

Public Service Motivation: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Job Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model

Bradley E. Wright
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Department of Political Science
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
bwright@uncc.edu

Robert K. Christensen
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Department of Political Science
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
rkchris@uncc.edu

Prepared for the
9th Public Management Research Conference
October 25-27, 2007

Abstract

Interest in public service motivation (PSM) continues to generate a lively research discourse. While some of this research suggests that individual employee PSM influences sector choice, relatively little research examines how time mediates these relationships. In this research we examine public service motivation among private and public sector lawyers. Using two waves of data that give insight into job choice over time, we extend the field's understanding of PSM by investigating the stability of the relationship between individual reward orientations and sector employment choice overtime as well as the mechanisms (attraction/selection vs. attrition/retention) that underlie this relationship.

Introduction

Although researchers often note that “public and private employees are different” (Houston, 2000, 725), it does not necessarily follow that important differences always exist or that any existing differences are dysfunctional. For example, researchers have failed to find significant sector differences in employee motivation or performance (Baldwin 1984, 1987; Emmert & Taher 1992; Posner & Schmidt 1982; Rainey 1979, 1983). Nonetheless, there are a growing number of empirical studies illustrating sector differences that are not only consistent with the function of each sector but also reflect favorably upon public sector. Consistent with the public sector’s emphasis on social equity (Frederickson, 1971), for instance, its employees are more likely to represent traditionally disadvantaged groups such as women and minorities (Blank, 1985; Frank & Lewis, 2004). Similarly, given the pro-social and service function of the public sector, it is also not surprising that it is more likely to employ individuals who value helping others and being useful to society (Crewson, 1997; Frank & Lewis, 2004; Houston, 2006; Rainey, 1982). In addition to their implications for society, these findings also have a number of important managerial implications for the ability to attract and motivate public sector employees (Blank, 1985; Perry & Wise, 1990). In particular the latter is consistent with the predictions of Public Service Motivation (PSM), which suggests that private and public employees differ in large part due to their reward or value orientations and that “understanding the values and reward preferences of public managers is essential in structuring organizational environments and incentive systems to satisfy those preferences” (Wittmer 1991, 369).

The purpose of this study is to investigate one of the most commonly made propositions of PSM theory, that “the greater an individual’s public service motivation, the more likely the individual will seek membership in a public organization” (Perry & Wise, 1990, 370). While

recruiting and retaining employees have always been important issues for the public sector, the changing demographics of the national workforce has recently increased the relevance of this line of inquiry. As baby-boomers retire from public sector employment, the “impending wave of hiring increases the need to investigate what kinds of people are attracted to government jobs and what characteristics make those jobs appealing” (Lewis & Frank, 2002, p. 395). Such an investigation also seems particularly relevant in light of Congressional approval of measures to encourage graduating students to consider careers in government by forgiving student debt for those choosing public sector employment (e.g., bill H.R. 2669, see Ballenstedt, 2007). While this initiative may be successful, it does not necessarily take advantage of the key tenet of PSM, that certain individuals may be predisposed to “respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368).

Notwithstanding the policy relevance and intuitive appeal of an inquiry into factors influencing the recruitment and retention of public employees, current empirical support of PSM influence on employee sector choice is incomplete as research has primarily focused on determining sector differences in PSM without investigating the relationship between PSM and sector employment choice over time (Leisink & Steijn, forthcoming; Wright, 2001; Wright, 2007). Using panel data of private and public sector lawyers, this study extends the field’s understanding of PSM by investigating the extent to which PSM may influence the likelihood that individuals select and retain employment in the public sector.

Literature Review

A growing body of work has often found public service motivation to be higher in public employees than private sector employees regardless of whether PSM was measured as an employee’s interest in opportunities to benefit society or help others (Crewson, 1997; Frank &

Lewis, 2004; Posner & Schmidt, 1996; Rainey, 1982) or their likelihood to perform prosocial acts behaviors (Brewer, 2003; Houston, 2006). These differences between private and public sector employees may be a result of attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) (Schneider 1987) or even adaptation processes (Hall, Schneider & Nygren 1975; Hinrichs 1964). Even so, the assumption that “the greater an individual’s public service motivation, the more likely the individual will seek membership in a public organization” (Perry & Wise, 1990, 370) is more consistent with the ASA emphasis that PSM influences employee sector choice than the adaptation’s view that an individual’s sector of employment may help determine their PSM. Although not mutually exclusive, for the purpose of this study we will assume that employee motives are inputs “brought to the work situation” that represent “the raw materials in the public sector motivational processes” (Perry & Porter 1982, 90) such that individuals are predisposed to ‘respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations’ (Perry & Wise, 1990, 368).

