

Xuhong Su¹
Barry Bozeman
University of Georgia

**Job choice motivation among public and nonprofit
managers: Impacts of sector switching²**

-Paper prepared for presentation at the Public Management Research Conference,
Columbus, Ohio, September 2009-

¹ Corresponding author: xuhongsu@uga.edu

² We are grateful to Mary K. Feeney for her work in managing the National Administrative Studies Project III database from which this study draws and to Hal Rainey and Gordon Kingsley for their assistance in constructing the questionnaire.

Job choice motivation among public and nonprofit managers: Impacts of sector switching

Abstract

Our study examines the professed job choice motivation of public and nonprofit managers and investigates the impacts of sector differences upon it. Unlike previous research relying on information pertaining to motivation, goals or values, we attempt to provide a behavior anchor for motivation studies: sector switching. Only very recently, does the mobility of employees across sector lines start to receive scholarly attention. This study is the first to investigate how sector switching shapes individuals' job choice motivation.

Based on questionnaire responses from mid- and upper-level personnel in public and nonprofit sector organizations, the study reveals five main dimensions of individuals' job choice motivation, and suggests that employees selecting into public organizations are indeed motivated by different factors than are their peers joining nonprofit organizations. Compared with employees remaining in the same sector, i.e. non-switchers, those switchers out of private organizations are more motivated by job security factor, regardless of sectors they switch in. Switching between the public and nonprofit sectors demonstrates a slightly different pattern, however, more caution is merited due to the small number of such switchers.

Job choice motivation among public and nonprofit managers: Impacts of sector switching

Introduction

Work motivation has proved to be a popular and resilient topic for public management researchers (for review, see Perry and Porter 1982; Wright 2001; Rainey 2003) and for researchers focusing on nonprofit managers (Phillips, 1982; Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Leete, 2000; Independent sector 2002; Urban Institute 2008). Work motivation research has shown its relation to a number of important social and managerial concerns in both sectors (Kanfer and Ackerman 2000; Moynihan and Pandey 2007b; Wright 2001; Borzgara and Tortia 2006), including enhanced employees' job satisfaction (Locke and Latham 1990; Wight 2001; Mirvis, 2006), organizational commitment (Scholl 1981; Goulet and Frank 2006) and individual and organizational performance (Rainey and Steinbauer 1998; Brewer and Selden 2000; Theuvsen 2004). However, most researchers focus on motivation as a means, rather than as an end.

A managerial research topic, one embedded in theories of general management but heretofore a lesser concern in public and nonprofit management, is the motivation to join an organization (Barnard 1938, March and Simon 1958). Public management scholars have given much more attention to job commitment and involvement, i.e., the desire to work hard and work well (Rainey 2003; Kanfer and Ackerman 2000; Moynihan and Pandey 2007b; Wright 2001), but for the most part have left questions of employee career trajectories to business management and, especially, labor economists. However, public management scholars' comparative neglect of job entry and exiting patterns seems curious inasmuch as public employees' motives are conceived as the "raw materials" in the public sector motivational process (Perry and Porter 1982:90). It seems to us that examining job choice motivation should be the starting point to explore this process. Our study attempts to fill a perceived gap in the public and nonprofit management research by exploring employees' job choice motivation and the determinants of these motivations.

Related to our concern is the now-prodigious research on public service motivation (PSM) (Perry 1996; 1997; 2000; Naff and Crum 1999; Pandey et al. 2008; Taylor 2008). Despite of much effort directed toward work motivation, the theory does to some extent address job choice motivation. One important PSM proposition

contends that "the greater an individual's public service motivation, the more likely the individual will seek membership in a public organization" (Perry and Wise 1990: 370), though the empirical evidence about this proposition has been inconclusive (Perry et al 2009). Some studies provide at least modest support for the idea that public service motivation relates positively to stronger preferences to work in public organizations (Lewis and Frank 2000; Vandebellee 2009; Sterjin 2008). The extent to which such preferences turn into actual public employment remains to be known.

Wright and Christen (2007) conducted possibly the first longitudinal analysis linking public service motivation to career decisions, suggesting that public service motivation does not predict the sector of employees' first professional job. Seemingly, in absence of universal patterns, "variation patterns" (Thompson 1967) regarding public service motivation would be a best alternative (Wright and Christen 2007). We believe that exploring the multiple dimensions of job choice motivation and how each dimension relates to diverse motivational antecedents may tell us much about these variations.

Another stream of work related to ours is the literature comparing employees' attitudes and preferences in the context of public-private (and sometimes nonprofit) organizational environments. These studies tend to suggest that public employees devalue extrinsic rewards relative to their private peers (Rainey 1982; Jurkiewicz et al. 1998; Houston 2000; Wittmer 1991). Others indicate that public employees' preferences for monetary rewards, job security, and promotion differ little from private counterparts (Crewson 1997; Houston 2000; Gabris and Simo 1995), and still others note that public employees may be more motivated by a desire for a "balanced" life (Buelens and Broeck 2007). Most of the studies focusing on the interaction between sector and motivation do not have data sufficient for the task of untangling selection dynamics from sectoral affiliation and cannot make conclusive statements about sector-based differences in job choice decisions. Our study tries to sort out job choice motivation issues by examining multiple dimensions of choice (not, for example, limited to sector perceptions) and by focusing on a representative sample of public and nonprofit managers.

Motivation directs individuals' behavior. It concerns "how behavior gets started, is energized, is sustained, is stopped, and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on" (Johns 1955: vii). However, most motivation studies

in public and nonprofit management focus almost exclusively on perceptual or subjective information provided by respondents on structured questionnaires. Most do not contain behavioral anchors or any dynamism with respect to time and work history. A distinguishing feature of our research, one that has quite recently begun to appear in the public management research literature (Bozeman and Ponomariov, 2009; Su and Bozeman, 2009a, 2009b; Boardman, Bozeman and Ponomariov, in press), is a focus on job trajectories (rather than single jobs) and “sector switching,” i.e. movement among public, private and nonprofit sectors. By examining trajectories rather than a single job and by considering movement from one sector to the next, it is perhaps possible to learn more about how previous work history affect contemporaneous choice.

Data and methods

The data for this study were drawn from the third wave of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP III). The survey, completed in 2005, was administered to 1849 public managers and 1307 nonprofit managers in Georgia and Illinois. Deploying the tailored design method (Dillman 2000) and featuring a pre-contact letter, postcard reminder and the three survey mailings, the survey resulted in an overall response rate of 39% (43% response rate for the public sector sample and 33% for the nonprofit sector sample). Comparison of the sampling population, respondents and nonrespondents showed no significant differences with regard to gender, state, job rank or agency of employment. More detailed information is available elsewhere (Feeney and Bozeman, 2008; Bozeman and Ponomariov, 2009).

