a semi-structured questions list before the interview. The main question was "Why do you stay and serve in the current sector?" Other questions included age, professional experiences, education level, job description, tenure, etc. Since I targeted frontline workers, I selected most interviewees from government service centers (GSCs) at the county-level (except for 4 from provincial and city-level). These centers deliver various public services, and

each center has 60 to 100 employees. Mostly, I walked into the government service center directly and talked to the information counter staff about our research. Then, I went to the director of the center and discussed the details. Luckily, all six public service centers I visited gave me the permission to continue. I randomly approached those who were free and asked whether they would accept our interview. For those who agreed, we moved to a small meeting room so that there were no other parties involved. In the most cases, the interviewee talked for more than 45 minutes, even though I had planned to finish in 30 minutes. All of them, except for one, did not allow us to record their interview. Hence, I wrote down the key points of the interview, and reflected and document the interview immediately after it was over. The disadvantage with this is that I could have lost some information in the process. Nonetheless, the positive point is that the interviewees felt secure and could hence provide more information. In total, I conducted 37 interviews, 29 of which were from the county-level centers, 4 from city-level, 3 from provincial level, and 1 from the township. 21 of the interviewees were male while 16 were female. 11 people have been in the public sector for less than 3 years, 17 between 4 and 7 years, and 7 for more than 8 years (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 Interviewees

Gender		Age		Education		Hierarchy		Tenure	
Male	21	1970s	5	High school or equivalent	5	Township	1	1 to 3 years	11

Female	16	1980s	28	College or university	25	County	29	4 to 7 years	17
		1990s	2	Master	5	City	4	8 or 7 longer	
		1960s	2			Province	3		
Sum	37	Sum	37	Sum	35	Sum	37	Sum	35

After I collected all the information from the 37 interviews, the notes were translated into a table organized by the interview questions. First, I read the answers about why the employees chose to stay in the government and categorized the answers by their meanings. Answers with similar meanings were merged into one motivation item. Next, I invited two graduate students in public administration to double-check the list and eventually got 17 motivational factors.

Lastly, I used the SDT-based motivation typology to analyze these items, and found that they can be categorized into the five different the motivation styles. External motivation and introjected motivation have two sub-dimensions. These two sub-dimensions of external motivation can be named constraints and rewards; and the two introjected motivation types were named pride and career development. A seven-factor model of MPS was established (see Table 3.5). Following this, I designed a questionnaire to examine this model.

Questionnaire

To examine the construct validity of MPS, I conducted a survey from May to

July 2016. The survey questions included the demographic variables, the 17 items of MPS, the scales of MJS (instrumental MJS is excluded), and the need satisfaction scales (adapted from La Guardia et al 2000). The measurement scales for these variables are listed in Appendix 4. To minimize the common method bias, I mixed the questions and ensured that the measurement items belonging to the same dimensions were listed away from one another. Overall, 109 questions are listed in the questionnaire. Respondents were required to read each item and score them as follows: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), somewhat disagree (3), somewhat agree (4), agree (5), or strongly agree (6). Before conducting the survey, I asked 6 graduates students to test out the questionnaire and give us feedback. I revised the questions slightly according to their feedback. It took about 10 to 18 minutes to finish the survey in most cases.

We handed out the questionnaires in county-level agencies, GSCs and departments from five different cities in China. Both online surveys and hardcopies were used in accordance with participants' preferences. The subjects were encouraged to do the online survey which was more convenient for data input. To enhance the informants' involvement and commitment, the researchers prepared tokens for the participants (e.g. small Indonesia Rupiah notes, postcard, pens, and notebooks). The online respondents could attend a lucky draw after they successfully submitted their answers (the prizes were

mobile top-up cards with different values: 20, 10, or 5 CNY). 572 questionnaires were collected, of which 178 were online responses, and 394 were hardcopies. Since all the questionnaires were handed out face to face, the response rate was almost 100%. I double-checked the answers one by one and deleted those with missing values, with 405 samples (70.8%) included into the dataset eventually.

Data analysis

We used both SPSS 23 and Stata 14 to run the data analysis. The descriptive analysis shows that 65.7% of the respondents were females while 34.1% were male. This ratio reflects the reality that a majority of the front-line positions are filled by female employees. The analysis also revealed that more than half of the employees in GSCs are under 31 years old, and only 11% are older than 44. 32.2% of the respondents have been in the government for 1 to 3 years, 22.9% for 4 to 7 years, and 45% for 8 years or longer (see Table 3.2, Table 3.3, and Table 3.4). Since I am focusing on front-line employees, I filtered the dataset by using the answer to the following question: “Do you provide service to the citizens directly?” After removing the cases of non-front-line workers, 313 samples were selected. Then, I used Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to examine the categories of MPS, and regressed it by autonomous MJS and need satisfaction. The results are discussed in next section.

Table 3.2 Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	.2	.2	.2
Female	266	65.7	65.7	65.9
Male	138	34.1	34.1	100.0
Total	405	100.0	100.0	

Table 3.3 Age group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30 or younger	198	48.9	49.6
	31 to 44	157	38.8	89.0
	45 or older	44	10.9	100.0
	Total	399	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	6	1.5	
Total		405	100.0	

Table 3.4 Tenure group

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 3 years	128	31.6	32.2
	4 to 7 years	91	22.5	55.0
	8 years or longer	179	44.2	100.0
	Total	398	98.3	100.0
Missing	System	7	1.7	
Total		405	100.0	

Results and Findings

Confirmatory factor analysis

To examine construct validity of MPS model, I ran the confirmatory factor analysis with data from the survey. Analysis showed the measures of each dimension had good reliability: Cronbach's Alpha =(0.6, 0.7) except

RetIntroPri=0.5 and RetExtConst=0.5. Pearson's correlation showed satisfactory convergent validity and discriminant validity of the measurement (Appendix 5). CFA rendered a good fit for our seven-factor model: root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) =0.054(90% confidence interval RMSEA=0.042,0.066), comparative fit index (CFI)=0.935, Tucher-Lewis index (TLI) =0.910, standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR)=0.055, coefficient of determination (CD)=0.997. The standardized item-factor loadings are over than 0.48 (ranging from 0.48 to 0.79). The values of factorial covariance are ranging from $\text{cov}(\text{RetIntrin}, \text{RetExtConst}) = -0.23$ to $\text{cov}(\text{RetIdet}, \text{RetExtRew}) = 0.57$. Based on the CFA, the seven-factor model was adequate. **Therefore, our first research inquiry was supported.** The employees' motivations for public service include both intrinsic motives and non-intrinsic motives. Inconsistent with PSM theory, which only emphasizes on prosocial motivation, the current study found that public servants are mainly driving by self-interested and altruistic motives. The final model was displayed in Figure 3.1.

Table 3.5 Motivation factors for public service (CFA)

Motivation types		Component						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intrinsic	The government job contents fit with my interest	0.69						
	I like the government job which can serve others. I may lose the opportunities to serve others if I quit	0.61						
	My job makes me feel accomplishment	0.77						
	I could know many people from my current job which could enrich my social connections		0.79					
Identified	My current job is helpful for my future career development		0.73					
	The government jobs are secure and I do not need to worry about unemployment			0.63				
Instrumental	The single public employees are easier to get married			0.62				
	My public service job is good for taking care of my family			0.50				
Introjected (Career investment)	The training and knowledge from government would be useless if I quit				0.72			
	The experience from government job would be useless if I quit				0.72			
	The social connections/guanxi in government would be useless if I quit				0.66			
Introjected (Pride)	I cannot leave before I make some achievements. It may make me feel ashamed					0.68		
	People may say I was a loser if I quit my job					0.48		
External(Reward)	The payment and welfare for public servants are fairly good, such as insurance, transportation subsidies, training, children's education, etc.						0.57	
	My current job has good opportunities to be promoted in the future						0.64	
External (Constraints)	My knowledge has not been updated for a long time so that I am not confident in my competence in the job market							0.69
	Working in government for a long time makes me feel slothful and I am afraid I could not acclimatize myself to the private sector							0.67

Figure 3. 1 Confirmatory factor analysis on MPS

Regression

The second research inquiry is to examine how need satisfaction influences the internalization process. The original MJS of the employees directly predicts the value of MPS on their first day of work. However, their MPS changes progressively due to their perception of the work context.