As Leisink and Steijn (forthcoming) note, the theory of PSM parallels that of ASA in many respects. The underlying assertion of ASA is that individuals are attracted to organizations based on the fit between an organization’s characteristics and their own. Consistent with the theory of PSM, the goals of the organization are considered the core of the ASA model because an individual’s preference for a particular organization is often based on their perception of the congruence between the organization’s goals (or values) and their own (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). Indirect support for this emphasis on self-selection (i.e., that individuals sort themselves into employment sectors) has been provided by studies indicating that employees tend to work for organizations that they feel will satisfy their most important needs (Graham & Renwick 1972; Lawler 1971).

The potential influence of organizational goals may be a particularly powerful when comparing private and public sector organizations because employee reward orientations seem to coincide with the general goals or function each sector serves. Charged with promoting general social welfare, public organizations often have missions with broader scope and more profound impact than typically found in the private sector (Baldwin 1984) and, therefore, are expected to attract employees who desire greater opportunities to fulfill higher-order needs and altruistic motives. Conversely, private sector organizations are expected to attract employees who value financial rewards as the organizations themselves emphasize economic returns on investment. In general, therefore, it is often assumed that “people prefer to work for the sector they think will provide them with more of the rewards they consider most important” (Lewis & Frank, 2002, 397). Consistent with the expectation that employee reward preferences will coincide with the function each sector serves, public sector employees have been found to place a lower value on financial rewards (Cacioppe & Mock 1984; Khojasteh 1993; Kilpatrick, Cummings & Jennings 1964; Lawler 1971; Newstrom et. al. 1976; Rainey 1982; Rawls, Ullrich & Nelson 1975; Wittmer 1991) and a higher value on helping others or serving the public (Buchanan 1975; Cacioppe & Mock 1984; Crewson 1997; Kilpatrick, Cummings & Jennings 1964; Rainey 1982; Wittmer 1991) than their private sector counterparts. While such results are consistent with the expectation that PSM influences sector employment choice, these studies have relied on cross-sectional designs that test this relationship only at a single point in time *after* individuals have selected a sector of employment (i.e. Crewson, 1997; Brewer, 2003; Houston, 2006; Posner & Schmidt, 1996; Rainey, 1982; Wittmer, 1991) or study (Karl & Peat, 2004). Nonetheless, consistent with the expectations of PSM theory and existing empirical findings, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1a. When PSM is measured concurrently with sector choice, individuals who choose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others are more likely to be employed in the public sector.

Hypothesis 1b. When PSM is measured concurrently with sector choice, individuals who choose their profession because of the financial opportunities are less likely to be employed in the public sector.

Going beyond the validation of previous findings, this study attempts to provide additional support for PSM theory by investigating the stability of the relationship between initial reward orientations and sector employment choice overtime by testing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2a. Individuals who choose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others are more likely to begin their careers in the public sector.

Hypothesis 2b. Individuals who choose their profession because of their interest in financial opportunities are less likely to begin their careers in the public sector.

Hypothesis 3a. Individuals who choose their profession because of their interest social service/helping others are more likely to be employed in the public sector in the future.

Hypothesis 3b. Individuals who choose their profession because of their interest in financial opportunities are less likely to be employed in the public sector in the future.

In addition to testing the relationship between reward orientation and sector employment choice overtime, it is also important to better understand the mechanisms by which PSM predicts public employment. In particular, to the degree PSM is found to predict sector employment overtime, these findings could be a result of varying degrees of attraction/selection or attrition/retention processes. Each sorting mechanism can have important implications for the efficacy of PSM. While it may be beneficial that PSM attracts employees into the public sector, its value is limited if PSM does not also help retain public employees. The use of PSM to retain employees assumes “that public employees experience a person-job fit and can fulfill their needs on the job” (Leisink & Steijn, forthcoming, 213). Unfortunately there is evidence to suggest that public sector employment may not always live up to its promise of providing opportunities to help others or benefit society. In several studies, public employees report being less committed to or satisfied with their jobs because they didn’t feel that they are able to make public service contributions at work (Buchanan 1974, 1975; Vinzant, 1998). Recent surveys of federal employees suggest that they are becoming less satisfied with their opportunities to accomplish something worthwhile (Light, 2002) and nearly one-third are considering leaving their organization within the next two years (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2005, *Human Capital Survey*).

Under such conditions, it may not be surprising that one recent study found that PSM is inversely related to job tenure (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). This particular finding only highlights further the need to understand PSM’s relationship with employee attraction and retention. If PSM is a force for attraction but not retention, then PSM may only provide a short term benefit to public organizations at best. It is also possible, however, that PSM may ultimately have negative consequences as it is helping public organizations attract the very

employees that are more likely to leave. To investigate the separate effects of attrition/retention and attraction/selection, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 4. Individuals selecting their first job in the public sector are more likely to stay (attrition/retention) in the public sector if they chose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others.