The NASP III questionnaire asked respondents to provide information on items that motivated them to accept a job at their current organizations (the items are provided below). In the present study, we employ confirmatory factor analysis to reveal the underlying structure of these job motives items.

As mentioned above, we use data from the NASP III study pertaining to job trajectories. Respondents were asked to provide information on their recent career history (last four jobs, including the current one). Pendakur and his colleagues (2000) examined job history of employees in the Canadian federal service, suggesting that nearly 65% of this population had at least one job change during their careers, but very few (less than 7%) had four or more. Inasmuch as the job trajectory questions had high response

difficulty, it was assumed that obtaining information about more than four jobs would have had unacceptable impacts on the response rate to the questionnaire.

The job trajectory data provided detailed information regarding the types of jobs (managerial, professional, technical or other), the types of organizations (public sector, private sector, nonprofit sector), time spans attached to each of past jobs and other career-related features. In addition, individual demographic characteristics were also solicited. Each dimension extracted from individuals' job choice motives was taken as a dependent variable. Linear regression analyses (OLS) were used to explore how sector, sector switching, individual occupations as well as their demographic characteristics shape respondents' job choice motivation.

Job choice motivation

In the NASP III questionnaire, respondents were asked to respond to the following Likert-type statements (1=not important, 2=somewhat unimportant, 3=somewhat important, 4=very important)¹

- Opportunity for advancement within the organization's hierarchy
- Opportunity for training and career development
- Job security
- The organizations' reputation for opportunities for women or minorities
- Overall quality and reputation of this organization
- The organization's pension or retirement plan
- Desire for less bureaucratic red tape
- Desire for a low conflict work environment
- Desire for increased responsibility
- Benefits (medical, insurance)
- "Family friendly" policies (e.g. flexible work hours, parental leave)
- Salary
- Ability to serve the public and the public interest
- Few, if any, alternative job offers
- Relatively low cost of living in the region
- Employment opportunities for spouse or partner

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of job choice motives as well as the results of t-tests for public and nonprofit managers. In general, managers from both organization types ranked job security as a "very important" factor shaping their job choice decisions (63% for public managers, and 40% for nonprofit managers), followed by salary, benefits, and increased responsibility. A closer look revealed the important

differences between public and nonprofit respondents. Public managers put significantly more emphasis on job security, career advancement, benefits, pension, and the ability to serve the public and the public interest; in contrast, nonprofit managers seemed more concerned with such factors as overall quality of the organization, increased responsibility, and salary. Though they shared similar desires for good working environment, salary and family friendly policies, public managers gave more weight to practical family issues such as low living cost and job opportunities for spouse than did their nonprofit peers.

-----Table 1 goes here -----

To infer the underlying dimensionality of the job choice items, we factor analyzed the above 16 items. The factor analysis was conducted using principal components analysis with a Varimax rotation, imposing orthogonality constraints. Five dimensions were extracted. Despite differences between public and nonprofit managers, they shared the same underlying structure in job choice motivation². The results are presented in Table 2. The five factors accounted for 60% of the total variance in individuals' job choice motivation. "Job Security" was the first factor emerging from the factor analysis, accounting for 15 percent of the whole variance. The items loading on this factor represented managers' appreciation of extrinsic rewards, including job security, pension or retirement plan and benefits items. The second factor mainly reflected individuals' desires for smooth working environment, which accounted for extra 13 percent of the total variance. The items loading on this factor were their desires for less bureaucratic red tape, a low conflict work environment and family friendly policies.

"Career Advancement" accounted for another 12 percent of the total variance, and included as strong factor loadings as the items "opportunities for advancement within the organization's hierarchy", "opportunity for training and career development" and "desire for increased responsibility". The fourth factor shaping individuals' job choices was the "Economic Concern," representing individuals' attention to low living cost and job opportunities for spouse, and their limitations by few job offers. This factor explained 11 percent of the total variance. The last factor emerging from the factor analysis pertained to "Individuals' Public Values" and accounted for nine percent of the total variance. The

item with the greatest loading on this factor is that individuals choose the current organization due to their ability to serve the public and the public interest.

-----Table 2 goes here-----

In order to render the factor dimensions suitable for analysis in regression models, we calculated and retained factor scores (coefficients relating the respondents to the dimensions) and used them as dependent variables in subsequent analyses.

Sector switching behavior

Our study focuses on public and nonprofit managers (our collective term for managers and upper-level professional, technical and other staff), which only allows us to examine part of sector-switching dynamics: switching out of private to the public or nonprofit sectors, and switching between the public and nonprofit sectors. The central question is this: compared with nonswitchers, are switchers different in each dimension of their job choice motivation? More specifically, are individuals switching out of the private sector different from those remaining in the public/nonprofit sector? Does the same pattern occur to switchers between the public and nonprofit sectors?

Table 3 presents the descriptive patterns regarding individuals' sector switching behaviors. Out of 784 public respondents, ninety-two reported that the job they held immediately prior to the current one was in the private sector, and 225 (28.7%) indicated that one or more of their prior three jobs were in the private sector. Twenty-five managers had a nonprofit job immediately prior to the current public job, and seventy-two (9.2%) public managers reported to have had one or more of their prior three jobs in the nonprofit sector.

The sector switching seemed more prevalent in the nonprofit than in the public sector. 24.8% (105 out of 426) of nonprofit managers came directly from private jobs, and 177 (41.5%) had one or more of their prior three jobs in the private sector. The personnel flow from the public into the nonprofit was also noticeable. Thirty-eight had a public job immediately prior to the current nonprofit one, and 97 reported to have had one or more of their prior three jobs in the public sector.

-----Table 3 goes here -----

Research hypotheses

Sector differences in job choice motivation

Both the public and nonprofit sectors have been seriously challenged by labor demands (Lewis and Frank 2002; Philips 1982; Urban Institute 2005). In the face of an aging workforce, public and nonprofit organizations have been trying hard, especially prior to the current recession, to attract more high-skilled employees to meet new and foreseen demands. The significantly higher average growth rate in its employment, compared to public and business sectors, has especially pressured nonprofit managers to concern themselves with workforce planning (Independent Sector 2002). While there is some diffusion of workforce approaches and innovations between the public and nonprofit sectors, there is little evidence about the extent to which practices in one sector can be effectively applied to the other. A key issue in making this determination is the degree to which, respectively, public and nonprofit managers' job choice motivations resemble one another. This issue has direct bearing on recruiting strategies. Do such strategies require customizing in each sector or do recruiting approaches that work in one sector prove equally effective in the other?