The assumption is that employees would have a higher Autonomous Motivation for Public Service (AMPS) if they had Autonomous Motivation for Job Selection (AMJS). The Controlled Motivation for Job Selection (CMJS)

would have negative effects on AMPS. Since the Instrumental Motivation for Job Selection (IMJS) is in between autonomous motivation and controlled motivation, it may have positive effects on AMPS. Based on SDT, external motives can be internalized if the basic needs are supported. The controlled regulations and instrumental regulations would gradually be integrated into self when relatedness, autonomy and competence are supported. For example, one servant initially joined in public sector because of external motives begins to like his or her job when he or she perceived relatedness, autonomy and competence.

Therefore, I can assume that need satisfaction has moderating effects on the relationships between AMPS and controlled MJS. I set IMJS, CMJS, Need Satisfaction (NS), $NS*IMJS$, and $NS*CMJS$ as independent variables, and AMPS as the dependent variable (DV) (Figure 3.2). The AMPS is measured by five items listed in Table 3.6. Then I regress AMPS on IMJS, CMJS, NS, $NS*IMJS$, and $NS*CMJS$. If the coefficient of NS and the interaction variables are positively significant, then the effects of NS on motivational internalization would be supported. The correlation analysis and collinearity diagnostics (eigenvalue & condition index) reveal that there is no multicollinearity problem (Table 3.7). So, the regression equation is written as:

$$AMPS = a + b * IMJS + c * CMJS + d * NS + e * IMJS * NS + f * CMJS * NS$$

The coefficient b , c , d , e , and f represent the effects of IMJS, CMJS, NS, and interaction variables on AMPS. To address the potential colinearity between NS and NS*IMJS, and NS*CMJS, all the independent variables are changed to standardized value. Then I regress autonomous MPS on all standardized independent variables on SPSS 23.

Figure 3. 2 The effects of MJS and NS on AMPS

Table 3.6 Measurement scale for AMPS ($\alpha=0.774$)

Question: <i>To which extent the following factors were important in making you decision to retain and serve in your current organization?</i>
The government job contents fit with my interest
My job makes me feel accomplishment
I like the government job which can serve others. I may lose the opportunities to serve others if I quit
My current job is helpful for my future career development
I know a lot of people from my current job which could enrich my social connections

These results support that IMJS, CMJS, NS, and interaction variables have significant effects on employees' autonomous motivation of public service (see

Table 3.8). IMJS, CMJS, and NS have positive effects on AMPS. These results demonstrate that those public employees who have CMJS to select a public service career, are likely to integrate external regulations into self when they could perceive autonomy and relatedness. The locus of control moves from external to internal. The differences in slopes between low NS and high NS groups are significant (Figure 3.3 and Figure 3.4). Therefore, **the internalization effect of NS is supported.**

Table 3.7 Correlation analysis

		AMJS	IMJS	CMJS	NS	AMPS
AMJS	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	300				
IMJS	Pearson Correlation	.373**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
	N	296	307			
CMJS	Pearson Correlation	.375**	.575**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
	N	291	297	299		
NS	Pearson Correlation	.317**	.049	-.160**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.394	.006		
	N	290	299	290	303	
AMPS	Pearson Correlation	.598**	.347**	.275**	.338**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	298	304	297	301	310

**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3.8 Regression model for MJS and NS

		Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	SE	R ²	Adj. R ²	ΔR^2	F
		B	Beta						
1	(Constant)	3.599***		77.384	.047	.262	.254	.016	33.624***
	IMJS	.198**	.217	3.423	.058				
	CMJS	.181**	.197	3.079	.059				
	NS	.340***	.375	7.127	.048				
2	(Constant)	3.573***		75.662	.047				
	IMJS	.201**	.220	3.498	.057	.279	.266		21.788***
	CMJS	.175**	.191	2.994	.058				
	NS	.326***	.360	6.760	.048				
	NS*IMJS	.108*	.128	2.164	.050				
	NS*CMJS	-.112*	-.136	-2.263	.050				

a. Dependent Variable: Autonomous motivation (AMPS); Predictors: (Constant), Instrumental motivation (IMJS), Controlled motivation (CMJS), Need satisfaction (NS). b. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Figure 3. 3 Interaction effect between NS and IMJS on AMPS

Figure 3. 4 Interaction effect between NS and CMJS on AMPS

To answer the third research inquiry, I regress the Job satisfaction (JS) on

AMPS, IMPS, and CMPS. The results show that AMPS has a positive influence on JS and, CMPS has negative effects on JS. The relationship between IMPS and NS is not significant. This finding is consistent with PSM literature, which indicates that PSM (intrinsic motivation) is positively related to JS (eg. Liu, Tang, & Zhu, 2008).

Table 3.9 Regression model for Job satisfaction and MPS^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	SE	R ²	Adj. R ²	F
	B	Beta				
1 (Constant)	1.544		.242			
AMPS	.844***	.727	.052	.480	.474	91.284**
CMPS	-.251***	-.154	.083			*
IMPS	.020 (Sig.= .715)	.018	.055			

a. Dependent Variable: **Job satisfaction (JS)**

b. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Discussion and conclusion

This study has four contributions. First, I examined the validity of MPS structure which contains internal motivation, identified motivation, instrumental motivation, introjected motivation and external motivation. Compared to existing motivation literature, MPS provides a more comprehensive and inclusive framework for future studies. Our findings demonstrate that public servants also value external factors such as job security, salary, etc. (Jurkiewicz

1998). Public employees are driven by both intrinsic and extrinsic motives, where these motives include both altruistic and self-interested motives. Empirical evidence supports the conclusions from existing public-private comparative studies (eg. Chen and Bozeman 2013, Bogg and Cooper 1995, Snyder and Osland 1996, Crewson 1997). The seven-factor model of MPS has strong potential to be applied in practice. MPS goes beyond PSM theories that only emphasize the intrinsic and prosocial motivations while underestimating extrinsic and self-interested motives (Van de Walle, Steijn, & Jilke, 2015). It extends the boundary of motivation contents in PA literature today.

Next, the 17 motivation items in the five categories have the potential to be converted into a measurement scale for future research. These items are grounded on field interviews, surveys and statistical analysis, which represent all aspects of the motivation for public service actions. This measurement scale may lead to many new research themes. For example, what are the outcomes of autonomous and controlled motivation (e.g. performance, turnover intention, person-organization fit)? Or is it linked to other public management issues, such as anti-corruption and red tape? The Self-Determination Index (SDI) could be developed on this scale as well. SDI reflects employees' autonomy and self-determination level (Chen and Bozeman 2013). A higher SDI predicts stronger autonomous willingness to work and higher wellbeing. The SDI could

be used for various comparative studies too. For instance, it can be used to compare the behavioral differences between frontline employees and public managers, public and private sectors employees, or public and non-profit employees.

Third, this study confirms the internalization and integration theory by SDT. Data analysis shows that the employees' perceived relatedness and autonomy has a positive effect on autonomous motivation for public service (AMPS). And the moderating effect of need satisfaction on relationship between controlled MJS and AMPS is supported. This means that providing a need supportive environment can cultivate and maintain autonomous motivation in public service. Then, the locus of control would gradually move from extrinsic regulation to internal regulation. This provides the knowledge for public managers to motivate employees more effectively. This finding is consistent with Vandenberg's (2014) research, which indicates that the satisfaction of basic psychological needs contributes to the development of public service motivation (PSM). The positive correlation between AMJS and AMPS implies that selecting new recruits with autonomous motivation is important. Individuals who are intrinsically motivated to join the public sector are more likely to have an AMPS later. Besides recruiting intrinsically motivated people, it is also important to learn how to provide a need-supporting

organization culture in the government. A need-supportive environment could facilitate integrating organization values into self.