Hypothesis 5. Individuals selecting their first job in the private sector are more likely to move (attraction/selection) to the public sector if they chose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others.

Methods

Study Population

To test our hypotheses, we use two waves of panel data collected by the American Bar Association (ABA) to analyze the employment trends of lawyers. To justify the use of this particular population, we begin with several observations concerning our study population. In 2007, the American Bar Foundation reported that there were 1,143,358 lawyers actively practicing and residing in the United States ("National Lawyer Population by State," 2007) with approximately 1/8 of the profession employed in the public sector (*Lawyer Demographics*, 2006). Because members of the legal profession are commonly employed by both sectors, we propose that the choice a lawyer makes between public and private sector employment can inform us about the attraction-selection choices other professions may make between public and private sector employment. Although past research suggests that PSM may be a more powerful force for some professions than others (Crewson, 1997; Lewis & Frank, 2002), there is empirical support for the relevancy of PSM in the legal profession (Nalbandian & Edwards, 1983). In addition, this particular study population allows us to control for profession *and* education in

examining the attraction-selection process. By holding education constant, for example, we are able to control for some of the socialization—whether favorable towards public sector selection—that might be introduced in the education process and avoid studying a population already associated with a particular sector.

Previous research has also suggested the potential relevancy of both the attraction-selection-attrition and the reward orientation issues for this particular population. Recent work has suggested that public interest organizations are struggling to recruit talented law graduates into the legal services arena. Studies show that this recruitment challenge is compounded by problems in retaining lawyers, as attorney attrition siphons off already scarce resources from these organizations providing legal access (*From Paper Chase to Money Chase: Law School Debt Diverts Road to Public Service*, 2002). In fact, Boylan's (2004) study of public sector lawyers, U.S. Attorneys found that comparatively lower government salaries led to increased turnover.

Survey Design & Participants

Our data are responses to the National Survey of Career Satisfaction of the American Bar Association (ABA).¹ The survey contains key questions that approximate those necessary to construct PSM attributes. First administered in 1984, the survey ultimately yielded two waves of data. Across both waves, the survey probes into the personal characteristics and job satisfaction of several populations of attorneys, from which respondents were randomly selected.

Wave I data was collected through an initial survey distributed in 1984 and a follow up survey to collect updated information in 1990. A random probability sample of 2,967 lawyers of all ages were selected from ABA member and nonmember lists of 569,706 lawyers in the United States purposely over sampling young lawyers (those under 36 years of age or admitted to the

bar after 1980). The initial 1984 survey received 2,236 responses for a response rate of 75.4%. Of these, our study focused on only 1,469 respondents who responded by mail and provided information regarding their reward orientations.² In 1990, respondents to the 1984 were again contacted. Of the 1,469 respondents providing initial reward orientation information in 1990, 840 (57.2%) completed the 1990 survey in sufficient detail to be included in this study.³ General demographic information from Wave I respondents used in our study is provided in Table 1a by sector of employment.

Wave II data comprises a new sample of lawyers contacted for the first time in 1990. This sample focused on attorneys admitted to the bar after 1984, asking about the respondent's first job and job at the time of the survey. While the 1990 Wave II survey yielded a 50 percent response rate from the 1,002 Wave II surveys distributed, only 347 respondents responded by mail and provided information regarding their reward orientations.⁴ General demographic information from Wave II respondents used in our study is provided in Table 1b by sector of employment.

Measures

To test our hypotheses, the sector of employment was measured in three ways. Two measures were captured in the initial surveys received by Wave I and Wave II respondents (1984 and 1990, respectively). These questions asked each participant to identify the job setting of their current position as well as their first legal position. Those that noted that their job setting was in the federal, state or local government (or judiciary) were coded as being employed in the public sector while those noting that they were in private practice or corporate counsel were coded as being employed in the private sector.⁵ To measure the respondents future sector of employment, Wave I respondents to the 1990 survey were asked to describe their current job

setting in a similar fashion. Taken together, both waves of data allow us to analyze the role of PSM at the individual level and by sector in three time periods of employment: the respondent's first legal job (a question asked in both waves), the respondent's job in 1984, and the respondent's job in 1990. The data can also enlighten the interaction of PSM with important behavioral (turnover) overtime.

To measure a respondent's reward orientation, the initial surveys received by Wave I and Wave II respondents (1984 and 1990, respectively) asked each participant to identify the most important that led them to choose a legal career. Responses by category are provided for Wave I respondents in Table 2a and Wave II respondents in Table 2b. Respondents that noted that the most important reason for choosing a legal career was their "interest in social service/helping others" were coded as exhibiting PSM. Conversely, those noting the most important reason as financial opportunity were used to test the corollary hypotheses concerning economic motivation. This wording helps isolate the effects of PSM as an antecedent to employment choice by asking about the relative importance of altruistic or economic incentives prior to any specific employment decision. In doing so, this wording limits the likelihood that responses will be influenced by post employment rationalization or socialization.

