

Ethos Reinforced, Government Endorsed? Comparing Pre-entry and Post-entry Values, Motivations, Sector Perceptions, and Career Preferences of MPA Students in Asia

Zeger Van der Wal

National University of Singapore

ABSTRACT

This article compares pre-entry and post-entry personal values, job motivations, sector perceptions, and career preferences of two cohorts of professional Master of Public Administration (MPA) students in Asia. The study triangulates data from surveys, focus groups, and exit interviews in a quasi-experimental setting. On the one hand, findings confirm that MPA programs attract students whose job motivations and sector perceptions are already skewed toward the public sector, particularly those enrolling directly from the public sector. On the other hand, overall appreciation of values associated with and preference for public sector employment goes down during the program, while preference for private sector employment goes up. Students with pre-enrollment public sector careers, however, have significantly higher levels of public service motivation at the moment of graduation than those with pre-enrollment careers outside government. The article concludes with implications of these findings for the study and practice of public administration education.

KEYWORDS

pre-employment values, public service motivation, public sector employment

Do public policy schools produce graduates with a genuine public service motivation and a preference for public sector employment? This question has featured in recent debates on the *raison d'être* of public policy schools (Choo, 2014; Moynihan, 2014; Piereson & Schaefer Riley, 2013). What sparked the debate was a notorious—and ultimately successful—lawsuit by the Robertson family against Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. The founding donors

were angry because the school increasingly churned out consultants and bankers rather than public servants, contrary to what the school's initial mission suggested. Other leading schools show a similar graduate profile (Piereson & Schaefer Riley, 2013). This article contributes to this debate by examining whether a public policy school in Asia fulfills its mission to produce leaders with high public service motivation who aspire to a career in—or close to—public service.

What does existing research tell us about public policy students? Studies show that such schools usually attract students with high levels of public service motivation, “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368), and appreciation of public values (Kjeldsen & Jacobsen, 2013; Rose, 2013; Vandenberg, 2008). This, in turn, leads to preference for postgraduate public sector or nonprofit employment (Gabris & Davis, 2009; Redman-Simmons, 2008; Rose, 2013), although sectoral demarcations seem to matter less to the new, millennial generation (Schultz, 2016). However, as most studies are cross-sectional, they do not tell us whether values, motivations, and job preferences change during, let alone because of, public policy education. With few exceptions, studies employing longitudinal designs to track changes during enrollment (Kennedy & Malatesta, 2010; Newcomer & Allen, 2012; Stuteville & DiPadova-Stocks, 2011) show how attributes and attitudes change but not why they change (Kjeldsen & Jacobsen, 2013).

In addition, such studies target almost without exception students in the West, and there is a question as to whether their findings are easily transferable to major countries in Asia. For instance, a comparative study between Master of Public Policy (MPP) and Master of Public Administration (MPA) students from China and the United States shows that the former are driven more by extrinsic factors, whereas the latter are primarily driven by intrinsic motivators, given expected modest salaries and social status compared to the private sector (Infeld, Qi, Adams, & Lin, 2009). Indeed, government jobs have high stature in many East Asian and Southeast Asian countries (Infeld, Adams, Qi, & Rosnah, 2010; Norris, 2003), and they often provide better primary and secondary benefits than private sector jobs (Fan, 2007; Taylor & Beh, 2013; Xu, 2006). This finding may apply to MPA students in particular, as they often enroll with substantive working experience and a mind-set skewed toward a particular sectoral ethos (Infeld & Adams, 2011).

Elucidating how potential future leaders of some of the region’s most emerging countries—like China, India, and Indonesia—view working life and evaluate various sectors is highly relevant, as these individuals will bring the “Asian century” (Mahbubani, 2008; Vielmetter & Sell, 2014) to full fruition in the years to come. So far, however, our field has viewed public administration in the Asian century mostly through a Western lens (Bice & Sullivan, 2014).

This article examines whether a 1-year full-time MPA program at a prominent public policy school in Asia affects students’ values, attitudes, and preferences. A quasi-experimental setting subjected two cohorts of students to pre-entry and post-entry surveys, focus groups, and interviews. The following question guided the study: How and why do pre-entry versus post-entry personal values, job motivations, sector perceptions, and career preferences of MPA students at a public policy school in Asia differ?

This article first synthesizes existing literature on how educational and organizational socialization affect values and motivations and how education affects career preferences, listing hypotheses for empirical testing. Then the article explains methodology, the study sample, and how items for the questionnaire and focus group guide were derived. The article then presents quantitative and qualitative data and discusses findings by positioning them in the broader literature on the impact of public administration education. The article concludes with limitations of the current study and suggestions for further research.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Effects of Organizational Environment on Values and Work Motivations

Previous studies have shown that organizational environments shape individual value perceptions and work motivations. Camilleri (2007) argues that the public service motivation of public employees is mainly the result of their organizational environment. Organizational characteristics, such as positive employee leader relations, job grade, organizational tenure, the

way individuals deal with others, and friendship opportunities at the workplace, associate positively with public service motivation (Kjeldsen & Hansen, 2016; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016). Bright (2005) also substantiates the positive association between organizational environment, values, and work motivations. He concludes that socialization mechanisms are present in public organizations. Furthermore, by surveying teachers from nine Flemish nonprofit teacher-training institutes about their work values and person-organization fit (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Kristof-Brown, 1996), De Cooman et al. (2009) conclude that individuals adapt their values depending on the organizational environment. Thus, socialization processes ensure fit between newcomers and organizations (cf. Jackall 1988).

Van Gelder and Dougherty (2012) also shed some light on the socializing effects of organizational environment. Using Moore's (1995) public value framework, they compare how public administration students with and without prior professional experience approach a particular design problem—developing a playground. They find substantial differences between both groups, especially in terms of understanding political context. Particularly, experience-based students were much more likely to exhibit what Moore argues helps to create public value, providing evidence for the effect of a public sector work environment on molding desired work values and attitudes.

A substantial number of studies explore the impact of employment sector on work motivations. Most literature in this field argues that public sector employees have higher levels of public service motivation than their private sector counterparts. For instance, by analyzing data from various large-employer surveys, Wright and Kim (2004) concluded that public sector employees have different motivations and expectations than their private sector counterparts, and this result is likely closely tied to the mission and goals of the organization (cf. Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Van der Wal, 2017b).

Yet some findings run contrary to this notion, suggesting instead that employment experience has no significant impact on values and work motivations. In a large-scale survey, Andersen et al. (2011) find no difference in the general level of public service motivation between Danish physiotherapists in the public and private sector. This may suggest that employment sector has minimal impact on work motivations. De Cooman et al. (2009), in contrast, suggest that organizational socialization serves to enhance employees' personal work values and their organizations' values; the authors also note that attrition mechanisms occur simultaneously. In short, whether the individual stays or leaves, the organization depends on an employee's original fit with the organization. This, in turn, weakens the socializing effect of the organization on individuals' values and work motivations. To explore whether MPA students in the present study's sample enter the program with a different baseline level of public service motivation and inclination to pursue post-graduate public sector employment due to their prior work experience, this study tested the following hypotheses:

- H1. Students with pre-enrollment public sector work experience will have higher levels of public service motivation and appreciation of values associated with public sector work than those with private sector or nonprofit sector work experience.
- H2. Students with pre-enrollment public sector work experience will be more likely to prefer public sector employment after they graduate.