Research on "publicness theory" (Bozeman 1987) suggests that, in general, the public sector is subject to relatively more political authority and less economic authority than is the nonprofit sector. Well defined job classifications, institutionalized occupational structures (Kettle 1996) coupled with elaborated bureaucratic structures and strong external political influences (Rainey 1989), all embedded in the public sector, impose multiple constraints upon managers regarding the recruiting packages they can offer. Typically, the public sector is expected to provide employees with job security and opportunities to serve the public interest, but with an implicit expectation, at least in most cases, pay increases will be slower or at least more standardized, and due to the relative stability of the workforce, advancement opportunities may prove fewer than one would find in the private and nonprofit sectors. Compared to the public sector, the nonprofit sector tends to present a more flexible and less formalized occupational structure (Anheier and Salamon 2006), and arguably a work environment less burdened with red tape than in the public sector (Bozeman 2000). Nonprofit managers may display more latitude in providing job seekers with advancement opportunities and other benefits.

Given that individuals seek to work for organizations perceived to satisfy their preferences (Graham and Renwick 1972; Lawler 1994), the differences with respect to

organizational and occupational structures between the public and nonprofit sectors can be expected to influence potential job seekers. One study provides indirect evidence in support of this, suggesting that managerial position holders prove to be most willing to switch to the public sector, while technical personnel are more likely to find homes in the nonprofit sector (Su and Bozeman, 2009). The different switching patterns, we contend, resulted from the interaction between the recruiting efforts from each sector and individuals' job choice motivation.

Our first set of hypotheses considers the differences in employees' job choice motivation between the public and nonprofit sectors. We borrow the existing literature on work motivation to develop our propositions and also consider existing work, surprisingly uncommon, that compares directly public and nonprofit organizations and their management. A good many post-hire studies have compared the importance of job security between private and public organizations, showing a mixed picture. Some suggest that private employees value job security more than their public peers (Crewson 1997, Wittmer 1991), while others indicate the opposite (Houston 2000). Some studies show that individuals, after joining organizations, may adjust their preferences to accord with organizational realities and expectations, (Rosenberg 1957; Wright 2001), and therefore possibly deviate from their previous preferences. The scenarios could be completely different at the time when individuals decide to join the organizations, as compared to a short time later, once they have experience actually working in the organization. One study, examining who wants to work for the federal government, showed that job security is cited as one of the most important reasons to work for the public sector (Lewis and Frank 2002). In contrast, job security has been less often ensured in the nonprofit sector (Handy and Katz 1998), and no research has investigated its relative importance in employees' job choice decisions.

H1.1: Those seeking work in the public sector are more motivated by job security than are those seeking work in the nonprofit sector

The importance of public service motivation has been emphasized in public management research (Perry and Wise 1990; Perry 1996, 1997, 2000), but its role in motivating individuals to join public organizations remains indeterminate (Lewis and Frank 2000; Vandebellee 2009; Sterjijn 2008; Wright and Christen 2007). While nonprofit

organizations are reported to rely disproportionately on intrinsically motivated employees (Leete 2000; Light 2002), little research provides any insight into whether and to what extent intrinsic motivation prompts job seekers to work in nonprofit organizations. One post-hire comparative analysis (Wittmer 1991) shows that nonprofit employees tend to rank "helping others" lower than their public counterparts, echoing the descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 in the present study.

The "crowding out" theory suggests that a variety of tangible contingent rewards undermine intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan 2004; Ryan and Deci 2000; Devaro and Brookshire 2007). Studies have reported an inverse relationship between public service motivation and individual preferences for monetary rewards (Crewson 1997; Bright 2005) among employees across sector lines. Examining job transitions from the private to public sectors, Georgellis and his colleagues (2008: 12) reached the conclusion that "individuals are more likely to move due to higher satisfaction with the work itself in the public sector, as the public sector provides greater opportunity for these individuals to carry out their public service motivation", and that extrinsic rewards such as higher wages and working hours are either insignificant in influencing the probability of transition to the public sector or reduce this probability. By this token, employees seeking to join public organizations may demonstrate lower levels of concerns for economic factors due to their strong commitment toward the public service. For the nonprofit sector, which presumably has a somewhat different set of intrinsic motivation objects, the crowding out effect may not be as strong as in the public one.

H1.2: Employees who choose to work for the public sector are more motivated by public values, and less motivated by economic concerns than are their nonprofit counterparts.

Regardless of whether one comes to an organization to pursue public service values, job security or other objectives, career advancement opportunity is usually among the preferred motives. Economists (e.g. Baker et al. 1988:11) contend that "promotions in organizations serve two important and distinct purposes." First is to match individuals who differ in their skills and abilities with the jobs for which they are best suited; and second to "provide incentives for lower level employees who value the pay and prestige

associated with a higher rank in the organization" (Baker et al. 1988:11). However, a serious limitation is that promotion cannot simultaneously maximize these two concerns.

One study (Devaro and Brookshire 2007) showed that nonprofit workers are intrinsically motivated by organizations' missions and the significance of job per se, and that the promotion within these organizations is more a way of job matching rather than a strong incentive. However, the study's sample included both nonprofit and public organizations, not disaggregated, making the task of differentiating the roles of promotion between the two sectors impossible. Since promotion achieves neither role perfectly, there is always a tradeoff between job matching function and being high-powered incentives, which occurs to both sectors.

H1.3: Employees seeking public jobs are as motivated by career advancement as those seeking nonprofit jobs.

Red tape, defined as "rules, regulations, and procedures that remain in force and entail a compliance burden but do not advance the legitimate purposes the rules were intended to serve" (Bozeman 2000: 12) often constitutes an important and generally quite undesirable aspect of work environments. Empirical evidence suggested that red tape is associated with administrative delays and work alienation (Dehart-Davis and Pandey 2005), higher levels of risk aversion among employees (Bozeman and Kingsley 1998), decreased benefits to clients (Scott and Pandey 2000), among other pathologies prevailing in organizations. Red tape, while especially pronounced in public sectors (for a summary of comparative research see Bozeman, 2000), but is also commonly found in private and nonprofit organizations (Rainey, Pandey and Bozeman, 1995). Relative to the public sector, the nonprofit sector's more flexible organizational structure presents lower levels of red tape, and a lower conflict in its working environment.