When looking at responses to this question over time, a few interesting patterns emerge relevant to our hypothesized relationship between sector employment and reward orientation. First, it should be noted that PSM is not just a public sector phenomenon. While a higher ratio of government lawyers have PSM (Tables 2a and 2b), the vast majority of lawyers with PSM work in the private sector. Of the Wave I respondents who chose a career in law because of their interest in social service/helping others, 76% worked their first legal job in the private sector (79% by 1984, 82% by 1990).⁶ A second related pattern exists regarding economic incentives.

Regardless of the wave or time period of employment, the percentage of private sector lawyers noting the importance of financial opportunities is similar to the percentage of public sector lawyers noting its importance.

Recognizing previous findings regarding the proclivity of women, minorities and older individuals to be over represented in public employment, we used demographic information provided by the surveys to control for these factors. Similarly we controlled for other factors that might influence a respondent's job selection related to opportunity (measured by academic achievement in law school as well as the prestige of their law school) and even desire for a greater balance of family-work (measured by marital status).

Results

To test our hypotheses, a series of logistic regression analyses were conducted using our measures of financial and service/helping others to predict sector employment at three points of time while controlling for race, gender, age, marital status, academic achievement and law school prestige. In doing so, the findings provide mixed support for our hypotheses. Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, respondents who report that their interest in social service/helping others was the most important reason they choose a legal career were more likely to be currently employed in the public sector ($p < 0.05$). Contrary to Hypothesis 2a, however, those same respondents were no more likely to report starting their legal career (first job) in the public sector ($p > 0.05$). Similarly, our hypotheses regarding the relationship between sector of employment and financial interests were also not supported. Contrary to Hypotheses 1b and 2b, respondents who report that their interest in financial opportunities was the most important reason they choose a legal career were no less likely to have either their current or first professional legal job in government ($p > 0.05$). This pattern of findings was robust across two waves of data (Table

3a/Wave I and Table 3b/Wave II) and also across iterations of the models where interest in social service/helping others or financial opportunities were measured more liberally as one of the top two reasons for choosing a career in law.

To test Hypotheses 3a and 3b, responses of Wave I participants regarding the most important reason they choose a legal career collected in 1984 were then used to predict the sector in which they were employed six years later during the 1990 follow up survey. The results (Table 3a) here were similar to the results found when predicting their sector of employment in 1984 (Hypotheses 1a and 1b). Consistent with Hypothesis 3a, respondents who reported in 1984 that their interest in social service/helping others was the most important reason they originally choose a legal career were more likely to be employed in the public sector in 1990 ($p < 0.05$). Hypothesis 3b was not supported as the respondents who reported in 1984 that their interest in financial opportunities was the most important reason they choose a legal career were no less likely to be employed in government in 1990 ($p > 0.05$).

To investigate the potential effects of attrition/retention (H_4) and attraction/selection (H_5) processes, two additional logistic regression analyses were conducted separating the first wave of respondents by the employment sector of their first legal job. First, when only including respondents whose first job was in the public sector in the analysis, interest in social service/helping others was used to predict whether they were still employed in the public sector at the time of the survey (1984). The findings are reported in Table 4. Contrary to our expectations in Hypothesis 4, individuals selecting their first job in the public sector were no more likely to stay (attrition/retention) in the public sector if they chose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others ($p > 0.05$). In fact, a substantial percentage of the lawyers with PSM whose first legal job was in government in both Wave I and Wave II

eventually leave and take jobs in the private sector (51% and 44%, respectively). Second, when only including respondents whose first job was in the private sector in the analysis, interest in social service/helping others was used to predict whether they switched to public sector employment by the time of the survey (1984). The findings are reported in Table 5. Consistent with Hypothesis 5, individuals originally employed in the private sector were more likely to move (attraction/selection) to the public sector by 1984 when they chose their profession because of their interest in social service/helping others ($p > 0.05$).⁷

Discussion

The findings of this study suggest that the relationship between PSM and sector employment choice is not entirely straightforward. While a strong interest in social service/helping others does not predict the employment sector of a lawyers' first legal job (H_{1a}) it does increase the likelihood of holding subsequent jobs in the public sector (H_{1b} and H_{1c}). An interest in financial opportunities, however, has no influence on a lawyer's initial (H_{2b}) or subsequent (H_{1b} and H_{3b}) sector of employment. While these findings do not fully support expectations that employee reward preferences will coincide with the function each sector serves, they are not entirely inconsistent with past empirical conclusions. In one of the studies most commonly cited in support of PSM, Crewson's (1997) analysis of the General Social Survey found that public employees had significantly higher PSM than private employees in only about half of the years analyzed.⁸ Empirical support for these differences, however, has not always been consistent. Similarly, several other studies have failed to find differences in preference for monetary rewards (Crewson 1997; Gabris & Simo 1995; Maidani 1991; Schuster 1974).