Effects of Education on Personal Values and Work Motivations

Numerous studies have confirmed the socializing role of education in shaping individual values and work motivations. Hyman and Wright's (1979) classic study used data from 38 national polls and showed that education increases general knowledge, awareness of public affairs, receptivity to new information, and

information-seeking behavior. Kingston et al.'s (2003) study draws a similar conclusion. A secondary analysis of survey data from the U.S. General Social Survey (1991–1998) found that despite substantial mediating impacts of cognitive ability and socioeconomic status, there were strong educational effects on civil liberties, gender equality, social capital, and cultural capital.

In particular, Newcomer and Allen (2010, p. 208) delve into the socializing effects of public policy education in positively affecting individuals' levels of public service motivation (cf. Rose, 2013). Similarly, Stuteville and DiPadova-Stocks (2011) and Kennedy and Malatesta (2010) acknowledge the positive impacts of public policy education on cultivation of values and ethics. Both studies call for greater emphasis on values and ethics in the curricula of public policy programs in the face of the new challenges brought by accelerated globalization.

However, Egerton's (2002) study, focusing on the efforts of tertiary education on social and civic engagement of young people, provides some contrary evidence. Although he found a significant difference of levels of civic engagement between young people who entered higher education and those who did not, he found little additional effect of education, concluding that the differences existed prior to higher education.

Likewise, through comparing the espoused value preferences between students and alumni from four professional programs at the University of Kansas, Edwards, Nalbandian, and Wedel (1981) found that students entering different professional educational programs appear to have different espoused value preferences. Nonetheless, there was a minimal difference between the values espoused by alumni and first-year students, suggesting that education may play an insignificant role in affecting value patterns. In the same vein, other studies suggest that different people-types are drawn to different degree programs in the first place, because of pre-educational socialization processes (Blau & Duncan, 1967; de Graaf & de Graaf, 1996; Ng, Gossett, Chinyoka, & Obasi, 2016; van Hooft, 2004).

Lastly, Kjeldsen's (2012) analysis of public service motivation levels of Danish students enrolled in different vocational education programs shows that the socializing effect of higher education depends on students' field of study. Although the estimated level of public service motivation among students in noncore public service studies increases with years of study, motivation levels of these students' public service counterparts stay the same across different educational stages. Thus, high levels of public service motivation among public policy students seem to be the result of an attraction effect.

Whether one's value perceptions and work motivations are the result of self-selection or socializing effects of education, and how one multiplies the other, is the subject of ongoing scholarly debate. To test whether taking an MPA program increases public service motivation levels and appreciation of values associated with public sector employment, the present study formulated the following hypotheses:

- H3. Students will show a stronger appreciation of values associated with public sector employment at the end of their MPA program than at the start.
- H4. Students will display higher levels of public service motivation at the end of their program than at the start.

Effects of Public Policy Education Programs on Career Preference

Whether MPP and MPA graduates are more likely—and perhaps, should be more likely—to join the public sector than the private or nonprofit sector has been debated by practitioners and scholars alike. For example, by surveying faculty of schools and departments that offer both MPP and MPA programs, Hur and Hackbart (2009) found that graduates are most likely to end up in the public and nonprofit sectors. In a similar vein, Infeld and Adams (2011) found that both MPP and MPA students preferred working in the public and

nonprofit sectors versus the private sector: both types of student were equally inclined toward having a career in which they were able to make “a contribution to the society” (cf. van der Wal, 2017a, p. 607). At the same time, however, Woolcock (2007) points out that many MPP graduates end up courting a broad array of employers who offer them “a modest salary, relative low-level responsibilities, and little long-term job security” (p. 5).

These studies provide important insights into the effect of public policy education on students’ career preferences. However, it is not yet clear to what extent graduate sectoral employment preferences are actually guided—or reinforced—by students’ education. Hence, testing the following hypotheses may provide useful contributions to the scholarly literature:

- H5. MPA students will have more positive public sector perceptions upon graduation than at the start of their program.
- H6. MPA students will choose the public or nonprofit sector as their preferred future sector of employment over the private sector.
- H7. MPA students will display a stronger preference for public sector and nonprofit employment upon graduation than at the start of their program.
- H8. Positive public sector perceptions are related to a preference for postgraduate public sector employment.

Types of Motivations Related to Government Employment

Although studies have consistently confirmed a positive association between preference for doing work that is useful to society and public sector employment, several studies have suggested that extrinsic rewards (especially financial rewards) also play a salient role in determining individuals’ choice of career (Chen & Hsieh, 2015; Liu & Tang, 2011; Liu & Perry, 2016).

For example, surveying students from two top-tier US law schools, using a policy-capturing research design, Christensen and Wright (2011) suggest that public service motivation does not automatically increase employee attraction to or satisfaction with public employment. Instead, financial rewards still play a prominent role in an individual’s job choice.

Lewis and Frank (2002) explore how individuals’ demographic characteristics and the importance these people place on various job qualities influence their preference for employment in the public sector. The authors also find that the more strongly respondents valued high income, the more likely they were to prefer government employment. Ko and Jun’s (2015) study about job motivations and career preferences of undergraduates in Singapore, China, and Korea found a positive association between a motivation to benefit society and a preference for public sector jobs among Singaporean and Korean students. Nonetheless, the authors also note that while intrinsic motivators are important, students’ choice of public sector employment is in fact affected by a mixture of extrinsic motivators, such as career prospects, and students’ perception of their own government.

Others have distinguished between public service motivation (intrinsic, idealistic motivators driving public sector employment) and public sector motivation (extrinsic motivators related to pay, stability, and job security). To examine how such motivations play a role in the choice for public sector employment, and how perceptions of government affect employment preference, the present study tests the following hypotheses:

- H9. Students who prefer the public sector as a postgraduate sector of employment have higher levels of public *service* motivation than public *sector* motivation.
- H10. Students who prefer the public sector as a postgraduate sector of employment have higher levels of *public sector* motivation than *private sector* motivation.

METHODOLOGY

Mixed Methods Quasi-experimental Design

The present study employed a mixed methods approach (e.g., Creswell, 2003) to show not only *if* MPA education affects the propensity toward values, motivations, and career preferences of future managers but also *why* this is the case, as well as how subjects word their motives and preferences for degree programs and future employment. So far, studies into student motivations, values, and preferences—or of managers, for that matter—are almost without exception quantitative in nature, with some exceptions (Pedersen, 2014; Ritz, 2015). As a result, we lack more substantive insights into the reasons and justifications for choosing degree programs and sectors of employment. To elicit such insights, the present study includes an open question in its questionnaire about the reason for sector preference, and survey data are complemented with data from focus groups and interviews (cf. van Steden, Van der Wal, & Lasthuizen, 2015; Van der Wal & Yang, 2015).

Usually, studies about the impact of educational programs use single-time cross-sectional data to explore whether perceived training effectiveness is positively correlated with dependent variables. As this study is interested in the change of values, motivations, perceptions, and preferences before and after training, “an experimental design that allows the comparison between a pretest and a posttest would be a more preferable method, as it provides a clearer time frame and causality” (Chen & Chen, 2016, p. 15).