Lastly, the findings confirm that the employees with internal motivation or identified motivation would have higher job satisfaction. Those who are driven by controlled motivation for public service may have lower job satisfaction. Instrumental motivation possibly has neutral effects on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a good predictor of organization performance and low turnover intention. Hence, the managers can use both MPS and MJS as tools for HR development. To identify those who really have a passion for public service, or to identify the values of public service, is very important. For employees with a controlled motivation for public service, managers could apply the motivation integration theory to cultivate and enhance their autonomous motivations.

However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, I only focused on the frontline employees. As mentioned above, the motivations of high level managers and street-bureaucrats should be different since their public service behaviors are different. Public managers make policies and decisions while street-bureaucrats deliver public goods to the citizens. The current study only investigated the front-line employees' motivations. The main reason for this is that the authors had little access to the high-level managers. The gap merits future efforts. Secondly, the cross-section data for measures of Motivation for

Job Selection (MJS) may not be the best means of analysis. I believe the respondents in our survey could remember the main motivational factors when they decided to apply for the government jobs. However, I must admit that some people might have forgotten some details over the years. To guarantee the accuracy, future studies could select and survey the new recruits right after they pass the national entrance exam for government employees, and then survey them regularly two or three years after they start working. Another limitation is that I did not include organization outcomes of autonomous and controlled motivation in current research. For example, how do the different types of motivations influence the employees' behavior patterns and performance? Do autonomous motives lead to more positive individual and organizational results than controlled motives? These questions merit further investigations.

References

- Alonso, P., & Lewis, G. B. (2001). Public Service Motivation and Job Performance Evidence from the Federal Sector. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 31(4), 363-380.
- Anderfuhren-Biget, S., Varone, F., Giauque, D., & Ritz, A. (2010). Motivating Employees of the Public Sector: Does Public Service Motivation Matter? *International Public Management Journal*, 13 (3), 213-246.
- Andersen, L. B. (2009). What determines the behaviour and performance of health professionals? Public service motivation, professional norms and/or economic incentives. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(1), 79-97.
- Andersen, L. B., & Pedersen, L. H. (2012). Public service motivation and professionalism. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 46-57.
- Andersen, L. B., & Serritzlew, S. (2012). Does public service motivation affect the behavior of professionals?. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 19-29.
- Andersen, L. B., Jørgensen, T. B., Kjeldsen, A. M., Pedersen, L. H., & Vrangbæk, K. (2013). Public Values and Public Service Motivation Conceptual and Empirical Relationships. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43(3), 292-311.
- Baard, P. P. (1994). A Motivational Model for Consulting with Not-For-Profit Organizations: A Study of Church Growth and Participation. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 46 (3), 19-31.
- Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of communication*, 28(3), 12-29.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall.
- Baldwin, J. N. (1987). Public versus private: Not that different, not that consequential. *Public personnel management*, 16(2), 181-193.

- Barfort, S., Harmon, N. A., Hjorth, F. G., & Olsen, A. L. (2015). Dishonesty and Selection into Public Service in Denmark: Who Runs the World's Least Corrupt Public Sector? Retrived from <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/kudkuiedp/1512.htm>.
- Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial Motivation: Is it ever Truly Altruistic?. *Advances In Experimental Social Psychology*, 20,65-122.
- Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2(2), 107-122.
- Barsoum, G. (2015). Young people's job aspirations in Egypt and the continued preference for a government job. *The Egyptian Labor Market in an Era of Revolution*, 108.
- Behn, R. D. (1995). The big questions of public management. *Public Administration Review*, 313-324.
- Bellante, D., & Link, A. N. (1981). Are public sector workers more risk averse than private sector workers? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 34(3), 408-412.
- Bellé, N. (2013). Experimental evidence on the relationship between public service motivation and job performance. *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 143-153.
- Bellé, N. (2014). Leading to make a difference: a field experiment on the performance effects of transformational leadership, perceived social impact, and public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 24, 109–136.
- Bellé, N., & Ongaro, E. (2014). NPM, administrative reforms and public service motivation: improving the dialogue between research agendas. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 80(2), 382-400.
- Bian, Y., Breiger, R., Galaskiewicz, J., & Davis, D. (2005). Occupation, class, and social networks in urban China. *Social Forces*, 83(4), 1443-1468.
- Blais, M. R., Sabourin, S., Boucher, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Toward a motivational model of couple happiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 1021.

- Blank, R. M. (1985). An analysis of workers' choice between employment in the public and private sectors. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 38(2), 211-224.
- Blau, P. M. (1960). Orientation Toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 5 (3), 341-361.
- Bright, L. (2005). Public Employees With High Levels of Public Service Motivation Who Are They, Where Are They, and What do They Want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25(2), 138-154.
- Bright, L. (2007). Does person-organization fit mediate the relationship between public service motivation and the job performance of public employees? *Review of public personnel administration*, 27(4), 361-379.
- Bright, L. (2008). Does public service motivation really make a difference on the job satisfaction and turnover intentions of public employees?. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 38(2), 149-166.
- Bogg, J., & Cooper, C. (1995). Job satisfaction, mental health, and occupational stress among senior civil servants. *Human Relations*, 48(3), 327-341.
- Bozeman, B., & Ponomariov, B. (2009). Sector Switching from a Business to a Government Job: Fast Track Career or Fast Track to Nowhere? *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 77-91.
- Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2011). *Rules and Red Tape: A Prism for Public Administration Theory and Research*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Bozeman, B., & Su, X. (2015). Public Service Motivation Concepts and Theory: A Critique. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 700-710.
- Brænder, M., & Andersen, L. B. (2013). Does Deployment to War Affect Public Service Motivation? A Panel Study of Soldiers Before and After Their Service in Afghanistan. *Public Administration Review*, 73(3), 466-477.
- Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and*

Theory, 8(3), 413-440.

Brewer, G. A., Selden, S. C., Facer, I. I., & Rex, L. (2000). Individual conceptions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 60(3), 254-264.

Brewer, G. A. (2008). Employee and organizational performance. *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*, 136-156.

Brewer, G. A., Ritz, A., & Vandenabeele, W. (2012). Introduction to a symposium on public service motivation: an international sampling of research. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 1-4.

Bright, L. (2005). Public Employees with High Levels of Public Service Motivation Who Are They, Where Are They, and What do They Want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25 (2), 138-154.

Bright, L. (2007). Does Person-Organization Fit Mediate the Relationship Between Public Service Motivation and the Job Performance of Public Employees? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27 (4), 361-379.

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

Bright, L. (2016). Public service motivation and socialization in graduate education. *Teaching Public Administration*, 34(3), 284-306.

Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., Witte, H., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2010). Capturing autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work: Construction and initial validation of the Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 981-1002.

Buelens, M., & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 65-74.

Bullock, J. B., Stritch, J. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2015). International Comparison of Public

- and Private Employees' Work Motives, Attitudes, and Perceived Rewards. *Public Administration Review*, 75(3), 479-489.
- Buunk, B. P., Collins, R. L., Taylor, S. E., VanYperen, N. W., & Dakof, G. A. (1990). The Affective Consequences of Social Comparison: Either Direction Has Its Ups and Downs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1238-1249.
- Buurman, M., Delfgaauw, J., Dur, R., & Van den Bossche, S. (2012). Public sector employees: Risk averse and altruistic? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(3), 279-291.
- Caillier, J. G. (2015). Transformational leadership and whistle-blowing attitudes: Is this relationship mediated by organizational commitment and public service motivation? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(4), 458-475.
- Caillier, J. G. (2014). Towards A Better Understanding Of Public Service Motivation And Mission Valence In Public Agencies. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1217-1236.
- Camilleri, E. (2006). Towards developing an organisational commitment-public service motivation model for the Maltese public service employees. *Public policy and administration*, 21(1), 63-83.
- Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel review*, 36(3), 356-377.
- Camilleri, E., & Van Der Heijden, B. I. (2007). Organizational commitment, public service motivation, and performance within the public sector. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 31(2), 241-274.
- Carpenter, J., Doverspike, D., & Miguel, R. F. (2012). Public Service Motivation as a Predictor of Attraction to the Public Sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80 (2), 509-523.
- Castaing, S. (2006). The effects of psychological contract fulfilment and public service motivation on organizational commitment in the French civil service. *Public policy and administration*, 21(1), 84-98.