The findings of this study suggest that instead of asking whether PSM affects employee attraction and retention, perhaps it is more appropriate to ask when and under what conditions PSM affects employee attraction and retention. Fortunately, this search for mitigating factors has already begun. In a more nuanced analysis of PSM and sector of employment, Lewis and Frank (2002) observed that the PSM/sector relationship might be stronger for college graduates, employees under 30 years old, and for some of the more specific employment classifications (i.e. education, postal and sanitary). Similarly, after reviewing the person-organization fit literature, Leisink and Steijn (forthcoming) have recently noted that more research is needed to investigate the relative importance of PSM when compared to other factors influencing job or sector choice.

Our study adds to this discussion by suggesting that PSM might not always influence an employee's first professional job or even employee retention but may be still be an important factor when recruiting employees with some prior professional experience (H₅). There are several potential explanations for this finding. It is possible, for example, that PSM becomes more salient after respondents take their first position and find certain organizational or job characteristics to be less gratifying than they had expected. Alternatively, graduates selecting their first job may have less autonomy incorporating PSM into their decision. Lack of job experience, school debt, and stiff competition for entry level jobs may have caused respondents with PSM to temporarily delay selecting jobs on internal motivations. Such individuals may gain more flexibility in acting upon more valued preferences in future job decisions after acquiring some initial experience. Either way, our findings suggest that PSM may help us understand the attraction-selection process after a respondent enters the work force, but little about the initial job selection.

Our findings regarding retention raise similar questions. The failure to find a relationship between PSM and employee retention (H₄) may also be the result of phenomena external to individual PSM. For example, as suggested in some previous research, public employees with PSM may find that their public sector jobs do not satisfy individual motivations as much as expected (Buchanan 1974, 1975; Vinzant, 1998), which may precipitate that employee exiting the sector (Wright & Pandey, 2007). Such an interpretation is consistent with research (Paarlberg & Perry, Forthcoming; Pandey, Moynihan & Wright, forthcoming; Wright & Pandey, 2007) suggesting that PSM's relationship to employee satisfaction and commitment is mediated by factors such as value congruence or person-organization fit.

Our study begins to demonstrate the importance of longitudinal analysis as a tool to more fully understand the implications of PSM. Extant investigations concerning the role of PSM are useful in identifying mitigating factors, but empirically incomplete in their ability to enlighten the interplay between PSM and the attraction-selection-attrition processes over time. We have demonstrated that PSM plays a different role in the attraction-selection-attrition process at different stages in an individual's career. Better understanding this process holds, in turn, the promise of addressing important policy proposals (e.g., bill H.R. 2669) and managerial challenges including the need to attract and retain skilled/motivated individuals in public positions.

¹ We recognize here assistance from Joanne Martin from the American Bar Foundation for her assistance in using and understanding the data.

² Phone respondents only completed an abbreviated set of survey questions that did not include information regarding their PSM.

³ Wave I respondents were only asked for information regarding their reward orientation used to measure PSM in the initial 1984 survey. The 1990 survey did, however, provide updated information about the recipient's current job including sector of employment.

⁴ As with the initial Wave I survey, those responding to Wave II by phone only completed an abbreviated set of survey questions that did not include information regarding their PSM.

⁵ Respondents describing their job setting as professors were excluded from this analysis.

⁶ A respondent's first job may/ may not coincide with the respondent's job in 1984, when reward orientation was assessed.

⁷ Due to low sample sizes, similar analyses could not be conducted with Wave II data or Wave I data comparing employment sector changes between 1984 and 1990.

⁸ While a statistically significant difference was found in only 8 of the 14 years analyzed, it was only found in 5 of the 11 years in which the General Social Survey was conducted using a full probability sample

References

- Baldwin, J. N. (1984). Are we really lazy? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 4, 80-89.
- Baldwin, J. N. (1987). Public versus private: Not that different, not that consequential. *Public Personnel Management*, 16, 181-193.
- Ballenstedt, B. R. (2007, September 7). Congress approves student loan forgiveness for public servants. Retrieved September 11, 2007, from <Http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0907/090707b2.htm>
- Blank, R. M. (1985). An analysis of workers' choice between employment in the public and private sectors. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 38(2), 211-224.
- Boylan, R. T. (2004). Salaries, turnover, and performance in the federal criminal justice system. *Journal of Law & Economics*, 47(1), 75-92.
- Brewer, Gene A. (2003). Building Social Capital: Civic Attitudes and Behavior of Public Servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13 (1): 5-26.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 533-546
- Buchanan, B. (1975). Government managers, business executives, and organizational commitment. *Public Administration Review*, 34(4), 339-347.
- Cacioppe, R., & Mock, P. (1984). A comparison of the quality of work experience in government and private organizations. *Human Relations*, 37(11), 923-940.
- Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4, 499-518.
- Emmert, M. A., & Taher, W. A. (1992). Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *American Review of Public*

Administration, 22(1), 37-48.