Despite being frequently propagated, pure experiments are not widely employed in public administration studies due to legal, ethical, and budgetary concerns (Chen & Chen, 2016). A pure experiment requires both the random selection of treatment and control groups and a pre-test/post-test comparison for treatment and control groups (Wellington & Szczerbinski, 2007). In the present study, it would be both unethical and illegal to create a control

group by excluding some students from completing their program. A quasi-experimental research setting, however, is feasible (cf. Grimmelikhuijsen, Jilke, Leth Olsen, & Tummers, 2016). While there are several types of quasi-experimental designs (e.g., post-test only design, nonrandom selection of control groups, time series, etc.), the most suitable one here is pre-test and post-test design without a control group. This method allows for making inferences about the impact of the intervention by comparing pre-test and post-test results (Wellington & Szczerbinski, 2007), in this case pre-entry and post-entry into the program. To reduce inference bias, this study further examines the relationship between pre-test and post-test difference and perceived program effect through qualitative data (focus groups, open survey questions, and exit interviews).

Sample and Respondent Selection

Study respondents are the 2013–2014 ($n = 58$) and 2014–2015 ($n = 39$) cohorts of students entering a full-time MPA program at a school of public policy at a highly ranked university in Southeast Asia. The program is directed toward midcareer employees with 6–8 years of working experience. Around 80% of participants are in their 30s; all of them had more than 5 years of working experience, with just two students clocking more than 10 years. Surveys and focus groups were conducted at the start of the degree programs, in August 2013 and August 2014. Surveys were conducted in person in the classroom, and missing respondents were approached online afterward. After meeting students who did not partake initially face-to-face, study researchers recorded a total of 97 respondents, reflecting a 100% response rate in both cohorts. The sample includes respondents from 15 different Asia-Pacific countries. China, India, Indonesia, and Singapore make up over 80% of the respondents. It is important to stress, however, that the aim of this research is not to compare countries, and the sample size does not allow for such a comparison. The limited generalizability of our findings beyond these two cohorts is clear. Table 1 provides basic respondent characteristics.

TABLE 1.
Respondent Characteristics

Respondent characteristics	Percentage	
Age		
20–24	1.0	
25–29	8.2	
30–34	41.2	
35–39	37.1	
40 and older	12.4	
Gender		
Male	60.8	
Female	39.2	
Sector of full-time pre-enrollment employment		
Public sector	70.1	
Private sector	19.6	
Nonprofit sector	10.3	
Preferred sector of postgraduate employment		
	T = 0	T = 1
Public sector	67.0	62.0
Private sector	17.6	22.8
Nonprofit sector	15.4	15.2

Note. $N=97$

Questionnaire and Measures. The basic questionnaire included 11 questions on background characteristics, socialization factors, and preferred sector of employment; 13 questions on public and private sector work motivations; 10 questions about personal values associated with careers in both sectors; and 10 questions on sector perceptions. These questions, and how they are combined in variables, are discussed below. The Appendix provides descriptive statistics for all items used.

Items are included about both public and private sector work motivation to characterize the motivational profile of respondents. An important related theme in the literature is the contrast between intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Buelens & van den Broeck, 2007, p. 66; Karl & Sutton, 1998). Here, this study includes not

just items on public service motivation but also items on extrinsic motivations classically associated with public sector work (cf. Perry & Hondeghem, 2008), as well as internalized positive views directed toward both sectors, being different from more general sector perceptions. After all, this study also wanted to test the socializing effect of working environments. Given that respondents already had substantive working experience, they may hold fairly classic public and private sector related motivations. In line with the mission of the school, however, public service motivations rather than public sector motivations would be expected to increase as a result of the MPA program.

This study used the following statements as measures of public sector work motivation: “contributing to society,” “balancing work and

family obligations,” and “an intellectually stimulating work environment.” To measure an overall positive inclination toward the public sector, this statement was added: “It is best for society when the public sector is responsible for the provision of crucial collective goods, such as energy, public transport and safety.” To measure public service motivation, the study included these statements: “meaningful public service is very important to me,” “considering the welfare of others is important to me,” and “being service oriented to others” (cf. Kjeldsen & Jacobsen, 2013; Rose, 2013). The private sector motivations used were as follows: “being successful,” “a high salary,” “total commitment to my employer,” “having a good salary,” “my career will be more important than family after graduation,” “I like to be successful in creating innovative products and services,” and “it is best for society when the market is given maximal leeway.”

Respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale whether they considered the characteristics important, with answer categories ranging from “very important” to “not important at all.” Respondents were also asked whether they agreed, again on a 5-point Likert scale, according to answer categories from “totally agree” to “totally disagree.” Reliability tests for two of the three variables produced sufficient Cronbach’s alpha reliability scores: .375 (public sector motivation), .618 (public service motivation), and .534 (private sector motivation). Public sector motivation is a newly constructed variable consisting of four items, combining intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, which may explain its low reliability. The variable is nevertheless included in the analysis here, to observe any differences between public service motivation and private sector motivation.

The literature on values shows a clear contrast between public and private values. Stackman, Connor, and Becker (2006) distinguish different personal values related to a career in private versus public sectors, as do Buelens and van den Broeck (2007). Based on these studies on value differences, the present study selected five public and five private values: equality, peace, self-sacrifice, justice, and compassion versus

accomplishment, joy, prosperity, change, and power. The five public values were combined into the variable PUBVALUE and the five private values were combined into the variable PRIVVALUE, with high Cronbach’s alphas: .790 and .698, respectively.

The present study measured negative and positive perceptions of government according to the following theses, negative and positive: “In general, government is very bureaucratic,” “Those choosing a career in government are often less ambitious than those choosing a career in business,” and “When you work for government, you are often caught in a web of political interests” (negative); “When you work for government, you can contribute positively to society,” and “Government is a much friendlier working environment than business” (positive) (Taylor, 2010).

In the same vein, as the private sector is perceived to be more competitive than the public sector, and with a less collegial working environment, this study tested the following (negative) statements: “In the business sector, there is a lot of competitiveness between colleagues,” “In the business sector, people often play ‘dirty games’ to maximize profit,” and “When you are working in the business sector, you are only concerned with your own benefits and that of your company.” The positive perceptions of the private sector are reflected in these statements: “In general, business works much more efficiently and effectively than government” and “In the business sector it is easier to get promoted to a better position.” The present study combines the items for positive public sector perceptions with those for negative private sector perceptions into the variable POSPUB; in turn, this study combines positive private sector perceptions with negative public sector perceptions into the variable POSPRIV. Both combined variables produced sufficient Cronbach’s alpha reliability scores: .527 and .601, respectively.

Lastly, in addition to mandating that respondents choose a preferred sector (public, private, or nonprofit), this study asked them, in an open

question, to state in one sentence why their preference lay with that sector. This allowed researchers to contextualize respondent preferences and to code, cluster, and rank their justifications; respondents could also express doubts or ambiguities.