- Chen, C. A. (2012). Explaining the difference of work attitudes between public and nonprofit managers: The views of rule constraints and motivation styles. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(4), 437-460.
- Chen, C. A., & Bozeman, B. (2013). Understanding public and nonprofit managers' motivation through the lens of self-determination theory. *Public Management Review*, 15(4), 584-607.
- Chen, C.-A., Hsieh, C.-W., & Chen, D.-Y. (2014). Fostering public service motivation through workplace trust: Evidence from public managers in Taiwan. *Public Administration*, 92 (4), 954-973.
- Chen, C.-A., & Hsieh, C.-W. (2015). Does pursuing external incentives compromise public service motivation? Comparing the effects of job security and high pay. *Public Management Review*, 17 (8), 1190-1213.
- Chen, C.-A., & Xu, C. (2016). Public Service Motivation: Review, Reflection, and Reorientation. *Journal of Public Administration (Taiwan)*, (51):69-96.
- Choi, D. L. (2004). Public service motivation and ethical conduct. *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(2), 99-106.
- Choi, Y. J. (2002). A study of public service motivation: The Korean experience. (63), ProQuest Information & Learning, US. Retrieved from [http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2002-95015-024](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2002-95015-024&site=ehost-live) &site=ehost-live Available from EBSCOhost psych database.
- Christensen, R. K. (2009). Employee Evaluations in the Public Sector: Public Service Motivation, Task, and Citizenship Behaviors. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, 23(2), 41-56.
- Christensen, R. K., & 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. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(4), 723-743.
- Clerkin, R. M., & Cogburn, J. D. (2012). The dimensions of public service motivation and

- sector work preferences. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32 (3), 209-235.
- Clerkin, R. M., Paynter, S. R., & Taylor, J. K. (2009). Public service motivation in undergraduate giving and volunteering decisions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 39 (6), 675-698.
- Cook, S. L., & Ma, Z. (2014). The interconnectedness between landowner knowledge, value, belief, attitude, and willingness to act: Policy implications for carbon sequestration on private rangelands. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 134, 90-99.
- Costa, H. A., Collins, J., & Levi, I. (1995). Desire-as-belief implies opinionation or indifference. *Analysis*, 55 (1), 2-5.
- Coursey David, H., Perry James, L., & Brudney Jeffrey, L. (2008, September). Littlepage Laura. In *Measurement questions in public service motivation: Construct formation and nomological distinctiveness and explanatory power for volunteering activities. 2008b. Paper presented for the Minnowbrook III Conference, Lake Placid, NY.*
- Coursey, D., Yang, K., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Public service motivation (PSM) and support for citizen participation: A test of Perry and Vandenabeele's reformulation of PSM theory. *Public Administration Review*, 72(4), 572-582.
- Crewson, P. E. (1995). A comparative analysis of public and private sector entrant quality. *American Journal of Political Science*, 628-639.
- Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(4), 499-518.
- Daniels, M. J. (1960). Affect and its control in the medical intern. *American Journal of Sociology*, 259-267.
- Davis, C. E., & West, J. P. (1980). Job reward preferences of Mexican-American and anglo public employees. *Public Productivity Review*, 199-209.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of Externally Mediated Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 18 (1), 105-115.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The Support of Autonomy and the Control of Behavior. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1024-1037.
- Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74 (4), 580.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The " what" and " why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11 (4), 227-268.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 49(3), 182.
- De Cooman, R., De Gieter, S., Pepermans, R., Hermans, S., Du Bois, C., Caers, R., & Jegers, M. (2009). Person–organization fit: Testing socialization and attraction–selection–attrition hypotheses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 102-107.
- De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2008). Volition and reasons for accepting temporary employment: Associations with attitudes, well-being, and behavioural intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 363-387.
- DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J., & Pandey, S. K. (2006). Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 873-887.
- Delfgaauw, J., & Dur, R. (2008). Incentives and workers' motivation in the public sector*. *The Economic Journal*, 118(525), 171-191.
- Desmarais, C., & Gamassou, C. E. (2014). All motivated by public service? The links between hierarchical position and public service motivation. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 80(1), 131-150.
- Duffy, R. D., & Raque-Bogdan, T. L. (2010). The motivation to serve others: Exploring relations to career development. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 18(3), 250-265.

- Dur, R., & Zoutenbier, R. (2014). Working for a good cause. *Public Administration Review*, 74(2), 144-155.
- Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 565-581.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Emmert, M. A., & Taher, W. A. (1992). Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 22(1), 37-48.
- Ertas, N. (2014). Public Service Motivation Theory and Voluntary Organizations Do Government Employees Volunteer More? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(2), 254-271.
- Fagin, R., & Halpern, J. Y. (1987). Belief, awareness, and limited reasoning. *Artificial intelligence*, 34 (1), 39-76.
- Farazmand, A. (2001). Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, 425(6960), 785-791.
- Feeney, M. K. (2008). Sector Perceptions among State-Level Public Managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(3), 465-494.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117-140.
- Francois, P. (2000). 'Public service motivation' as an argument for government provision. *Journal of Public Economics*, 78, 275-299.
- Francois, P. (2000). 'Public service motivation' as an argument for government provision. *Journal of Public Economics*, 78(3), 275-299.
- Frank, S. A., & Lewis, G. B. (2004). Government employees working hard or hardly

- working? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 34(1), 36-51.
- Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001). Motivation crowding theory. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 15 (5), 589-611.
- Frederickson, H. G. (2002). Confucius and the moral basis of bureaucracy. *Administration & Society*, 33(6), 610-628.
- Gabris, G. T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public personnel management*, 24(1), 33-51.
- Gagné, M., Ryan, R. M., & Bargmann, K. (2003). Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and well-being of gymnasts. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, 15(4), 372-390.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26 (4), 331-362.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M. H., Aubé, C., Morin, E., & Malorni, A. (2010). The Motivation at Work Scale: Validation evidence in two languages. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(4), 628-646.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Broeck, A. V. D., Aspel, A. K., ... & Westbye, C. (2014). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, (ahead-of-print), 1-19.
- Gagné, M. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation, and self-determination theory*: Oxford University Press.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Broeck, A. V. d., Aspel, A. K., . . . Güntert, S. T. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24 (2), 178-196.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*, international edition. Singapore: Pearson.

- Gerring, J. (1999). What makes a concept good? A criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences. *Polity*, 357-393.
- Georgellis, Y., Iossa, E., & Tabvuma, V. (2011). Crowding out intrinsic motivation in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21 (3), 473-493.
- Georgellis, Y., & Tabvuma, V. (2010). Does Public Service Motivation Adapt? *Kyklos*, 63 (2), 176-191.
- Giauque, D., Ritz, A., Varone, F., & ANDERFUHREN-BIGET, S. I. M. O. N. (2012). Resigned but satisfied: the negative impact of public service motivation and red tape on work satisfaction. *Public Administration*, 90(1), 175-193.
- Goldman, A. I. (1979). What is justified belief? In G. S. Pappas (Ed.), *Justification and Knowledge: New Studies in Epistemology* (pp. 1-23). Springer.
- Graham, W. K., & Renwick, P. A. (1972). Expected need deficiency and preferences for three types of organizations. *The Journal of Psychology*, 82(1), 21-26.
- Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (2), 393-417.
- Grand, J. L. (2010). Knights and knaves return: public service motivation and the delivery of public services. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(1), 56-71.
- Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 465.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 52(5), 890.
- Gunderson, M. (1979). Earnings differentials between the public and private sectors. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 228-242.
- Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 289-298.