H1.4: Employees looking for public jobs are less motivated by smooth working environment than their nonprofit peers.

Sector switching and job choice motivation

Previous studies have investigated the switching patterns and its influences in employees' sector perceptions (Feeney 2008) and their career outcomes (Bozeman and Ponomariov 2009), however, to our knowledge, no study has examined the impacts of sector switching on individuals' job choice motivation. Schneider's (1987) attraction-

selection-attrition (ASA) framework indicates that an individual selects into an organization that fits her values, and leaves if she does not fit the organization. These results converge with the person-organization fit framework (Chatman 1989, 1991, also see Kristof 1996), which suggests that the compatibility between individual and the organization plays a critical role in determining her job search and choice behaviors. Theorists agree that the chief factor explaining switching across sectors is the individual's expectation that the new sector will satisfy job preferences. Related, we contend that past experiences in other sectors, good or bad, inevitably shape individuals' motivation to seek and accept a job in a different sector. While this may seem "obvious," it seems clear that, conceivably, other factors could be even more important, such as exogenous job market factors, a preference for familiar work settings, and so forth.

One competitive advantage the public sector has generally demonstrated over other sectors is the security of tenure. While the nonprofit sector does not provide the level of security one finds in the public sector, nonprofit organizations usually have higher political authority constraints and endowments and lower economic authority than one finds in business (Bozeman 1987), which in some instances provides more job stability than in comparably sized and resourced private firms. Thus, it is at least possible that those switching from private to nonprofit sector seek security and shelter from the vicissitudes of markets. For switchers from the nonprofit to public sector, following the argument in H1.1, we expect that this type of switchers may, similarly, be more motivated by job security than are non-switchers. For those who switch out of the public into the nonprofit sector, job security is indeed terminated, and according to the person-organization fit framework (Chatman 1989, 1991), this type of movers may be less motivated by job security since simple stay could keep them better off if that is what they feel truly significant.

H2.1: Regardless of the sectors into which they enter, employees switching out of the private sector are more motivated by job security; the same pattern occurs to switchers from the nonprofit to public sector. For employees switching from the public into the nonprofit sector, job security is not a significant motivation.

Empirical evidence suggests that public employees value more the opportunities to serve the public and the public interest, and less economic rewards relative to their

private counterparts (Crewson 1997; Rainey 1982). Arguably, those who switch out of private sector into the public should find public values more appealing and economic rewards less so (at least compared to others). However, the literature implies that public service motivation (Perry and Wise 1990) pertains as much to organizational socialization process as to individual predisposition (Chatman 1989; Moynihan and Pandey 2007a; Chatman 1991). Previous studies pointed out that public managers as well as their organizations can enhance employees' public service motivation (Moynihan and Pandey 2007a; Camerili 2007). Following the literature, we suggest that the socialization process may well escalate levels of public service motivation if one remains in the public sector. For those remaining in the nonprofit sector, similar socialization processes occur, but the degree of public service motivation demonstrated by their employees may be slightly lower (Mann 2006; Wittmer 1991).

One study (Francois 2000) indicates that when public service motivation is employed as a strong incentive, as is the case in the public sector, economic rewards are less powerful in motivating employees. Studies also suggest that wage differentials between the private and public sectors have been pronounced (Lewis 1991; Kettl 1996), and more often private organizations have a wage advantage over public and nonprofit ones (Devaro and Brookshire 2007). It is highly likely that economic concern is not a dominant motivator for employees to switch to the public sector, especially in higher positions (Holzer et al 1991; Krueger 1988). While little is known regarding nonprofit employees' sensitive elasticity to higher wages, in general, the lower wages per se in the nonprofit than private sectors may indicate that switchers from the private to nonprofit sectors are less concerned with economic concerns. Differences are assumed between public and nonprofit employees regarding public service motivation and economic concerns (H1.2); nevertheless, whether these differences would be of any significance relative to non-switching employees is not clear.

H2.2: There are no significant differences regarding public values and economic concerns between those switching out of private sector and non-switchers; the same pattern is expected for switchers between the public and nonprofit sectors.

Devaro and Brookshire (2007) suggested that the probabilities of promotion and expected promotion are higher in profit than nonprofit (including both nonprofit and

public) organizations, and that the wage increases attached to promotion are no higher in nonprofits than for-profits. They argued that due to the presence of intrinsic motivation (e.g. public values), promotion in nonprofits creates weaker incentives than in for-profits, and serves more as a way of job matching (Devaro and Brookshire 2007). For those who switch out of private organizations, they should be more motivated by the work per se, rather than by extrinsic incentives. Compared with non-switchers whose job has been somewhat matched within the public or nonprofit sectors, promotion allows private switchers to better fit the organizations and fulfill their intrinsic motives. We expect that private switchers are more motivated by promotion than non-switchers.

Following H1.3, we expect the similar patterns for switchers between the public and nonprofit sectors as nonswitchers. Our previous study (Su and Bozeman, in press) suggested that individuals switching from private into nonprofit sector are more likely to have a promotion, while not so when from private in public sector. However, this finding may not pertain to individuals' desire for promotion when they are in job seeking process.

H2.3: Switchers out of the private sector are more motivated by career advancement than non-switchers, and switchers between the public and nonprofit sectors have no significant differences with non-switchers regarding career advancement.

The higher levels of red tape typically found in the public sector (Bozeman, 2000) may constitute an impediment for employees to switch into the sector. This implies that those individuals who do decide to move into the public sector may be less motivated by desires for a smooth working environment than other factors. However, no extant empirical evidence reveals which sector has an advantage in providing a smooth working environment. Switchers out of the private into the nonprofit sector may not be particularly attentive to this factor since the working environment is perceived more as a hygiene factor than a strong motivator (Herzberg 1968). Presumably, individuals switching out of the public into the nonprofit sector may attend to be affected by a desire for a smoother work environment, but there is not direct evidence to support this view.

H2.4. Switchers into the public sector are less motivated by the smooth working environment, regardless of their original sectors; no significant differences

will be detected for switchers to the nonprofit sector from either the public or private sector.

Descriptive results: characteristics of sector switchers

This section compares different types of sector switchers and nonswitchers on a number of motivational, occupational and demographic variables (Table 4). The mean of five dimensions of job choice motivation are the factor scores derived from Table 2, representing the weight each group gave to a specific dimension in their job choice process.