Focus Groups and Exit Interviews. To add to the survey and gain in-depth understanding of students' views and choices, this study conducted four focus groups of between four and seven participants in each session, using the Delphi method (Rowe & Wright, 1999). Sessions lasted between 50 and 70 minutes. These focus groups were conducted with a combined total of 26 participants within two weeks after respondents took the survey. The format aimed to produce interactive, deliberative, and respectful (though not necessarily consensual) exchanges of views,

guided by three engagement questions and four exploration questions (e.g., Creswell, 2003; Morgan, 1988). Two key topics were discussed: views of working life in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors based on participants' experiences; and motives for applying to the program. At the end of the program, 10 exit interviews asked about the merit of the degree program and how the program had changed students' views of issues and sectors.

FINDINGS

Table 2 indicates that students enrolling from the public sector scored higher on public service motivation and positive public sector perceptions compared to those enrolling with private sector and nonprofit backgrounds; but public sector enrollees scored lower on public values and public sector motivation.

TABLE 2.
Students With ($n = 68$) and Without ($n = 29$) Pre-entry Public Sector Experience

Variables		Pre-entry, private or nonprofit		Pre-entry, public		t-test
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p value
Public service motivation	Pre-entry (T = 0)	4.160	0.460	4.313	0.536	0.202
	Post-entry (T = 1)	4.120	0.499	4.338	0.501	0.065*
Public sector motivation	Pre-entry (T = 0)	4.466	0.339	4.429	0.439	0.692
	Post-entry (T = 1)	4.380	0.354	4.343	0.456	0.717
Private sector motivation	Pre-entry (T = 0)	3.557	0.446	3.602	0.535	0.689
	Post-entry (T = 1)	3.647	0.447	3.639	0.416	0.941
Public values	Pre-entry (T = 0)	7.855	1.680	7.742	1.349	0.729
	Post-entry (T = 1)	7.312	1.547	7.288	1.598	0.949
Positive public sector perceptions	Pre-entry (T = 0)	3.678	0.631	3.740	0.547	0.633
	Post-entry (T = 1)	3.704	0.520	3.736	0.530	0.794
Positive private sector perceptions	Pre-entry (T = 0)	3.518	0.518	3.426	0.643	0.512
	Post-entry (T = 1)	3.584	0.571	3.556	0.575	0.842
Future preferred sector of employment	Pre-entry (T = 0)	0.360	0.490	0.800	0.403	0.000***
	Post-entry (T = 1)	0.240	0.435	0.776	0.420	0.000***

Note. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

However, at the time of enrollment, students were much more inclined to go back to the public sector after graduation. Differences for post-entry public service motivation and pre-entry and post-entry postgraduate sector preference are significant between those with and without public sector backgrounds. However, scores on all other public sector-related variables slightly decreased for public professionals during enrollment, while attitudes toward the private sector became slightly more positive. It should be noted that differences are small and nonsignificant.

As the findings in Table 3 show, the comparison between pre-entry and post-entry work motivations, sector perceptions, and employment pre-

ference for all students produced no significant differences. Significant differences can be seen only for values associated with public sector employment, with overall appreciation going down during the program. Moreover, postgraduate public sector preference slightly decreased as well.

Overall, however, respondents scored high on public service motivation and public sector motivation before they started the program, suggesting they were preselected into the MPA based on these motivations. Intriguingly, MPA students do value the statements “being successful” and “earning a high salary”—traditionally associated with private sector employment—arguably a region-specific finding.

TABLE 3.
Pre-entry and Post-entry Difference

Item	Pre-entry (T=0)		Post-entry (T=1)		t-test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p value
Public service motivation	4.267	0.535	4.269	0.514	0.985
Public sector motivation	4.440	0.409	4.352	0.427	0.150
Private sector motivation	3.589	0.508	3.645	0.422	0.412
Public values	7.777	1.327	7.287	1.361	0.027**
Positive public sector perceptions	3.722	0.570	3.724	0.523	0.982
Negative public sector perceptions	3.453	0.608	3.558	0.571	0.228
Preference for public sector employment upon graduation	0.678	0.469	0.634	0.484	0.540

Note. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; $N = 97$

TABLE 4.
Post-entry Motivations of Those with Public Sector Preference

Public service motivation		Private sector motivation		<i>t</i> -test
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i> value
4.427	0.483	3.588	0.424	0.000***

Public service motivation		Public sector motivation		<i>t</i> -test
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i> value
4.427	0.424	4.408	0.439	0.607

Note. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$; $N = 60$

In all, respondents displayed a public sector ethos and mind-set with no reinforcement occurring during the program.

Table 4 shows how students with post-entry postgraduate public sector preference score on the three types of motivations. Clearly, students with public sector employment preference have significantly higher public service motivation than private sector motivation; public service motivation and public sector motivation are almost equal.

Students Speaking Out: Pre-entry

This study categorized and coded 82 responses to the open-ended survey question, "Please describe the reason for your sector preference in one sentence," resulting in five main coding categories that are juxtaposed with the preference for employment sector as indicated by the respondents in Table 5. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of statements corresponding with the particular code, illustrated by one exemplary quote reflecting the overall category.

In many ways, the qualitative survey data corroborate the quantitative data. Particularly, those who justify and explain their preferred employment sector by "wanting to work in service of others" and "making great impact" often see themselves working in the nonprofit sector as opposed to the public sector (those with private sector preferences could not be coded into these categories). In the end, job content, career opportunities, self-development, and "fit with the sector"—or sometimes, lack of fit, resulting in desire for a sector switch—and "serving others or society," were the most dominant categories.

Students Speaking Out: Post-entry

The present study coded 76 responses to the open-ended survey question, "Please describe the reason for your sector preference in one sentence," using the same categories as for the pre-entry responses. Compared to pre-entry responses, more students referenced career opportunities and the content of the job, with

TABLE 5.
Sector of Postgraduate Employment Preference Explained (Pre-entry vs. Post-entry)

Sector/ Reason	1. Job content, career opportunities, personal growth		2. Being of service to others	
	Pre-entry: 26	Post-entry: 36	Pre-entry: 10	Post-entry: 11
Public PRE-ENTRY 52 POST-ENTRY 47	"I value performance and result more than salary." (13)	"It provides an optimal balance of my preferred job nature, work scope, employment security and reasonable remuneration." (20)	"I think this gives most scope for creating the environment for others to flourish." (9)	"Giving back to the community that has served me well." (8)
Nonprofit PRE-ENTRY 16 PRE-ENTRY 13	"Diversity in careers." (4)	"More international, more diverse." (4)	"Can contribute directly to the society." (1)	"Apply what I have learnt and contribute to the community." (3)
Private PRE-ENTRY 14 POST-ENTRY 16	"I want to experience a more competitive working environment." (9)	"Business sector makes people grow faster." (13)		

Note. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of statements corresponding with the particular code, illustrated by one exemplary quote reflecting the overall category.

the statements "serving the nation" and "fit with sector" being much less prominent. A small portion of students changed their sector preference from public to private; preference for nonprofit employment remained equal. Also, "fit with sector" decreased as a justification among all students, regardless of preference. This shows that students do open up to the possibility of other sectors and careers during their graduate program. Private sector preference, rising slightly as indicated before, is

explained by students' having more dynamic and faster career and growth opportunities, even more so than at the pre-entry stage.