- Haddock, G., & Maio, G. R. (2013). Psychology of Attitudes. Retrieved from SAGE knowledge database.
- Harvey, O. (1986). Belief systems and attitudes toward the death penalty and other punishments. *Journal of Personality*, 54(4), 659-675.
- Hayamizu, T. (1997). Between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: Examination of Reasons for Academic Study Based on the Theory of Internalization. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 39 (2), 98-108.
- Hickey, R. (2014). Prosocial Motivation, Stress and Burnout Among Direct Support Workers. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 27 (2), 134-144.
- Hotchkiss, D. R., Banteyerga, H., & Tharaney, M. (2015). Job satisfaction and motivation among public sector health workers: evidence from Ethiopia. *Human resources for health*, 13(1), 1.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational dynamics*, 16(4), 5-21.
- Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 713-728.
- Houston, D. J. (2006). "Walking the walk" of public service motivation: Public employees and charitable gifts of time, blood, and money. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1), 67-86.
- Houston, D. J., & Cartwright, K. E. (2007). Spirituality and public service. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 88-102.
- Houston, D. J. (2011). Implications of occupational locus and focus for public service motivation: Attitudes toward work motives across nations. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5), 761-771.
- Johnson, B. J. (2012). Public Service Motivation and the Technical, Political, and Facilitator Roles of City Planners. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 30-45.

- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of applied psychology*, 77(3), 261.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., Massey, T. K., Jr., & Brown, R. G. (1998). Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 21(3), 230-250.
- Karl, K. A., & Sutton, C. L. (1998). Job values in today's workforce: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public personnel management*, 27(4), 515-527.
- Khojasteh, M. (1993). Motivating the private vs. public sector managers. *Public personnel management*, 22(3), 391-401.
- Kim, S. (2005). Individual-level factors and organizational performance in government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(2), 245-261.
- Kim, S. (2006). Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea. *International journal of manpower*, 27(8), 722-740.
- Kim, S. (2008). Revising Perry's measurement scale of public service motivation. *The American Review of Public Administration*.
- Kim, S. (2009). Testing the structure of public service motivation in Korea: A research note. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(4), 839-851.
- Kim, S., & Vandenabeele, W. (2010). A strategy for building public service motivation research internationally. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 701-709.
- Kim, S. (2011). Testing a revised measure of public service motivation: Reflective versus formative specification. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 521-546.
- Kim, S. (2012). Does Person-Organization Fit Matter in the Public Sector? Testing the Mediating Effect of Person-Organization Fit in the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Work Attitudes. *Public Administration Review*, 72 (6), 830-840.

- Kim, S. et al. (2013). Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23, 79–102.
- Kjeldsen, A. M. (2012). Sector and occupational differences in public service motivation: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 58-69.
- Kjeldsen, A. M. (2012). Vocational Study and Public Service Motivation: Disentangling the Socializing Effects of Higher Education. *International Public Management Journal*, 15 (4), 500-524.
- Kjeldsen, A. M., & Jacobsen, C. B. (2013). Public service motivation and employment sector: Attraction or socialization?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23 (4), 899-926.
- Kjeldsen, A. M. (2014). Dynamics of public service motivation: Attraction–selection and socialization in the production and regulation of social services. *Public Administration Review*, 74, 101-112.
- Kleinginna, P., Jr., & Kleinginna, A. (1981). A categorized list of motivation definitions, with a suggestion for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5 (3), 263-291.
- Lavigna, B. (2012). Commentary on “Pulling the Levers: Transformational Leadership, Public Service Motivation, and Mission Valence”. *Public Administration Review*, 72(2), 216-217.
- Leisink, P., & Steijn, B. (2009). Public service motivation and job performance of public sector employees in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(1), 35-52.
- Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government?. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 395-404.
- Li, C., Wu, Y., & Kee, Y. H. (2016). Validation of the Volunteer Motivation Scale and its relations with work climate and intention among Chinese volunteers. *Asian Journal of*

- Social Psychology*, 19(2), 124–133.
- Li, D. (2014). *Value Theory: A Research into Subjectivity*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Li, M., & Wang, Z. (2014). Emotional labour strategies as mediators of the relationship between public service motivation and job satisfaction in Chinese teachers. *International Journal Of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*. doi: 10.1002/ijop.12114
- Liu, B., Tang, N., & Zhu, X. (2008). Public service motivation and job satisfaction in China. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(8), 684-699.
- Liu, B. C. (2009). Evidence of public service motivation of social workers in China. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(2), 349-366.
- Liu, B., Liu, J., & Hu, J. (2010). Person-organization fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: an empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 38(5), 615-625.
- Liu, B. C., & Tang, T. L. P. (2011). Does the love of money moderate the relationship between public service motivation and job satisfaction? The case of Chinese professionals in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5), 718-727.
- Liu, B., Zhang, X., Du, L., & Hu, Q. (2013). Validating the Construct of Public Service Motivation in For-Profit Organizations: A Preliminary Study. *Public Management Review*, (ahead-of-print), 1-26.
- Liu, B., Zhang, X., & Lv, X. (2014). Compassion as the affective dimension of public service motivation in a Chinese context. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(2), 245-252.
- Liu, B., & Perry, J. L. (2016). The psychological mechanisms of public service motivation: A two-wave examination. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(1), 4-30.
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (2006). A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees.

- Public Administration Review*, 66(4), 605-618.
- Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. *Public personnel management*, 20(4), 441-448.
- Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: Public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public personnel management*, 35(1), 33-48.
- Madsen, K. B. (1974). Modern theories of motivation: A comparative metascientific study. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- MacIntyre, A. (1967). Egoism and altruism. In Paul Edwards (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan.
- More, H. W., Wegner, F. W. & Miller, L. S. (2003). Effective Police Supervision. Cincinnati, Anderson Publishing Co.
- Moulton, S., & Feeney, M. K. (2010). Public service in the private sector: Private loan originator participation in a public mortgage program. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 547-572.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 40-53.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 803-832.
- Moynihan, D. P. (2010). A Workforce of Cynics? The Effects of Contemporary Reforms on Public Service Motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 13 (1), 24-34.
- Myers, J. (2008). Public Service Motivation and Performance Incentives: a literature review. Retrived from http://www.publicservices.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/publicservicemotivationandperformanceincentives_myersjune2008.pdf

- Myers, D. G., & Twenge, J. M. (2013). *Social psychology*: New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Naff, K. C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America does public service motivation make a difference?. *Review of public personnel administration*, 19(4), 5-16.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 19(4), 317-328.
- Niskanen, W. A. (1971). *Bureaucracy and representative government*: Transaction Publishers.
- Olson, M. (2009). *The logic of collective action* (Vol. 124). Harvard University Press.
- Paarlberg, L. E., Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). From theory to practice: Strategies for applying public service motivation. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 268-293). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Paarlberg, L. E., & Lavigna, B. (2010). Transformational Leadership and Public Service Motivation: Driving Individual and Organizational Performance. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 710-718.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pandey, S. K., & Stazyk, E. C. (2008). Antecedents and correlates of public service motivation. *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*, 101-117.
- Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E., & Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Public service motivation and interpersonal citizenship behavior in public organizations: Testing a preliminary model. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 89-108.
- Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2008). Leadership and public service motivation in US federal agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 109-142.
- Pearce, J. L. (1983). Job attitude and motivation differences between volunteers and employees from comparable organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 646.