Frank, S. A., & Lewis, G. B. (2004). Government employees: Working hard or hardly working?

American Review of Public Administration, 34(1), 36-51.

Frederickson, H. G. (1971). "Toward a New Public Administration," in *Toward a New Public*

Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, pp. 309- 331. Scranton, PA: Chandler Publishing.

From Paper Chase to Money Chase: Law School Debt Diverts Road to Public Service. (2002).

Equal Justice Works; Partnership for Public Service; National Association for Law Placement; National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

Gabris, G. T., & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management*, 24(1), 33-51

Graham, W. K., & Renwick, P. A. (1972). Expected need deficiency and preferences for three types of organizations. *Journal of Psychology*, 82, 21-26.

Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1975). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176--90.

Hinrichs, J. R. (1964). The attitudes of research chemists. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 287-293.

Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-Service Motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 10(4), 713-727.

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.

- Karl, K. A., & Peat, B. (2004). A match made in heaven or a square peg in a round hole? How public service educators can help students assess person-environment fit. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 10*(4), 265--278.
- Khojasteh, M. (1993). Motivating the private vs. public sector managers. *Public Personnel Management, 22*(3), 391-401.
- Kilpatrick, F. P., Cummings, M. C. jr., & Jennings, M. K. (1964). *The image of the federal service*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Lawler, E. E. (1971). *Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lawyer Demographics. (2006.): American Bar Association Market Research Department.
- Leisink, P & Steijn, B. (forthcoming). Recruitment, attraction, and selection. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.) *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*. Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review, 62*(4), 395-404.
- Light, P. C. (2002). The troubled state of the federal public service. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- 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.
- Moynihan, D.P. & Pandey, S.K. (2007) The role of organizations in fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review, 67*(1), 40-53.

- Nalbandian, J., & Edwards, J. T. (1983). The values of public administrators: A comparison with lawyers, social workers and business administrators. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 4(1), 114-127.
- Newstrom, J. W., Reif, W. E., & Monczka, R. M. (1976). Motivating the public employee: Fact vs. fiction. *Public Personnel Management*, 5, 67-72.
- Paarlberg, L., & Perry, J. L. (Forthcoming). Values management: aligning individual values and organizational goals. *American Review of Public Administration*.
- Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E. & Moynihan, D. P. (forthcoming). Public Service Motivation and interorganizational citizenship behavior: Testing a preliminary model. *International Public Management Journal*.
- 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., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public-Service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1982). Determining managerial strategies in the public sector: What kinds of people enter the public and private sectors? An updated comparison of perceptions, stereotypes, and values *Human Resource Management*, 21(2).
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1996). The values of business and federal government executives: More different than alike. *Public Personnel Management*, 25(3), 277-289.
- Rainey, H. G. (1979). Perceptions of incentives in business and government: Implications for civil service reform. *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), 440-448.
- Rainey, H. G. (1982). Reward Preferences among Public and Private Managers: In Search of the Service Ethic. *American Review of Public Administration*, 16(4), 288-302.

- Rainey, H. G. (1983). Private agencies and private firms: Incentive structures, goals and individual roles. *Administration & Society*, 15(2), 207-242.
- Rawls, J. R., Ullrich, R. A., & Nelson, O. T. (1975). A comparison of managers entering or reentering the profit and nonprofit sectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(3), 616-623.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437--53.
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 747--73.
- Schuster, J. R. (1974). Management-compensation policy and the public interest. *Public Personnel Management*, 3, 510-523.
- Vinzant, J. C. (1998). Where values collide: Motivation and role conflict in child and adult protective services. *American Review of Public Administration*, 28(4), 347-366.
- What Do Federal Employees Say? Results from the 2004 Human Capital Survey. (2005.): United States Office of Personnel Management.
- Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving the people or serving for pay: Reward preferences among government, hybrid sector and business managers. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14(4), 369-383.
- Wright, B. E. & Pandey, S. K. (2007). What Makes Mission Matter? Mission Valence, Public Service Motivation and Human Resource Outcomes. Paper presented at the 9th National Public Management Research Conference, Tucson, AZ.
- Wright, B. E. (2001). Public Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature Model and a Revised Conceptual Model. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 11(4), 559.

Wright, B. E. (2007). Methodological Challenges associated with Public Service Motivation
Research. Paper presented at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management.