The number of students expressing preference for postgraduate nonprofit employment remained similar, but the biggest shift in justifications was from "fit with sector" to "serving others and society"; in short, classic motivations for government employment go up while sector preference remains stable.

TABLE 5.
Sector of Postgraduate Employment Preference Explained (Pre-entry vs. Post-entry) (continued)

Sector/ Reason	3. To serve the nation		4. Fit with industry/sector		5. Making greater impact	
	Pre-entry: 7	Post-entry: 5	Pre-entry: 30	Post-entry: 14	Pre-entry: 9	Post-entry: 10
Public PRE-ENTRY 52 POST-ENTRY 47	"My country needs to build public sector capacity." (7)	"Public sector in my country is weak which needs more attention." (4)	"Familiarity with the process and system it works." (16)	"I have a good experience in public sector; the public policy course learnings would help me in working better in the same sector." (9)	"Provides me the opportunity to not stop at advocacy but also implement." (7)	"Public sector can change larger and more fundamental issues than private sector." (6)
Nonprofit PRE-ENTRY 16 PRE-ENTRY 13		"Public participation seems to be the only way of moving forward in a democratic setup." (1)	"I relate to it the most." (9)	"Have good experiences and understanding of this sector." (2)	"I think it is the sector where I can have most impact." (2)	"In an NGO I wish to bridge gap in trust deficit between government and private sector." (3)
Private PRE-ENTRY 14 POST-ENTRY 16			"Private sector dynamics are more close to my personality." (5)	"My domain of work is only in private sector." (2)		"I am able to contribute more through private perspectives." (1)

Note. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of statements corresponding with the particular code, illustrated by one exemplary quote reflecting the overall category.

Pre-entry Focus Groups

Seven pre-entry focus groups, comprised of 26 survey respondents enabled questioning about some survey topics in a safe and collaborative environment (Eliot & Associates, 2005). Students were selected who had backgrounds from all sectors, with the majority being from the public sector. Student responses were coded for two main issues: (1) views on the public and private sector based on students' experiences and (2) reasons for choosing this degree (Table 6).

The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of statements corresponding with the particular code.

The focus group results complement the survey findings in two ways. First, students are at least as critical of the public sector as the private sector (indeed, the number of negative public sector views exceeds the number for the private sector). Second, the vast majority of statements about motives for choosing an MPA degree

TABLE 6.
Responses of Pre-entry Focus Groups

1. Views on private sector	2. Views on public sector	3. Why choose an MPA?
More prestige, meritocracy, and awarded performance (Positive, 11)	The right place for advancing public agendas and achieving public impact (Positive, 4)	Looking for skills upgrading and problem solving capabilities to increase career opportunities (14)
Competition and complexity can lead to overload and burnout, and business sector has questionable ethics (Negative, 8)	Public sector is ineffective, inefficient, corrupt, dominated by relationships, and not accountable (Negative, 11)	To elevate standing and gain promotion within current job (8)
		Did not have the background or means to seek an MBA (2)

Note. N=26

emphasize a desire to upgrade skills and capabilities and to increase career opportunities, rather than express a particular passion for public service.

Post-entry Exit Interviews

In addition, 10 exit interviews were conducted with students immediately after they completed the post-entry survey, about a week before graduation. These interviews asked students what they took away from their degree program in relation to their initial expectations, whether the MPA experience changed their outlook on policy issues and sectors, and how that may affect their choice of postgraduate sector of employment.

The interview data displayed in Table 7 add three intriguing factors to the previous findings. First, it becomes clear that MPA students are indeed passionate about creating public value, but they do not necessarily view public sector employment as the proper or even most effective vehicle for doing so. Second, a related sentiment expressed by some students is that

private and social enterprises are more capable of facilitating such pursuits because such enterprises value initiative, assess performance based on merit, and allow more individual impact. Third, however, at the end of their program students overall feel enriched and better prepared to pursue their ambitions.

DISCUSSION

The overall findings lead to only partly accepting Hypothesis 1: public sector professionals do indeed enter the program with higher levels of public service motivation but with slightly less appreciation of public sector values than students with other professional backgrounds. The findings do, however, convincingly support Hypothesis 2: students with public sector backgrounds are significantly more likely to go back to the public sector than those with other backgrounds at the moment of entry, confirming socialization effects (Bright, 2005; Camilleri, 2007; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Ritz et al., 2016). However, the public sector preference at the moment of exit decreases for both groups, particularly for the non-public sector profes-

sionals. This finding challenges somewhat the mission of public policy schools to enhance or reinforce a love for public service.

Contrary to what was expected based on many other studies (Kennedy & Maletesta, 2010; Rose, 2013; Stuteville & DiPadova-Stocks, 2011; Van der Wal & Oosterbaan, 2010), values and motivations positively associated with public sector employment overall remained stable or decreased over the course of the degree program. Thus,

Hypotheses 3 and 4 must be rejected. At the same time, baseline levels were fairly high to start with, corroborating earlier findings about public-service-minded students being selected into programs that prepare them for public service careers (Kjeldsen, 2012; Kjeldsen & Jacobsen, 2013).

As expected, though, given the nature of the degree program, a large majority of students still prefer public sector employment upon graduation, leading to confirmation of Hypothesis 6.

TABLE 7.
Responses of Post-entry Exit Interviews

What are your key takeaways?	Were expectations met fully?	How do you view policy issues and sectors now?	How does this affect your choice of preferred sector of employment?
<p>“Many skills were honed but most valuable were the discussions with other students about ethics and morality.”</p> <p>“Discussions reach a level of depth that MBA programs cannot match; their students are thinking about where to make money next.”</p>	<p>“Yes, I have changed and grown significantly.”</p> <p>(Fully, 5)</p>	<p>“It has further sparked my interest in and passions for development work.”</p> <p>“I have never come out of any class discussion biased toward one sector or another. I have come to believe though that the impact you can make is smaller in larger institutions.”</p>	<p>“I want to pursue gender and development issues like before but not necessarily in the public sector.”</p> <p>“I see a lot of potential in creating social innovation outside the usual public sector institutions.”</p> <p>(Affected, 6)</p>
	<p>“Overall yes, but it could have been much more rigorous.”</p> <p>(Partly, 5)</p>		<p>“It hasn’t changed. I was in a social enterprise before enrolling here and I want to go back to social enterprise even more now.”</p> <p>“I was in government and still want to work in government, because I care about environmental and economic issues and government has the most impact there.”</p> <p>(Not affected, 4)</p>

Note. N=10

Such preference also correlates significantly with positive public sector perceptions, confirming Hypothesis 8. However, as both the percentage of students preferring public sector employment as well as the overall positive perception of public sector life slightly decreased during the program, Hypotheses 5 and 7 must be rejected.

The findings overwhelmingly support Hypotheses 9: those preferring postgraduate public sector employment at the moment of graduation have significantly higher levels of public service motivation than private sector motivation. But Hypothesis 10 must be rejected, as students preferring public sector employment report more or less similar levels of public service motivation and public sector motivation. This finding suggests a need for more research into how intrinsic and extrinsic motivations combine and compete (Chen & Hsieh, 2014; Infeld et al., 2009, 2010; Infeld & Adams, 2011; Perry & Liu 2014; Van der Wal 2015), how public sector motivation needs to be measured (given the low reliability scores of this study's variable), and how both types of motivations make up a complex mix that drives future public leaders, progressing as their careers evolve.