- Pedersen, M. J. (2015). Activating the Forces of Public Service Motivation: Evidence from a Low-Intensity Randomized Survey Experiment. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 734-746.
- Pelled, L. H., & Xin, K. R. (1997). Work values and their human resource management implications: A theoretical comparison of China, Mexico, and the United States. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 6(2), 185.
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., Briere, N. M., & Blais, M. R. (1995). Toward a New Measure of Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Amotivation in Sports: The Sport Motivation Scale (SMS). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 35-35.
- Perry, J. L., & Porter, L. W. (1982). Factors affecting the context for motivation in public organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 89-98.
- Perry, J. L. (1986). Merit pay in the public sector: The case for a failure of theory. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 7(1), 57-69.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 367-373.
- 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.
- Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(2), 181-197.
- Perry, J. L. (2000). Bringing society in: Toward a theory of public-service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 471-488.
- Perry, J. L., & Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Behavioral dynamics: Institutions, identities, and self-regulation. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 56-79). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008a). Building theory and empirical evidence about public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 3-12.
- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (Eds.). (2008b). *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service: The Call of Public Service*. Oxford University Press.
- 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. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 681-690.
- Perry, J. L. (2014). The motivational bases of public service: foundations for a third wave of research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 36(1), 34-47.
- Perry, J. L. & Vandenabelle, W. (2015). Public Service Motivation Research: Achievements, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 692-699.
- Petrovsky, N., & Ritz, A. (2014, May). Public service motivation and performance: a critical perspective. In *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 4-4). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Potipiroon, W., & Ford, M. T. (2014, January). When Does Public Service Motivation Relate to Organizational Commitment? A Three-Way Interaction. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2014, No. 1, p. 10948). *Academy of Management*.
- Prebble, M. (2014). Has the Study of Public Service Motivation Addressed the Issues That Motivated the Study? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(3), 267-291.
- Rainey, H. G. (1982). Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 16(4), 288-302.
- Rainey, H. G., & Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(1), 1-32.
- Rashid, S., & Rashid, U. (2012). Work motivation differences between public and private sector. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 1(2), 24-33.
- Rayner, J., Williams, H. M., Lawton, A., & Allinson, C. W. (2010). Public service ethos:

- Developing a generic measure. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21 (1): 27-51.
- Rhemtulla, M., Brosseau-Liard, P. É., & Savalei, V. (2012). When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. *Psychological methods*, 17(3), 354.
- Rhinehart, J. B., Barrell, R., DeWolfe, A., Griffin, J., & Spaner, F. (1969). Comparative study of need satisfactions in governmental and business hierarchies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53(3p1), 230.
- Ritz, A. (2009). Public service motivation and organizational performance in Swiss federal government. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(1), 53-78.
- Ritz, A., & Brewer, G. A. (2013). Does Societal Culture Affect Public Service Motivation? Evidence of Sub-national Differences in Switzerland. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(2), 224-251.
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2013, June). Public service motivation: a systematic literature review and outlook. In *Public Management Research Conference, June, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI*.
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook. *Public Administration Review*, online first.
- Ryan, R. M. & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived Locus of Causality and Internalization: Examining Reasons for Acting in Two Domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 749–761.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
- Scott, P. G., & Pandey, S. K. (2005). Red Tape and Public Service Motivation Findings

- from a National Survey of Managers in State Health and Human Services Agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25(2), 155-180.
- Sheldon, K. M., Turban, D. B., Brown, K. G., Barrick, M. R., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Applying self-determination theory to organizational research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 22, 357-393.
- Smith, J. O., & Sjoberg, G. (1961). Origins and career patterns of leading Protestant clergymen. *Social Forces*, 39(4), 290-296.
- Snyder, M. M., & Osland, J. (1996). Public and private organizations in Latin America: a comparison of reward preferences. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(2), 15-27.
- SON, C. D. B. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. *The handbook of social psychology*, 2, 282.
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61(4), 335-340.
- Spitzmuller, M., & Van Dyne, L. (2013). Proactive and reactive helping: Contrasting the positive consequences of different forms of helping. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 560-580.
- Steijn, B. (2008). Person-environment fit and public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 13-27.
- Steen, T. (2008). Not a government monopoly: The private, nonprofit, and voluntary sectors. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sun, J. Y., & Gu, Q. (2016). For public causes or personal interests? Examining public service motives in the Chinese context. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. doi:10.1111/1744-7941.12119
- Sun, T., & Yang, Y. (2008). A political analysis on public sector preference, *Social Scientist (In Chinese)*, 137(9):41-44.
- Tan, H.-H., & Tan, C.-P. (2002). Temporary employees in Singapore: What drives them?

The Journal of Psychology, 136(1), 83-102.

- Tansel, A. (2005). Public-private employment choice, wage differentials, and gender in Turkey. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 53(2), 453-477.
- Taylor, J. (2007). The impact of public motives on work outcomes in Australia: a comparative multi-dimensional analysis. *Public Administration*, 85(4), 931-959.
- Taylor, J. (2008). Organizational influences, public service motivation and work outcomes: An Australian study. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1).
- Taylor, J. (2010). Public service motivation, civic attitudes and actions of public, nonprofit and private sector employees. *Public Administration*, 88(4), 1083-1098.
- Taylor, J., & Westover, J. H. (2011). Job satisfaction in the public service: the effects of public service motivation, workplace attributes and work relations. *Public Management Review*, 13(5), 731-751.
- Taylor, J., & Taylor, R. (2015). Does the economy matter? Tough times, good times, and public service motivation. *Public Money & Management*, 35(5), 333-340.
- Tremblay, M. A., Blamharg, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its Value for Organizational Psychology Research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 41 (4), 213-226.
- Tschirhart, M., K. K. Reed, S. J. Freeman, and A. L. Anker. 2008. Is the grass greener? Sector shifting and choice of sector by MPA and MBA graduates. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37:668-88.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallieres, E. F. (1992). The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 52 (4), 1003-1017.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Ratelle, C. F. (2004). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: A hierarchical model. *Handbook of self-determination research*, edited by Deci E. L. and Ryan R. M., 37-63. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

- Vandenabeele, W., Scheepers, S., & Hondeghem, A. (2006). Public service motivation in an international comparative perspective: The UK and Germany. *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(1), 13-31.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a public administration theory of public service motivation: An institutional approach. *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. *Public Administration*, 86(4), 1089-1105.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2008b). Development of a public service motivation measurement scale: corroborating and extending Perry's measurement instrument. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 143-167.
- Vandenabeele, W., & Van de Walle, S. (2008). International differences in public service motivation: Comparing regions across the world. *Motivation in public management: the call of public service*, 223-244.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2011). Who wants to deliver public service? Do institutional antecedents of public service motivation provide an answer? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31, 87-107.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2014). Explaining Public Service Motivation: The Role of Leadership and Basic Needs Satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34(2), 153-173.
- Vandenabeele, W., Brewer, G. A., & Ritz, A. (2014). Past, present, and future of public service motivation research. *Public Administration*, 92(4), 779-789.
- Van de Walle, S., Steijn, B., & Jilke, S. (2015). Extrinsic motivation, PSM and labour market characteristics: a multilevel model of public sector employment preference in 26 countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 81(4), 833-855.
- van Loon, N. M., Leisink, P., & Vandenabeele, W. (2013). Talking the Talk of Public Service Motivation: How Public Organization Logics Matter for Employees'

- Expressions of PSM. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(14), 1007-1019.
- Von Hippel, C., Mangum, S. L., Greenberger, D. B., Heneman, R. L., & Skoglund, J. D. (1997). Temporary employment: Can organizations and employees both win? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 93-104.
- Ward, K. D. (2014a). Cultivating public service motivation through AmeriCorps Service: A longitudinal study. *Public Administration Review*, 74(1), 114-125.
- Ward, K. D. (2014b). Tapping the Americorps pipeline: Using secondary data to test the public service motivation construct. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(2), 240-258.
- Warren, D. C., & Chen, L. (2013). The relationship between public service motivation and performance. In Ringquist, E. (ed.). *Meta-analysis for Public Management and Policy*, San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (2), 222-244.
- Williams, G. G., Gagné, M., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Facilitating autonomous motivation for smoking cessation. *Health Psychology*, 21 (1), 40-50.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 694-713.
- Wise, L. R. (2004). Bureaucratic posture: On the need for a composite theory of bureaucratic behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 64(6), 669-680.
- Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving the people or serving for pay: Reward preferences among government, hybrid sector, and business managers. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 369-383.
- Wright, B. E. (2001). Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(4), 559-586.