Table 1a. Wave I Respondent Demographics by Sector of Employment

	Employment Sector of First Legal Job		Employment Sector in 1984		Employment Sector in 1990	
	Private (n = 1,018)	Public (n = 274)	Private (n = 1,162)	Public (n = 177)	Private (n = 744)	Public (n = 76)
Caucasian	98.2%	97.0%	98.3%	96.0%	98.0%	97.4%
Male	83.6%	80.2%	85.0%	71.8%		
Married	72.4%	69.4%	84.8%	71.8%	74.4%	73.3%
Age (in years)						
Average			38.3	36	43	44
Std Dev			11.1	10.2	9.7	9.5
Prestige of Law School						
Very prestigious	25.5%	14.6%	23.3%	18.6%	23.5%	19.7%
Somewhat prestigious	43.5%	48.9%	46.1%	44.1%	45.8%	48.7%
Not very prestigious	26.2%	31.4%	26.2%	31.6%	27.2%	28.9%
Not at all prestigious	4.7%	5.1%	4.5%	5.6%	3.5%	2.6%
Class Rank in Law School						
Top quartile	47.8%	43.4%	49.7%	31.4%	50.9%	29.3%
Second quartile	32.9%	33.6%	32.3%	40.6%	30.6%	41.3%
Third quartile	15.3%	16.8%	14.0%	21.7%	14.2%	22.7%
Fourth quartile	4.0%	6.2%	4.0%	6.3%	4.3%	6.7%
1983 Annual Salary						
< \$15,000			7.5%	5.7%		
\$15,000-24,999			12.4%	22.7%		
\$25,000-39,999			26.6%	36.4%		
\$40,000-54,999			18.4%	18.8%		
\$55,000-74,999			13.1%	13.1%		
\$75,000-99,999			8.9%	2.8%		
\$100,000-199,999			10.4%	0.0%		
\$200,000 or more			2.6%	0.6%		

Table 1b. Wave II Respondent Demographics by Sector of Employment

	Employment Sector of First Legal Job		Employment Sector in 1990	
	Private (n = 235)	Public (n = 83)	Private (n = 239)	Public (n = 64)
Caucasian	94.5%	89.7%	95.3%	87.5%
Male	69.1%	56.4%	68.2%	53.1%
Married	61.3%	51.3%	60.5%	50.0%
Age (in years)				
Average			32.9	34.8
Std Dev			5.73	6.62
Prestige of Law School				
Very prestigious	24.0%	16.0%	22.7%	16.4%
Somewhat prestigious	43.8%	45.7%	43.7%	44.3%
Not very prestigious	27.0%	33.3%	28.6%	34.4%
Not at all prestigious	5.2%	4.9%	5.0%	4.9%
Class Rank in Law School				
Top quartile	44.6%	46.9%	50.6%	32.3%
Second quartile	31.8%	33.3%	29.1%	40.3%
Third quartile	14.6%	14.8%	12.2%	22.6%
Fourth quartile	9.0%	4.9%	6.0%	4.8%
1989 Annual Salary				
< \$15,000			5.9%	9.4%
\$15,000-24,999			7.1%	7.8%
\$25,000-39,999			18.5%	57.8%
\$40,000-54,999			26.9%	21.9%
\$55,000-74,999			24.4%	3.1%
\$75,000-99,999			9.7%	0.0%
\$100,000-199,999			5.5%	0.0%
\$200,000 or more			2.1%	0.0%

Table 2a. Reasons Wave I Respondents Chose Career in Law by Sector of Employment

	Employment Sector of First Legal Job		Employment Sector in 1984		Employment Sector in 1990	
	Private (n = 1,018)	Public (n = 274)	Private (n = 1,162)	Public (n = 177)	Private (n = 744)	Public (n = 76)
Most Import Reason						
Intellectual Challenge	39.7%	36.5%	40.1%	41.8%	41.5%	35.5%
Financial Opportunity	15.5%	15.3%	15.7%	13.0%	15.6%	14.5%
Interest in Social Service/Helping Others	11.4%	13.5%	10.6%	18.1%	9.9%	21.1%
Family wishes	6.1%	6.2%	6.1%	5.6%	4.8%	7.9%
Influence of a role model	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Other	27.0%	27.8%	27.0%	21.5%	27.5%	21.0%
Mentioned in top 2 reasons						
Financial Opportunity	46.5%	45.3%	47.4%	41.4%	45.5%	43.8%
Interest in Social Service/Helping Others	23.9%	28.3%	23.5%	34.3%	23.2%	31.5%

Table 2b. Reasons Wave II Respondents Chose Career in Law by Sector of Employment