On a broader note, the findings on dynamics in sector preferences and motivational profiles in relation to sectoral aspirations align with dynamics in how careers develop: from traditional, linear careers within few organizations to boundaryless and self-directed careers characterized by a greater number of job and organization changes (Briscoe & Hall, 2006; Lyons, Ng, & Schweitzer, 2012; Lyons, Urick, Kuron, & Schweitzer, 2015; Parry, Unite, Chuddzikowski, Briscoe, & Shen, 2012). Indeed, younger generations in different parts of the world display increasingly protean career orientations, with a desire for interesting and meaningful work, personal growth, developing new skills, and high materialistic rewards rather than a specific sector preference (Ng et al., 2010; Schultz, 2016; Twenge & Kasser, 2013). As said, these developments pose questions for public policy schools about how "sector-specific" their degree programs and desired graduates should be and whether

sector-specificity is at all realistic and desirable in the years to come. Protean career dynamics will also lead to increased "sector switching" (de Graaf & Van der Wal, 2008; Hansen, 2014; Johnson, McGinnis, & Ng, 2015; Su & Bozeman, 2009).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has three key limitations and consequent implications for future research. First, given the small sample size of this study, the results are not generalizable to the 22 countries making up the continent of Asia, with their widely different political histories, cultures, religions, and demographics. The results may speak for China, India, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, in particular Singapore and Indonesia. Second, a related concern is that the public sectors of some Asian countries suffer from corruption and cronyism (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl, & Baumhart, 2003), while Singapore is in many ways the exact opposite (Quah, 2011). This may affect students' perceptions about government capacity in these countries. However, this study's sample size and research aims do not allow for a rigorous between-country comparison at this stage. Follow-up studies with much larger samples and from more countries in the region are needed. Still, Singaporean respondents did not diverge widely from other respondents in their responses.

Third and finally, the long-term effects of a degree program on deeply held attitudes and perceptions may only surface after a few years and a renewed experience of working in (the same) agency and sector. Perhaps a year is simply too short a period of time for any effects to really take hold. Currently, the study author is working on longitudinal data collection mechanisms that will allow collection of data for up to two years after students finish their program. Such data would better establish both the long-term effect of the degree as well as a potential "shock effect" of postgraduate employment (cf. Blau & Duncan, 1967; Kjeldsen & Jacobsen, 2013). In addition, such data enable empirical mapping of the frequency of postgraduate sector switching.

On a more general note, future studies should use with caution research concepts and instruments devised in Western contexts, such as public service motivation, to study Asian contexts and instead construct new variables, scales, and measures to study phenomena in this region.

CONCLUSION

This research commenced with the following question: How and why do pre-entry and post-entry personal values, job motivations, sector perceptions, and career preferences of MPA students in Asia differ? The data show that respondents enter their MPA program with a strong public-sector-related motivational profile, appreciation of personal values associated with public sector employment, and largely positive perceptions toward working life in the public sector. Around 70% have a professional background in the public sector, and around 67% prefer to go back to that sector after spending their year in graduate school. However, it is also clear MPA students are not uniform in their preferred sector of employment, making it difficult to label them “future government leaders.”¹

Intriguingly, by the time students finish their MPA program, their public-sector-related values, motivations, and perceptions have slightly decreased, and some students who initially preferred public sector employment switch to a preference for business. This finding may worry public policy schools engaged in debates on whether they do an adequate job of producing graduates with a strong public service ethos and a preference for public service. At the same time, students aspire to careers characterized by public value creation, just not necessarily through government employment. Lastly, there are stark differences between students who come from the public sector and those who don't: the former have a stronger overall public-sector-oriented profile. Clearly, socialization by sector trumps socialization by degree program.

In addition, many students are fairly critical of government's capacity to tackle social issues and pursue public values and its ability to enact meritocracy and incorruptibility. This finding in particular differentiates respondents from

their Western peers and points at a somewhat cynical or perhaps merely realistic view of public sector capabilities in many Asian countries (cf. Pandey & Jain, 2014; Van der Wal, 2017b). If and how MPA enrollment corroborated or even enforced such views is an intriguing question that merits further study.

The following are four key takeaways on the effects of MPA education on the attitudes and perceptions of respondents in this study:

1. Professional MPA students in this study are critical of, or at least realistic about, the capabilities and abilities of public sectors in the region; yet, the majority of respondents still choose to go back to public sector employment when they graduate, driven by a mix of public service motivation and public sector motivation.
2. Taking a 1-year MPA program did not enhance values, motivations, and perceptions positively associated with the public sector or preference for public sector employment; on the contrary, most of these indicators decreased slightly.
3. Such decrease could even be observed among MPA students with a professional public sector past. Public servants, however, display significantly higher levels of public service motivation compared to MPA students with private sector and nonprofit backgrounds and a significantly higher preference for postgraduate public sector employment, pre-entry as well as post-entry.
4. Overall, the vast majority of respondents expressed great passion toward creating public value and impact through their careers; however, many of them simply do not view the public sector as the exclusive or even the best place to have such an impact. So, even though ethos is hardly reinforced nor government unanimously endorsed, many future MPA students will spend the rest of their working lives contributing to their societies by addressing key policy challenges in their respective countries.

NOTES

- 1 More generally, a one-on-one relationship between study and career choice (and the expected preferences of the [future] employer) is increasingly and repeatedly questioned by former students; see, for instance, the online forum “MPA vs. MBA” at <http://forums.degreeinfo.com/archive/index.php/t-11244.html>.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, L. B., Pallesen, T., & Pedersen, L. H. (2011). Does ownership matter? Public service motivation among physiotherapists in the private and public sectors in Denmark. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 31*(1), 10–27.
- Bayer, A. E. (1980). Review of the book *Education's lasting influence on values*, by H. H. Hyman and C. R. Wright. *Journal of Higher Education, 51*(6), 693–695.
- Bice, S., & Sullivan, H. (2014). Public policy studies and the “Asian century”: New orientations, challenges, and opportunities. *Governance, 27*, 539–544.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: Wiley.
- 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.
- Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (2006). The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1), 4–18.
- 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.
- Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 1–23.
- Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel Review, 36*(3), 356–377.
- Chen, C-A., & Chen, D. J. (2016). *Does training enhance new hires' self-determination in public service? A quasi-experimental study*. Paper presented at the *Public Administration Review 75th Anniversary International Conference*, Guangzhou, China.
- 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.
- Choo, J. (2014, February 1). The role of public policy schools. *Global-Is-Asian*. Retrieved from <http://global-is-asian.nus.edu.sg/index.php/the-role-of-public-policy-schools>.
- 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.
- Christie, P. M. J., Kwon, I. G., Stoeberl, P. A., & Baumhart, R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of ethical attitudes of business managers: India, Korea and the United States. *Journal of Business Ethics, 46*, 263–287.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- 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 Graaf, G., & Van der Wal, Z. (2008). On value differences experienced by sector switchers. *Administration and Society, 40*(1), 79–103.
- de Graaf, N. D., & de Graaf, P. M. (1996). De invloed van socialisatie op leefstijlen: Tellen restricties uit het verleden ook mee? In H. B. G. Ganzeboom & S. Lindenberg (Eds.), *Verklarende sociologie: Opstellen voor Reinhard Wippler* (pp. 329–341). Amsterdam: Thesis.