With nonswitchers as a reference group, the comparisons reveal that switchers from the private to public sectors are less likely to be on managerial track³ (relative to those on professional, technical and other tracks), raising the question whether skills in managerial careers can be easily transferable between these two sectors (Bozeman and Ponomariov, 2009). For those switching from the private to nonprofit sectors, the story seems different. They appear to be more concerned with a smooth working environment and significantly less with all other factors (job security, advancement, working environment and public values). Relative to nonswitchers, a significantly higher percentage of switchers are on managerial career tracks, and noticeably lower percentage on professional career tracks.

-----Table 4 goes here-----

Given the small samples of switchers between the public and nonprofit sectors, the interpretation of both groups requires caution. Seemingly, those switching from public to nonprofit pay more attention to smooth working environment and public values, and significantly less to job security, advancement and economic concerns, while those switching from nonprofit to public sector are less motivated by job security and career advancement. Given that the opportunity to serve the public and the public interest and job security are often frequently associated with the public sector, switchers from public to nonprofit organizations putting less emphasis on public values seemingly makes little sense. Consistent with general expectation, switchers from the nonprofit to public sector emphasize job security less,

With respect to demographic characteristics, those switching from the public to nonprofit sector exhibit higher levels of education, longer career tenure and they are

significantly older than non-switchers. Those switching from the nonprofit to public sector display a significantly longer duration in private organizations, and generally are much older compared to non-switchers.

Regression results

Sector differences

Switching out of the private sector, the commonest pattern in our study, deserves special treatment. Table 5 presents the results of regression models examining the impacts of sector differences and private sector switching experiences on employees' job choice motivation, with other types of sector switching behaviors (between the public and nonprofit sectors) being controlled. The switching between the public and nonprofit sectors are examined and presented in Table 6, with private switching experiences being controlled. The regression models presented in Table 6 can also be a robust test for the impacts of sector differences on individuals' job choice motivation. All hypotheses and empirical findings are summarized in Table 7.

Both Table 5 and 6 present similar outcomes regarding how sector differences shape each dimension of individuals' job choice motivation. Those who move to public organizations prove to be more concerned with job security than those joining the nonprofit sector, therefore providing support for H1.1. The sector where individuals decide to take a job plays the biggest role in shaping their motives toward job security. Public service motivation has been widely emphasized in public organizations, however, we find only marginal evidence in favor of the argument that those joining the public sector are more motivated by public values than their peers joining the nonprofit sector. Seemingly, the public sector does offer individuals opportunities to serve the public and the public interest, but the opportunity differences between the public and nonprofit sectors are not as significant as expected. This could be attributed to the fact that employees in nonprofit organizations are also motivated by public values, a finding receiving some scholarly support in the public management literature (Perry 2000; Mann 2006).). Contrary to our expectation, people selecting into the public sector are indeed more motivated by the economic concerns than those devoted to nonprofit organizations, failing to support H1.2

The results confirm H1.3 that employees entering into the public sector are no more or less motivated by career advancement than those choosing a nonprofit job. Consistent with H1.4, people choosing public organizations tend to devalue the importance of smooth working environment as opposed to those who decide to have nonprofit jobs. The perception of rigid organizational structures and clumsy bureaucracy, illusory or real, appears to shape individuals' job choice.

Our results indicate that public employees are not mainly or uniquely driven by public values. Relative to nonprofit respondents, they are more motivated by job security, economic concerns, and public values, and less by desire to have a smooth working environment. Public managers are best described as multi-motive with respect to their job motivations.

Private sector switching

We find evidence that employees moving from the private sector to public organizations are significantly more motivated by job security, partially supporting the H2.1. Given that the public sector in most instances ensures job security, employees attracted by this motive have confidence that their expectation will be met when they enter into the public sector. We also find that those moving from private to nonprofit organizations are more motivated by job security, though to a lesser degree.

People switching out of the private sector into the public sector are motivated by advancement, while their counterparts switching into the nonprofit sector are significantly less motivated by career advancement. This finding is particularly interesting because our previous study (Su and Bozeman 2009) demonstrated that in reality, those who switch out of private in the public sector are no more likely to receive a promotion, but those from private in the nonprofit sector are more likely to have one. The differences between job choice motivation and the actual career development after entering a sector indicates the complexity of the job choice process. Job choice is subject to the influences of multiple factors including but not limited to job choice motivation, organizational recruitment activities, organizational structures and, of course, a variety of exogenous factors related to job markets.

Private sector switchers are no different with nonswitchers regarding their motives toward smooth working environment and economic concerns. Both are perceived

as hygiene factors rather than motivators, therefore are widely appreciated regardless of sectoral affiliations. With respect to public values, individuals switching out of private organizations do not demonstrate more dedication than those currently in public and nonprofit organizations.

-----Table 5 goes here-----

Switching between public and nonprofit sectors

Table 6 presents a different picture with respect to switchers between public and nonprofit sectors. Those who switch out of public into nonprofit organizations are less motivated by job security and advancement, but more by public values. Some previous studies have indicated that public employees are more motivated by public values than are nonprofit employees (Wittmer 1991). One possible scenario could be that public employees who are driven by public values chose public sector work to serve those values but find them frustrated by various organizational and political barriers and, thus, move to the nonprofit sector on the expectation that the values will be in alignment with the work and that the ability to achieve the values will be enhanced by less constraining features of the nonprofit work environment. The predominant focus on public values can devalue other incentives, among which career advancement could be one, as predicted well by crowding out theory (Deci and Ryan 2004; Ryan and Deci 2000). There are no significant differences between these switchers and nonswitchers regarding their motives toward economic concerns or working environments.

Switchers from nonprofit organizations to public ones are less motivated by job security, but demonstrate no differences regarding other job choice factors. The finding regarding job security is surprising. Do nonprofit employees feel secure enough so that it is no longer a worthwhile pursuit? Or are they more concerned with other factors at the expense of job security? The small sample stratum (25 moving from nonprofit to public) does not allow us to answer this question, but poses the question for future research.

-----Table 6 goes here -----

Occupational variables and demographics

Job choice motivation is also closely tied to different career tracks. Those in managerial positions are more motivated by career advancement and public values, less by economic concerns; professional and technical employees are less motivated by public

values, though the relationship is statistically significant only for technical employees. Compared to males, females are more motivated by a smooth working environment and public values, and less by economic concerns. Older employees are more motivated by public values and less by career advancement. People with higher education levels are less motivated by job security, working environment and economic concerns, but more motivated by public values.