- Wright, B. E. (2007). Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter? *Public Administration Review*, 67 (1), 54-64.
- Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). Public Service Motivation and the Assumption of Person—Organization Fit Testing the Mediating Effect of Value Congruence. *Administration & Society*, 40(5), 502-521.
- Wright, B. E. (2008). Methodological challenges associated with public service motivation research. *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*, 80-98.
- Wright, B. E., Perry, J., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- 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.
- Wright, B. E., & Christensen, R. K. (2010). Public Service Motivation: A Test of the Job Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(2), 155.
- Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2011). Public Organizations and Mission Valence When Does Mission Matter?. *Administration & Society*, 43(1), 22-44.
- 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.
- Xu, C., & Chen, C.-A. (2016). Moving from Public Service Motivation (PSM) to Motivation for Public Service (MPS): Through the Lens of Self-Determination Theory. In S. L. Wade (Ed.), *Self-Determination Theory (SDT): Perspective, Applications and Impact*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Yung, B. (2014). In What Way Is Confucianism Linked to Public Service Motivation? Philosophical and Classical Insights. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37(5), 281-287.

- Yung, B. (2010). Can Confucianism add value to democracy education?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1919-1926.
- Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communications Monographs*, 55(4), 374-388.
- Yousaf, M., Zafar, S., & Ellahi, A. A. (2014). Do public service motivation, red tape and resigned work satisfaction triangulate together? *International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management*, 63(7), 923-945.

Appendixes

Appendix 1

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in the survey of “Motivation for public service behaviors” conducted by Xu Chengwei and Chen Chung-An at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. The purpose of this survey is to investigate why public servants choose to be involved in public service behaviors. It will take you less than 30 minutes to complete the survey. Your kind participation is appreciated.

Any personal information related to your identity will be kept confidential. This survey will not ask you to provide your names or contacts and others which can directly track to your identity. Your cities, job titles, department information will be replaced with numbers or symbols in our publications. You can stop at any time your participation and withdraw from doing this survey. And you can ask us to return all your information even after the survey is over. The information you provided would be deleted from the records/database, and your submitted survey answers will not be used in the research and publication.

If you have any questions, please contact us:

Principal investigator: Chen Chung-An, assistant professor, Public Policy and Global Affairs Programme, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore , Email: cchongan@ntu.edu.sg.

Co-Investigator: Xu Chengwei, PhD candidate, Public Policy and Global Affairs Programme, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Email: cxu005@e.ntu.edu.sg

☐ I declare that I understand the procedures described above and agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Names of Researcher

Signature

Date

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to:

Institutional Review Board Secretariat
Nanyang Technological University
E-mail: IRB@ntu.edu.sg
Tel: +65 6592 2495

调查对象知情书

尊敬的被调查者，非常感谢您参与我们的调查项目：“公共服务行为的动机基础：自我决定理论的视角”，这项调查有新加坡南洋理工大学陈重安教授与博士候选人许成委共同承担。本次调查大约会占用您30分钟的时间，您的帮助对本研究具有重要意义，我们表示衷心感谢！

任何关于您的个人信息将被严格保密。调查中无需提供您的姓名和联系方式以及其它能够直接识别您身份的信息。所有发表中，问卷中涉及的城市名称、工作名称、单位名称等都会用代号表示。您可以随时暂停或者退出我们的调查。即便是调查结束，您依然可以要求我们退回您提供的有关信息；您所提供信息将会从记录或数据库中删除，您提供的调查答案将不会用于研究或发表。

如果您之后有任何疑问，可以随时联系我们：

主要负责人：陈重安，南洋理工大学公共政策与全球事务系助理教授，邮箱：cchongan@ntu.edu.sg。

第二负责人（项目联系人）：许成委，新加坡南洋理工大学公共政策与全球事务系博士候选人，邮箱：cxu005@e.ntu.edu.sg，电话号码：+65 82364796 或者 +86 15991791413。

我理解以上描述，并我同意参与此项研究。

调查员签名

日期

受访者签名

日期

如果您对于您的权益还有进一步的问题，您还可以联系：

伦理审查委员会秘书处

新加坡南洋理工大学

电邮： IRB@ntu.edu.sg

电话： **+65** 6592 2495

Appendix 2

Interview questions

Note: this is for investigators only

访谈提纲

1. What reasons drove you to be a public servant? 您最初选择做一名公务员的动力或原因有哪些?
2. Which department and position are you serving for? 您工作的部门和岗位是什么?
3. Please describe your daily work? 请您描述一下您每天的公共服务的具体行为?
4. Have you ever thought about quit? Why did not? 在这些年的工作中, 您有没有考虑过放弃公务岗位进入私营部门工作?
5. If you were thinking to leave your job as a public servant, what could be the reasons? 如果您在考虑将来可能离开公共服务岗位, 原因是什么?
6. Which reasons make you retain in current job? 如果您选择继续留在公共服务岗位上, 原因有哪些?
7. Would you like to transfer to another department? Why? 您是否尝试过转换到其它政府部门? 原因是什么?
8. Would you take public work again, if you had second chance? 如果您有重新选择工作的机会, 您还会选择做一名公务员吗?
9. Will you support your children to work in public sectors? 您会支持您的子女成为公务员吗? 为什么呢?
10. How you evaluate your current job? 您对这些日常工作的评价是什么? (很有意思/对社会有价值/很无聊/很难压力很大/希望退休能够清闲一些)
11. Please evaluate your job satisfaction, 1 means strongly unsatisfied, 7 means strongly satisfied. 如果“1”表示“您对工作很不满意”, 7表示“您对工作很满意”, 请选择 1 到 7 中间的一个数字评价您的工作满意度。
12. What does the “public” mean to you? and how to distinguish serving the public with serving others? 您认为“公共”一词的含义是什么, 当您想到“公共服务”时, 如何区分“服务公众”和“服务“他人”?
13. Do you feel proud of your public service job? 您是否因为做一名公务员而觉得自豪?
14. How PSM develops? How does PSM change during professional life? 公共服务动机是指对公共事务或公共服务方面的工作作出积极反应的一种倾向, 有学者解释为为社会服务的意愿; 您的内在公共服务动机如何发生并随着职业生涯发展发生变化的?
15. Do you have enough competence for the current job? 目前的工作您感到游刃有余

余还是力不从心呢？

16. Do you have enough autonomy regarding your work? 在目前的岗位是否能够按照自己的意志办事呢？
17. Can you feel relatedness in your working context? 目前的同事关系和单位氛围如何？如是否让你感到关系亲密并且感受到被别人关心？