- Edwards, J. T., Nalbandian, J., & Wedel, K. R. (1981). Individual values and professional education implications for practice and education. *Administration and Society*, 13(2), 123–143.
- Egerton, M. (2002). Higher education and civic engagement. *British Journal of Sociology*, 53(4), 603–620.
- Eliot & Associates (2005). How to conduct a focus group. Retrieved from https://assessment.trinity.duke.edu/documents/How_to_Conduct_a_Focus_Group.pdf.
- Fan, M. (2007, May 29). In China, a state job still brings benefits and bragging rights. *Washington Post*, p. A7.
- Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Gabris, G. T., & Davis, T. J. (2009, June 6–8). *Measuring public service motivation in MPA students: Does the construct influence student perception toward the application of management techniques and role behavior in the public sector?* Paper presented at the IPSM Conference, Bloomington, IN.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G., Jilke, S., Leth Olsen, A. & Tummers, L. G. (2016). Behavioral public administration: Combining insights from public administration and psychology. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 45–56.
- Hansen, J. R. (2014). From public to private sector: Motives and explanations for sector switching. *Public Management Review*, 16(4), 590–607.
- Hur, Y., & Hackbart, M. (2009). MPA vs. MPP: A distinction without a difference? *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15(4), 10–27.
- Hyman, H. H., & Wright, C. R. (1979). *Education's lasting influence on values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Infeld, D. L., & Adams, W. C. (2011). MPA and MPP students: Twins, siblings, or distant cousins? *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 17(2), 277–303.
- Infeld, D. L., Adams, W. C., Qi, G., & Rosnah, N. (2010). Career values of public administration and public policy students in China, Malaysia and the United States. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 3, 800–815.
- Infeld, D. L., Qi, G., Adams, W. C., & Lin, A. (2009, June 6–8). Work values and career choices of public administration and public policy students in the U.S. and China. Paper presented at the IPSM Conference, Bloomington, IN.
- Johnson, McGinnis, J., & Ng, E. S. (2015). Money talks or millennials walk: The effect of compensation on nonprofit millennial workers sector-switching intentions. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(3), 283–305.
- Karl, K. A., & Sutton, C. L. (1998). Job values in today's workplace: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(4), 515–527.
- Kennedy, S. S., & Malatesta, D. (2010). Safeguarding the public trust: Can administrative ethics be taught? *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 16(2), 161–180.
- Khojasteh, M. (1993). Motivating the private vs. public sector managers. *Public Personnel Management*, 22(3), 391–401.
- Kingston, P. W., Hubbard, R., Lapp, B., Schroeder, P., & Wilson, J. (2003). Why education matters. *Sociology of Education*, 76(1), 53–70.
- 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., & Hansen, J. R. (2016). Sector differences in the public service motivation-job satisfaction relationship: Exploring the role of organizational characteristics. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. doi:10.1177/0734371X166631605.
- Kjeldsen, A. M., & Jacobsen, C. B. (2013). Public service motivation and employment sector: Attraction or socialization? *Journal of Public Administration and Theory*, 23(4), 899–926.
- Ko, K., & Jun, K. N. (2015). A comparative analysis of job motivation and career preference of Asian undergraduate students. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 192–213.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1–49.
- Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 395–404.

- Liu, B., Hui, C., Hu, J., Yang, W., & Yu, X. (2011). How well can public service motivation connect with occupational intention? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77(1), 191–211.
- Liu, B., & Perry, J. L. (2016). The psychological mechanisms of public service motivation: A two-wave examination. *ROPPA*, 36(1), 4–30.
- Liu, B., & 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.
- Lyons, S. T., Ng, E. S. W., & Schweitzer, L. (2012). Generational career shift: Millennials and the changing nature of careers in Canada. In E. S. W. Ng, S. T. Lyons, & L. Schweitzer (Eds.), *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation* (pp. 64–85). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Lyons, S. T., Urick, M., Kuron, L., & Schweitzer, L. (2015). Generational differences in the workplace: There is complexity beyond the stereotypes. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 8(3), 346–356.
- Mahbubani, K. (2008). *The new Asian hemisphere. The irresistible shift of global power to the East*. New York, NT: Public Affairs.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moynihan, D. (2014, June 11). Why policy schools really matter. Retrieved from the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management: <http://www.appam.org/why-policy-schools-really-matter>.
- Moynihan, D., & Pandey, S. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 40–53.
- Newcomer, K. E., & Allen, H. (2010). Public service education: Adding value in the public interest. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 16(2), 207–229.
- Ng, E. S. W., Gossett, C. W., Chinyoka, S., & Obasi, I. (2016). Public vs. private sector management: An exploratory study of career choice among graduate management students in Botswana. *Personnel Review*, 45(6): 1367-1385.
- Ng, E. S. W., Lyons, S. T., & Schweitzer, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Norris, P. (2003). Is there still a public service ethos? Work values, experience, and job satisfaction among government workers. In J. D. Donahue & J. S. Nye Jr. (Eds.), *For the people: Can we fix public service?* (pp. 72–89). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Pandey, S., & Jain, N. (2014). Relation between personal values and corruption permissiveness of government servants in India and the moderating role of dissatisfaction with the financial condition of the family. *International Review of Public Administration*, 19(2), 126–142.
- Parry, E., Unite, J., Chuddzikowski, K., Briscoe, J. P., & Shen, Y. (2012). Career success in the younger generation. In E. S. W. Ng, S. T. Lyons, & L. Schweitzer (Eds.), *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation* (pp. 242–261). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Pedersen, L. H. (2014). Committed to the public interest? Motivation and behavioral outcomes among local councillors. *Public Administration*, 92(4), 886–901.
- 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., & Hondeghem, A. (Eds.) (2008). *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. 1990. The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373.
- Piereson, J., & Schaefer Riley, N. (2013, December 6). The problem with public policy schools. *The Washington Post*.
- Quah, J. S. T. (2011). *Curbing corruption in Asia: An impossible dream?* New York, NY: Emerald Publishing.
- Redman-Simmons, L. M. (2008, September). *Graduate students' attraction to government public service professions*. Paper presented at the Minnowbrook 3 Conference, Lake Placid, NY.