Employees in Georgia are less motivated by job security than their Illinois peers, perhaps because at-ill employment practices have been widely adopted. However, the reform seems not to dampen their desire to serve the public and the public interest. We find that Georgia employees are more motivated by public values than Illinois counterparts. Also, Georgia employees are more motivated by smooth working environment and less economic concerns compared with Illinois one.

-----Table 7 goes here -----

Conclusions

This study investigated individuals' job choice motivation, using a combined sample of public and nonprofit employees, most of them managers but the sample includes technical and professional employees at a rank similar to mid- and upper-management. Unlike previous studies focusing only on one or a few items pertaining to motivation, we examined a wide variety of job choice motives.. Our analysis shows that at least five dimensions of job choice are prominently represented: job security, career advancement, smooth working environment, economic concerns and public values. A job choice decision seems in most cases to represent a balancing of diverse motives.

Only recently have public management scholars began to give attention to the impacts of sector switching, a primary feature of our paper. Our study integrates this behavioral anchor into motivational studies. Previous studies examining sectoral differences in individuals' work motivation have not in most instances been able to make inferences about the effects of selection dynamics compared to socialization effects and, partly for this reason, tend to focus almost exclusively on perceptions. Introducing sector switching behaviors is a small step toward unraveling the relationship between career selection and subsequent socialization.

Our results indicate that employees moving to the public sector are different in some important respects from those moving to a nonprofit job. The former group appears to be more motivated by job security, economic concerns and public values, and less motivated by smooth working environment. While the findings corroborated the importance of public values in public employees' job choice decision, as predicted by public service motivation theory (Perry and Wise 1990), the findings fail to support the crowding out theory (Deci and Ryan 2004). Seemingly, employees' economic concerns can be aligned with public values rather than being at odds with one another. No significant differences were manifested regarding career advancement between public and nonprofit employees in their pursuit of a new sector job.

In our study, the majority of switchers were out of the private sector in the public or nonprofit sectors. The job choice motivation demonstrated by these private switchers proves to be different from non-switchers. Typically, private switchers were more motivated by job security, regardless of sectors they switch into. For those who switch into the public sector, their desire for career advancement seemed to be more salient than non-switchers, while the pattern did not hold when they switched in the nonprofit sector. Private switchers were not more motivated by public values.

Switchers from public to nonprofit were more motivated by public values, and less by career advancement and job security. The finding was consistent with crowding out theory, but failed to meet the general expectation. It could be the case that this minor group, driven by public values, failed to have opportunities to do so in the public sector, and that they decided to fulfill their motives in the nonprofit sector. For those switching out of nonprofit to public, they were less concerned with job security, but felt neutral regarding all other factors in relative to nonswitchers.

It is not surprising to find that employees on different career tracks showed different job choice motivation. Those on managerial tracks were more motivated by advancement and public values, less concerned with economic factor; on the contrary, those on professional and technical tracks were less attracted to practice public values. Speculatively, we may provide some insight regarding why public service motivation do not predict the employment sector of professionals' first job, as found by Wright and

Christen (2007). The effects of different career tracks need to be taken into consideration when exploring how public service motivation shapes individuals' job choices.

One notable finding related to the state of Georgia where traditional civil service system had been dismantled to be replaced with at-will employment. Compared with state employees working in Illinois, those who had a job in Georgia were more motivated by public values and smooth working environment, and significantly less by economic concerns and job security. While it is interesting to speculate about impacts of the Georgia civil service reform, one must exercise caution. In general, there are significant differences in the demographic composition and individual attributes of Georgia employees, compared to those in Illinois, and these may be more important than the specifications of public employment policies.

More studies on sector switching, we believe, will aid our understanding of motivational process in both public and nonprofit organizations. For managers working in both types of organizations, this study provides a wide variety of leverage they could deploy in recruiting practices. Rather than simply relying on either public values or economic incentives, our study suggested that people selecting public and nonprofit jobs appreciate diverse factors, and that individuals struggle to reach a balanced decision in their job choice process. While public and nonprofit sectors should learn much from each other, the recruiting practices widely adopted in one sector may, if transferred to another sector, need to be tailored to the needs of the other sector.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of job choice motives

T-test of mean differences	All N=1220	Public N=790	Sig. t-test	Nonprofit N=439
Opportunity for advancement within the organization's hierarchy	2.88	3.05	***	2.58
Opportunity for training and career development	3.15	3.19	**	3.06
Job security	3.36	3.49	***	3.11
The organizations' reputation for opportunities for women or minorities	2.02	2.09	**	1.89
Overall quality and reputation of this organization	3.17	3.01	***	3.46
The organization's pension or retirement plan	3.08	3.31	***	2.64
Desire for less bureaucratic red tape	2.34	2.23	***	2.55
Desire for a low conflict work environment	2.48	2.47	-----	2.49
Desire for increased responsibility	3.19	3.06	***	3.42
Benefits (medical, insurance)	3.27	3.41	***	3.00
"Family friendly" policies (e.g. flexible work hours, parental leave)	2.78	2.78	-----	2.78
Salary	3.28	3.26	-----	3.33
Ability to serve the public and the public interest	3.17	3.27	***	2.98
Few, if any, alternative job offers	1.97	2.12	***	1.69
Relatively low cost of living in the region	1.85	2.02	***	1.52
Employment opportunities for spouse or partners	1.50	1.61	***	1.31

*** significance at 1% level; ** significance at 5% level; * significance at 10% level.

Table 2 Principal Components Analysis of Job Choice Motive

Job choice motivation	Factor Loadings ¹				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Job security	.71				
Benefits (medical, insurance)	.86				
The organization's pension or retirement plan	.83				
Desire for less bureaucratic red tape		.80			
Desire for a low conflict work environment		.78			
"Family friendly" policies (e.g. flexible work hours, parental leave)		.60			
Opportunity for advancement within the organization's hierarchy			.77		
Opportunity for training and career development			.79		
Desire for increased responsibility			.59		
Few, if any, alternative job offers				.67	
Relatively low cost of living in the region				.77	
Employment opportunities for spouse or partners				.75	
Ability to serve the public and the public interest					.83
The organizations' reputation for opportunities for women or minorities					.49
Overall quality and reputation of this organization					.46

Factor I= Job Security

Factor II= Smooth Working Environment

Factor III= Career Advancement

Factor IV= Economic Constraints

Factor V= Public value

¹ Principal Components Analysis; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Table 3: descriptive patterns of individuals' sector switching behavior

Switching patterns	Public (784)	Nonprofit (426)
Last job was in the private sector	11.7% (92)	24.8% (105)
Last job was in the other sector (except private sector)	3.2% (25)	8.9% (38)
Last job involved sector switching	14.9% (117)	33.7% (143)
Any one or more of the past three jobs was in the private sector	28.7% (225)	41.5% (177)
Any one or more of the past three jobs was in the other sector (except private sector)	9.2% (72)	22.6% (97)

Note: Those whose first job was the current one were excluded.