Appendix 3

Correlation Matrix

	Internal1	Internal2	Internal3	IdenAchi1	IdenAchi2	IdenAchi3	IdenRepu1	IdenRepu2	IdenRepu3	Instru12	Instru3	Insto4	Intro1	Intro2	Intro3	ExterConst1	ExterConst3	ExterConst4	ExterRew1	ExterRew2
Internal1	1.000	.713	.595	.274	.488	.262	.006	-.013	.061	.154	.007	-.011	-.033	.070	.070	.062	-.035	.005	.000	.148
Internal2	.713	1.000	.653	.391	.620	.432	.074	.025	.132	.115	-.015	.022	.007	.183	.108	.039	-.030	.051	.056	.129
Internal3	.595	.653	1.000	.509	.592	.401	.003	.047	.142	.030	-.001	.027	.034	.080	.045	.051	-.098	.011	.044	.011
IdenAchi1	.274	.391	.509	1.000	.470	.328	.257	.265	.255	.010	-.037	.022	.102	.169	.180	.124	-.060	.014	.116	.041
IdenAchi2	.488	.620	.592	.470	1.000	.486	.132	.160	.198	.007	.108	.136	.086	.219	.268	.065	-.054	-.002	.032	.116
IdenAchi3	.262	.432	.401	.328	.486	1.000	.313	.230	.281	.217	.203	.161	.149	.246	.190	.102	-.121	-.106	.080	.056
IdenRepu1	.006	.074	.003	.257	.132	.313	1.000	.678	.499	.204	.227	.230	.175	.256	.214	.173	.057	.047	.299	.289
IdenRepu2	-.013	.025	.047	.265	.160	.230	.678	1.000	.563	.047	.238	.266	.218	.221	.248	.147	.078	.092	.209	.213
IdenRepu3	.061	.132	.142	.255	.198	.281	.499	.563	1.000	.329	.313	.299	.346	.356	.273	.275	.109	.113	.140	.113
Instru12	.154	.115	.030	.010	.007	.217	.204	.047	.329	1.000	.433	.281	.286	.299	.053	.209	.199	.219	.160	.172
Instru3	.007	-.015	-.001	-.037	.108	.203	.227	.238	.313	.433	1.000	.469	.368	.253	.097	.128	.106	.077	.078	.014
Insto4	-.011	.022	.027	.022	.136	.161	.230	.266	.299	.281	.469	1.000	.479	.429	.263	.168	.191	.212	.136	.073
Intro1	-.033	.007	.034	.102	.086	.149	.175	.218	.346	.286	.368	.479	1.00	.435	.191	.235	.132	.237	.098	.022
Intro2	.070	.183	.080	.169	.219	.246	.256	.221	.356	.299	.253	.429	.435	1.00	.415	.255	.169	.275	.310	.234
Intro3	.070	.108	.045	.180	.268	.190	.214	.248	.273	.053	.097	.263	.191	.415	1.00	.234	.195	.181	.132	.202
ExterConst1	.062	.039	.051	.124	.065	.102	.173	.147	.275	.209	.128	.168	.235	.255	.234	1.000	.325	.271	.236	.069
ExterConst3	-.035	-.030	-.098	-.060	-.054	-.121	.057	.078	.109	.199	.106	.191	.132	.169	.195	.325	1.000	.635	.179	.012
ExterConst4	.005	.051	.011	.014	-.002	-.106	.047	.092	.113	.219	.077	.212	.237	.275	.181	.271	.635	1.000	.241	.053
ExterRew1	.000	.056	.044	.116	.032	.080	.299	.209	.140	.160	.078	.136	.098	.310	.132	.236	.179	.241	1.000	.596
ExterRew2	.148	.129	.011	.041	.116	.056	.289	.213	.113	.172	.014	.073	.022	.234	.202	.069	.012	.053	.596	1.000

Appendix 4

Motivation for Job Selection Scale (MJSS) ($\alpha=0.795$)

Question: *To which extent the following factors were important in making you decision to select a job in your current organization?*

Serving people is a source of my happiness, and I truly think it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Serving people is a calling, and I do it without a reason.

The internal satisfaction originating from helping others is just indescribable.

Being a public servant, especially in high level, gives me a chance to make important policies so as to make a difference to the society.

Doing public service is a kind of patriotism and responsibility

Public employment could help me fulfilling my potential and seeking self-actualization

The power of high-level officials is what I'm longing for because power means accomplishment or success

Being an official means fame and prestige in this society

Working in government make me feel proud and brings glory to my family

Instru1 The real income of public servants is quite reasonable (including medical insurance, transportation subsidy, children's education, etc.)

Instru2 The welfare and other benefits of public servants are quite reasonable

Instru3 The government job is quite stable, and I won't lose my job

My parents and many of my relatives want me to be a public servant. It's a face-saving job. I don't want to let them down

Many of my friends are doing quite well as a public servant. I feel the peer pressure that I should try the same thing

I have invested too much in preparing for the civil service examination. It is very unwise to give up. The sunk cost is too high

People believe that public servant is easier to be married

I don't like a competitive environment. Public service work is probably a better fit

I don't have any specialties or any particular interest. I don't really know what is best for me; by chance, I took the public service exam. Luckily, I passed

I could not find a job when I graduated. Just took the government job temporally and might look a new job later

My family members or relatives who are working in government could help me with job application and career development

Being a public servant would benefit my family business

Perceived autonomy and relatedness ($\alpha=0.705$)

Question: *To which extent the following items describe your current work?*

The citizens who come to government often have unreasonable requirements.

Some citizens may cheat in order to achieve their purposes

The citizens who come for government services could consider my situations and collaborate with me
My colleagues like me and I like them as well
The colleague relationship is hypocritical and complicated, and people talk about nothing
but flubdub and formulae
The politics within government are complicated and make me feel restless
The individuals' ideas cannot be heard and respected since the leadership usually is autocratic
The rules and regulations of government agencies are very stereotyped and rigid which bring many
obstacles for my job
I feel suffering because my supervisor often required me to do works that are contradictory to my beliefs

Appendix 5

Correlation analysis

	RetIntri n1	RetIntri n3	RetIntri n2	RetId e2	RetId e1	RetIns t1	RetIns t2	RetIns t3	RetIntroP ri1	RetIntroP ri2	RetIntroC ar1	RetIntroC ar2	RetIntroC ar3	RetExtCo ns1	RetExtCo ns2	RetExtRe w1	RetExtRe w2
RetIntrin1	1.000	.531	.431	.399	.298	.058	.127	.190	.129	-.067	.093	.071	.178	-.181	-.189	.347	.230
RetIntrin3	.531	1.000	.471	.430	.364	.088	.165	.133	.170	-.049	.117	.025	.159	-.173	-.179	.404	.331
RetIntrin2	.431	.471	1.000	.313	.240	-.090	.032	-.049	.191	.135	.169	.092	.244	-.098	-.199	.284	.176
.RetIde2	.399	.430	.313	1.000	.578	.120	.252	.240	.220	-.005	.116	.106	.238	-.074	-.087	.469	.440
RetIde1	.298	.364	.240	.578	1.000	.227	.378	.266	.263	.026	.169	.226	.271	.078	.064	.408	.387
RetInst1	.058	.088	-.090	.120	.227	1.000	.360	.315	.173	.130	.304	.351	.251	.295	.316	.192	.320
RetInst2	.127	.165	.032	.252	.378	.360	1.000	.363	.215	.085	.305	.287	.242	.111	.162	.270	.367
RetInst3	.190	.133	-.049	.240	.266	.315	.363	1.000	.067	-.038	.166	.192	.162	.144	.141	.161	.276
RetIntroP ri1	.129	.170	.191	.220	.263	.173	.215	.067	1.000	.327	.358	.344	.243	.009	.043	.220	.202
RetIntroP ri2	-.067	-.049	.135	-.005	.026	.130	.085	-.038	.327	1.000	.276	.283	.269	.162	.100	.098	-.003
RetIntroC ar1	.093	.117	.169	.116	.169	.304	.305	.166	.358	.276	1.000	.514	.474	.203	.184	.274	.229
RetIntroC ar2	.071	.025	.092	.106	.226	.351	.287	.192	.344	.283	.514	1.000	.490	.218	.224	.152	.244
RetIntroC ar3	.178	.159	.244	.238	.271	.251	.242	.162	.243	.269	.474	.490	1.000	.174	.217	.258	.268
RetExtCo ns1	-.181	-.173	-.098	-.074	.078	.295	.111	.144	.009	.162	.203	.218	.174	1.000	.361	-.061	.081
RetExtCo ns2	-.189	-.179	-.199	-.087	.064	.316	.162	.141	.043	.100	.184	.224	.217	.361	1.000	-.077	.052
RetExtRe w1	.347	.404	.284	.469	.408	.192	.270	.161	.220	.098	.274	.152	.258	-.061	-.077	1.000	.464
RetExtRe w2	.230	.331	.176	.440	.387	.320	.367	.276	.202	-.003	.229	.244	.268	.081	.052	.464	1.000