- Ritz, A. (2015). Public service motivation and politics: Behavioural consequences among local councilors in Switzerland. *Public Administration*, 93(4), 1121–1137.
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public service motivation: A systematic literature review and outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 414–426. doi:10.1111/puar.12505.
- Rose, R. P. (2013). Preferences for careers in public work: Examining the government-nonprofit divide among undergraduates through public service motivation. *American Review of Public Administration*, 43(4), 416–437.
- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15(4), 351–381.
- Schultz, D. (2016). Public affairs education for a new generation. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 22(1), 7–10.
- Stackman, R. W., Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (2006). Sectoral ethos: An comparison of the personal values systems of female and male managers in the public and private sectors. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(4), 577–597.
- Stuteville, R., & DiPadova-Stocks, L. N. (2011). Advancing and assessing public service values in professional programs: The case of the Hauptmann School's Master of Public Affairs Program. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 17(4), 585–610.
- Su, X., & Bozeman, B. (2009). Dynamics of sector switching: Hazard models predicting changes from private sector jobs to public and nonprofit sector jobs. *Public Administration Review*, 69(6), 1106–1114.
- Taylor, J. (2010). Graduate recruitment in the Australian public sector. *Public Management Review*, 12(6), 789–809.
- Taylor, J., & Beh, L. S. (2013). The impact of pay-for-performance on the performance of Australian and Malaysian government employees. *Public Management Review*, 15(8), 1090–1115.
- Twenge, J. M., & Kasser, T. (2013). Generational changes in materialism and work centrality, 1976–2007 associations with temporal changes in societal insecurity and materialistic role modeling. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(7), 883–897.
- Van der Wal, Z. (2011). The content and context of organizational ethics. *Public Administration*, 89(2), 644–660.
- Van der Wal, Z. (2013). Mandarins vs. Machiavellians? On differences between work motivations of political and administrative elites. *Public Administration Review*, 73(5), 749–759.
- Van der Wal, Z. (2015). All quiet on the non-Western front? A systematic review of public service motivation scholarship in non-Western contexts. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 37(2), 69–86.
- Van der Wal, Z. (2017a). Future business and government leaders of Asia: How do they differ and what makes them tick? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(3), 603–616.
- Van der Wal, Z. (2017b). *The 21st century public manager*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van der Wal, Z., & de Graaf, G. (2007). The bureaucrat, the businessperson, and the perception of each other's values: Empirical notions on the other sector's most important organizational values. *Public Integrity*, 9(1), 45–62.
- Van der Wal, Z., & Oosterbaan, A. (2010). Bestuur of Bedrijf: Waar willen studenten werken en waarom? *Bestuurskunde*, 19(2), 58–69.
- Van der Wal, Z., & Oosterbaan, A. (2013). Government or business? Identifying determinants of MPA and MBA students' career preferences. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(2), 239–258.
- Van der Wal, Z., & Yang, L. (2015). Confucius meets Weber or "managerialism takes all"? comparing civil servant values in China and the Netherlands. *International Public Management Journal*, 18(3), 411–436.
- Van Gelder, M., & Dougherty, G. W., Jr. (2012). Do students with experience know that much more? Assessing in-service and pre-service differences in public administration students. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(2), 349–374.
- van Hooft, E. A. J. (2004). *Job seeking as planned behavior: In search of group differences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, VU Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- van Steden, R., Van der Wal, Z., & Lasthuizen, K. M. (2015). Overlapping values, mutual prejudices: Empirical research into the ethos of police officers

- and private security guards. *Administration and Society*, 47(3), 220–243.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Government calling: Public service motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice. *Public Administration*, 86(4), 1089–1105.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2009). The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75, 11–34.
- Vielmetter, G., & Sell, Y. (2014). *Leadership 2030: The six megatrends you need to understand to lead your company into the future*. New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Waldner, C. (2012). Do public and private recruiters look for different employees? The role of public service motivation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1), 70–79.
- Woolcock, M. (2007). Higher education, policy schools, and development studies: What should master's degree students be taught? *Journal of International Development*, 19(1), 55–73.
- Wright, B., & Kim, S. (2004). Participation's influence on job satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24(1): 18–40.
- Xu, Z. (2006). China: Public servant jobs all the rage. *Ohmy News*. Retrieved February 17, 2010, from http://www.english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?no=331467&rel_no=1.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Zeger Van der Wal is an associate professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. He leads the school's research, teaching, and executive education efforts in the areas of public management and leadership, focusing on issues of good governance, ethics, and work motivation. He has authored or coauthored more than 90 publications, including books and journal, magazine, and newspaper articles.

APPENDIX

Descriptive Statistics of all Items

Work motivations	T = 0				T = 1			
	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Being successful	1	5	4.31	0.712	1	5	4.32	0.694
Contributing to society	1	5	4.60	0.553	1	5	4.49	0.583
A high salary	1	5	3.80	0.786	1	5	3.96	0.588
Being service-oriented to others	1	5	4.03	0.822	1	5	4.01	0.840
Intellectually stimulating work environment	1	5	4.56	0.558	1	5	4.57	0.559
Total commitment to my employer	1	5	3.91	0.902	1	5	3.85	0.859
Balancing work and family obligations	1	5	4.58	0.674	1	5	4.47	0.669
Meaningful public service is very important to me	1	5	4.55	0.629	1	5	4.61	0.552
My career will be more important after graduation	1	5	2.40	0.986	1	5	2.57	1.107
Welfare of others is important to me	1	5	4.20	0.687	1	5	4.17	0.686
I like to create innovative products and services	1	5	4.12	0.794	1	5	4.27	0.678
It's best when the public sector is responsible for public goods	1	5	4.01	0.979	1	5	3.87	0.958
It's best when the market is given maximum freedom	1	5	2.99	0.984	1	5	2.90	0.979

Personal values	T = 0				T = 1			
	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Fun	1	10	7.38	2.074	1	10	7.39	1.989
Achievement	1	10	8.34	1.734	1	10	8.63	1.627
Equality	2	10	8.41	1.645	1	10	7.78	2.431
Peace	2	10	8.54	1.628	1	10	7.90	2.132
Prosperity	1	10	7.83	1.715	1	10	7.71	1.827
Change	1	10	7.29	1.978	1	10	7.30	2.089
Power	1	10	6.72	2.343	1	10	6.99	2.068
Self-sacrifice	1	10	6.59	2.106	1	10	6.40	2.383
Justice	1	10	8.33	2.141	1	10	8.14	2.009
Charity	1	10	7.09	2.174	1	10	6.42	2.235

APPENDIX

Descriptive Statistics of all Items (continued)

Sector perceptions	T = 0				T = 1			
	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
"In general, government is very bureaucratic."	1	5	4.07	0.718	1	5	4.13	0.801
"In general, business works much more efficiently and effectively than government."	1	5	3.58	0.929	1	5	3.71	0.967
"When you are working in the business sector, you are only concerned with your own benefits and that of your company."	1	5	3.42	1.130	1	5	3.55	1.073
"Those choosing a career in government are often less ambitious than those choosing a career in business."	1	5	2.54	1.045	1	5	2.73	1.149
"In the business sector it is easier to get promoted to a better position."	1	5	3.19	1.029	1	5	3.20	0.997
"In the business sector, there is a lot of competitiveness between colleagues."	1	5	4.02	0.725	1	5	3.96	0.721
"When you work for government, you are often caught in a web of political interests."	1	5	3.91	0.919	1	5	4.02	0.798
"When you work for government, you can contribute positively to society."	1	5	4.07	0.824	1	5	4.02	0.766
"Government is much friendlier working environment than business."	1	5	3.13	0.914	1	5	3.12	0.942
"In the business sector, people often play 'dirty games' to maximize profit."	1	5	3.48	0.951	1	5	3.49	0.892