Table 4: comparison switchers and non-switchers

T-test of mean differences	Non-switchers	Private-public	Private-nonprofit	Public-nonprofit 35	Non-profit-public 22
Job secure dimension	.09	.14	-.50 ***	-.88 ***	-.20*
Advance dimension	.03	-.14	-.10*	-.47**	-.27*
Economic dimension	.06	.23 *	-.39***	-.54**	.33
Smooth working environment	-.05	-.10	.45***	.40**	-.29
Public values dimension	.06	-.03	-.30**	.32*	-.15
Number of managerial jobs	1.14	.58 ***	1.43**	1.43*	1.14
Number of professional jobs	.89	.71	.52**	.60*	.64*
Number of technical jobs	.24	.33	.21	.14	.41
Career length (years spent on the jobs covered in the survey only)	13.3	14.5 *	12.72	14.6*	14.8
Duration in the private sector	1.11	8.81***	9.23***	.88	2.95**
Married	.79	.75	.85*	.86	.91
Female	.46	.38	.39	.34	.41
education	2.31	2.26	2.30	2.65**	2.41
Age	49.2	50.5*	49.5	53.5**	51.4**
Georgia	.47	.56*	.32 **	.37	.36

Note:

*** significance at 1% level; ** significance at 5% level; * significance at 10% level.

The reference group is the non-switcher.

Due to the small samples in switching between the public and nonprofit sectors, extra caution is warranted in its interpretation.

Table 5. Sector and private switching on job choice motivation

Variables	Job security	advance	Smooth working environment	Economic concerns	Public values
Public sector	.65 (.07) ***	.01(.08)	-.68(.07)***	.61(.07)***	.15(.08)*
Private to public	.36 (.17) **	.33(.18)*	.01(.17)	.07(.18)	-.14(.18)
Private to nonprofit	.32 (.17) *	.28(.18)	-.04(.17)	.03(.17)	-.27(.18)
Last job was outside the current organization	-.47(.13)***	-.34(.14)**	.06(.13)	.01(.13)	.10(.14)
Private sector tenure	.02(.01)	.00(.02)	.03(.01)*	-.01(.01)	-.01(.02)
Private sector tenure: squared	-.00 (.00)	.00(.00)*	-.00(.00)**	.00(.00)	.00(.00)
Total number of managerial jobs	-.03(.03)	.09(.03)**	-.03(.03)	-.07(.03)**	.07(.03)**
Total number of professional jobs	-.03(.03)	-.03(.03)	.01(.03)	-.03(.03)	-.05(.03)
Total number of technical jobs	-.04(.04)	.01(.05)	.03(.05)	-.02(.05)	-.10(.05)**
First job captured in the survey	-.01(.07)	-.03(.07)	.08(.07)	.11(.07)	.04(.07)
Female	.09(.06)	.03(.06)	.23(.06)***	-.12(.06)*	.30(.06)***
Age	-.00(.00)	-.02(.00)***	-.01(.00)	-.01(.00)	.01(.00)**
Married	-.00(.07)	-.05(.07)	.04(.07)	.03(.07)	.14(.07)*
Education	-.21(.04)***	-.05(.04)	-.24(.04)***	-.11(.04)**	.12(.04)**
Georgia	-.11(.06)*	.05(.06)	.26(.06)***	-.23(.06)***	.23(.06)***
R-Squared	.15	.07	.14	.12	.06

*** significance at 1% level; ** significance at 5% level; * significance at 10% level.

Table 6. Sector and inter-sector switching on job choice motivation

Variables	Job security	advance	Smooth working environment	Economic concerns	Public values
Public sector	.66(.07)***	.01(.07)	-.67(.07)***	.61(.07)***	.21(.07)**
Public to nonprofit	-.48(.17)**	-.39(.18)**	.12(.17)	-.08(.17)	.35(.18)**
Nonprofit to public	-.47(.20)**	-.26(.21)	-.01(.20)	.14(.21)	-.24(.21)
Last job was in private organizations	-.13(.10)	-.03(.10)	.05(.10)	.05(.10)	-.10(.10)
Private sector tenure	.02(.01)	.00(.02)	.03(.01)*	-.01(.01)	-.01(.02)
Private sector tenure: squared	-.00(.00)	-.00(.00)*	-.00(.00)**	.00(.00)	.00(.00)
Total number of managerial jobs	-.03(.03)	.09(.03)**	-.03(.03)	-.07(.03)**	.07(.03)**
Total number of professional jobs	-.03(.03)	-.03(.03)	.01(.03)	-.03(.03)	-.05(.03)*
Total number of technical jobs	-.04(.05)	.01(.05)	.03(.05)	-.02(.05)	-.10(.05)**
First job captured in the survey	-.01(.07)	-.03(.07)	.08(.07)	.11(.07)	.04(.07)
Female	.09(.06)	.03(.06)	.23(.06)***	-.12(.06)*	.30(.06)***
Age	-.00(.00)	-.02(.00)***	-.01(.00)	-.01(.00)	.01(.00)**
Married	-.00(.07)	-.05(.07)	.04(.07)	.03(.07)	.14(.07)*
Education	-.21(.04)***	-.04(.04)	-.24(.04)***	-.11(.04)**	.12(.04)**
Georgia	-.11(.06)*	.05(.06)	.25(.06)***	-.22(.06)***	.21(.06)***
R-Squared	.15	.07	.14	.12	.07

*** significance at 1% level; ** significance at 5% level; * significance at 10% level.

Table 7. Summary of hypotheses and research findings.