	Employment Sector of First Legal Job		Employment Sector in 1990	
	Private (n = 235)	Public (n = 83)	Private (n = 239)	Public (n = 64)
Most Import Reason				
Intellectual Challenge	39.6%	39.8%	41.8%	34.4%
Financial Opportunity	11.5%	12.0%	10.9%	10.9%
Interest in Social Service/Helping Others	14.9%	22.9%	13.0%	26.6%
Family wishes	4.3%	3.6%	3.8%	4.7%
Influence of a role model	7.7%	1.2%	6.3%	6.3%
Other	22.0%	20.5%	24.2%	17.1%
Mentioned in top 2 reasons				
Financial Opportunity	48.1%	30.1%	47.7%	28.1%
Interest in Social Service/Helping Others	26.4%	43.4%	29.8%	42.2%

Table 3a. Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Public Sector Employment of Wave I Respondents for First Legal Job (n = 1,249), 1984 Job (n = 1,290), and 1990 Job (n = 799)

Predictor	First Job ^a			1984 Job ^a			1990 Job ^b		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>
Most Important Factor in Choosing Legal Career									
Social Service/Helping Others ^a	0.25	0.21	1.28	0.60*	0.23	1.81	0.92*	0.33	2.51
Financial Opportunities ^a	0.06	0.20	1.06	-0.10	0.25	0.90	0.02	0.36	1.02
Controls									
Caucasian	-0.43	0.44	0.65	-0.36	0.49	0.70	-0.14	0.79	0.87
Married	-0.07	0.16	0.93	-0.21	0.18	0.81	0.00	0.30	1.00
Age	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.02	0.01	1.02
Female	0.15	0.18	1.16	0.67*	0.20	1.96	0.14	0.36	1.15
Graduation Quartile	0.15	0.08	1.16	0.39*	0.09	1.48	0.41*	0.13	1.50
Prestige of Law School	0.25*	0.09	1.28	0.19	0.10	1.21	0.15	0.16	1.16
Constant	-9.02	13.54		0.64	16.34		32.60	24.03	
χ^2		17.71			45.42			18.95	
<i>df</i>		8			8			8	
Percent Employed in Public Sector		21.4			13.4			9.3	

* p < 0.05

^aAs Reported in 1984.

^bAs reported in 1990.

Table 3b. Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Public Sector Employment of Wave II Respondents for First Legal Job (n = 290) and 1990 Job (n = 292)

Predictor	First Job ^a			1990 Job ^a		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>
Most Important Factor in Choosing Legal Career						
Social Service/Helping Others ^a	0.47	0.35	1.59	0.86*	0.37	2.36
Financial Opportunities ^a	0.08	0.45	1.08	0.39	0.48	1.47
Controls						
Caucasian	-0.72	0.52	0.49	-0.82	0.55	0.44
Married	-0.26	0.28	0.77	-0.21	0.31	0.81
Age	0.00	0.02	1.00	0.03	0.02	1.03
Female	0.38	0.29	1.47	0.59	0.31	1.80
Graduation Quartile	-0.16	0.16	0.85	0.23	0.16	1.26
Prestige of Law School	-0.26	0.28	0.77	0.27	0.19	1.30
Constant	7.42	45.62		49.78	47.82	
χ^2		11.13			20.04	
<i>df</i>		8			8	
Percent Employed in Public Sector		25.9			20.5	

* p < 0.05

^aAs Reported in 1990.

Table 4. Logistic Regression Predicting 1984 Public Sector Employment (Retention) of Wave I Respondents with First Legal Job in Government (N = 297)

Predictor	1984 Job ^a		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>
Most Important Factor in Choosing Legal Career			
Social Service/Helping Others ^a	0.14	0.43	1.15
Financial Opportunities ^a	-0.14	0.40	0.87
Controls			
Caucasian	-0.43	0.80	0.65
Married	-0.49	0.31	0.61
Age	-0.07*	0.02	0.93
Female	0.90*	0.37	2.46
Graduation Quartile	0.23	0.16	1.26
Prestige of Law School	0.25	0.19	1.28
Constant	-130.89	40.27	
χ^2		35.25	
<i>df</i>		8	
Percent Employed in Public Sector		32.7	

* $p < 0.05$

^aAs Reported in 1984.

Table 5. Logistic Regression Predicting 1984 Public Sector Employment of Wave I Respondents with First Legal Job in Private Sector (N = 928)

Predictor	1984 Job ^a		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>e^B</i>
Most Important Factor in Choosing Legal Career			
Social Service/Helping Others ^a	0.83*	0.36	2.29
Financial Opportunities ^a	-0.51	0.45	0.60
Controls			
Caucasian	0.22	1.09	1.25
Married	0.16	0.33	1.17
Age	0.03*	0.01	0.03
Female	0.56	0.36	1.75
Graduation Quartile	0.58*	0.15	1.78
Prestige of Law School	-0.09	0.17	0.91
Constant	46.75	21.55	
χ^2		27.67	
<i>df</i>		8	
Percent Employed in Public Sector		6.5	

* $p < 0.05$

^aAs Reported in 1984.