Variables	Job security		Advancement		Smooth working environment		Economic concerns		Public values	
	P	P	----	---	N	N	N	P	P	P
Public sector	P	P	----	---	N	N	N	P	P	P
Private to public	P	P	P	P	N	---	---	---	---	---
Private to nonprofit	P	P	P	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Public to nonprofit	N	N	---	N	---	---	---	---	---	P
Nonprofit to public	P	N	---	---	N	---	---	---	---	---
Managerial	---		P		---		N		P	
Professional	---		---		---		---		--/N	
Technical	---		---		---		---		N	
Female	---		---		P		N		P	
Older	---		N		---		---		P	
Highly Educated	N		N/---		N		N		P	
Georgia	N		---		P		N		P	

Note:

1. For variables regarding sector differences and sector switching patterns, the first column refers to the hypotheses, and the second documents the empirical relationship.
2. For variables regarding career tracks and demographics, there are no hypotheses and therefore the merged column only reports the empirical findings.
3. Throughout the Table, P denotes the positive relationship hypothesized or found; N denotes the negative relationship; and --- denotes that there are no significant differences.

References

- Anheier, H.L and Salamon, L.M. (2006). The nonprofit sector in comparative perspective. In *The nonprofit sector: a research handbook* (2nd), edited by Powell, W.W. and Steinberg, R, 89-116. Yale University.
- Baker G.P, Jensen M.C, and Murphy K.J. (1988). Compensation and incentives: practices VS. theory. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. XLIII, No. 3, July. 593-616
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*, Harvard University Press.
- Borzaga, C. and Tortia, E (2006). Work motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 225-248
- Bozeman, B. and Ponomariov, B. (2009). Sector Switching from a Business to a Government Job: Fast-Track Career or Fast Track to Nowhere? *Public Administration Review*, 69 (1), 77 - 91
- Bozeman, B. (1987). *All organizations are public: bridging public and private organizational theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bozeman, B. (2000). *Bureaucracy and Red tape*. Prentice Hall.
- Bozeman, B. and Kingsley, G.(1998). Risk culture in public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 58:109-18
- Brewer, G.A. and Selden, S.C. (2000). —Why Elephants Gallop: Assessing and Predicting Performance in Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4): 685-711.
- 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), 138-155.
- Buelens, M. and Broeck, H.V.D.(2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1),65-74
- Camerili, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel Review*, 36(3), 356-377
- Cnaan, R.A. and Goldberg-Glen, R.S. (1991) “Measuring Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services,” *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27, 3, 269-284.

- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: a model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 333-49
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36:459-84.
- Crewson, P. E. (1997). —Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4: 499-518.
- Dillman, D.A (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: the tailored design method*. New York: Wiley
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2004). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- DeHart-Davis, L. and Pandey, S.K. (2005). Red tape and public employees: does perceived rule dysfunction alienate managers? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 15:133-48
- Devaro, J., and Brookshire, D. 2007. Promotions and incentives in nonprofit and for-profit organizations. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 60(3), 311-339.
- Feeney, M.K. and B. Bozeman (2008) “Mentoring and Network Ties,” *Human Relations*, 61, 12, 1651-1676 .
- Francois, P. (2000). —‘Public service motivation‘ as an argument for government provision. *Journal of Public Economics*, 78 (3): 275-299.
- Feeney, M. K. (2008). Sector Perceptions among State-Level Public Managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(3):465-494;
- Gabris, G. T. and Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management*, 24(1), 33-51.
- Georgellis, Y. Iossa, E. and Tabvuma, V.(2008). *Crowding out public service motivation*, Center for Economic Development & Institutions, working paper, No.08-07. Retrieved from <http://ideas.repec.org/p/edb/cedidp/08-07.html>
- Graham, W.K. and Renwick, P.A. (1972). Expected need deficiency and preferences for three types of organizations. *Journal of psychology*, 82, 21-26.
- Goulet, L. R. and M. L. Frank (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management*. 31(2), 201-211.

- Houston, D.J. (2000). Public service motivation: a multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 713-728
- Handy, F., and Katz, E. (1998). The wage differential between nonprofit institutions and corporations: Getting more by paying less? *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 26(2), 246.
- Holzer, H.J., Lawrence F. K., and Alan B. K. (1991). Job Queues and Wages. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (3): 739 – 68 .
- Independent Sector. (2002). *The New Nonprofit Almanac and Desk Reference: The Essential Facts and Figures for Managers, Researchers, and Volunteers*. Urban Institute.
- Jurkiewicz, C.L, Massey, T.K. and Brown, R.G. (1998). Motivation in public and private organizations: a comparative study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 12(3), 230-50
- Johns, M.R.(Ed.) (1955). *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press
- Kanfer, R. and Ackerman, P.L.(2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 440-458.
- Kettl, D. 1996. *Civil Service Reform: Building a Government that Works*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: an integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49
- Krueger, A.B. (1988). The Determinants of Queues for Federal Jobs. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 41 (4): 567 – 81 .
- Lawler, E.E. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leete, L. (2000). Wage equity and employee motivation in nonprofit and for-profit organizations. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organizations*, 43(4), 423-46.
- Lewis, G. B., and Nice, D. 1994. Race, sex, and occupational segregation in state and local governments. *American Review of Public Administration*, 24(3), 393-410.
- Lighth, P.C. (2002). *The state of nonprofit workforce*. The Nonprofit Quarterly, Fall, 6-16

- Lewis, G. B. and Frank, S.A. (2002). Who wants to work for government? *Public Administration Review*, 62 (4), 395-404.
- Locke, Edwin A.; Latham, Gary P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*. Vol 1(4), 240-246.
- Mann, J.A. (2006). A motive to serve: public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(1), 33-48
- Mirvis, P.H. (2006). The quality of employment in the nonprofit sector: an update on employee attitudes in nonprofits versus business and government. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 3(1), 23-41
- Moynihan, D.P and Pandey, S.K (2007a). The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 67 (1), Pages 40 - 53
- Moynihan, D.P and Pandey, S.K (2007b). Finding workable levers over work motivation: comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 803-832
- March, J. G. and Simon, H. A. (1958). *organizations*, New York: Wiley.
- Naff, K. C. and Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 19 (Fall): 5-16.
- Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E., and Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Public service motivation and interpersonal citizenship behavior in public organizations: Testing a preliminary model. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1): 89-108.
- Pendakur R., Lee, S., Mata, F., and Dole, N. 2000. Job mobility and promotion in the federal public service. *Final report*, Canadian public service commission. See: http://www.psagency-agencefp.gc.ca/research/demographics/mobilit_e.pdf
- Perry, J.L. and Porter, L. W. (1982). Factors affecting the context for motivation in public organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 89-98.
- Perry, J. L. and Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373.
- Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1), 5-22.

- (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(2), 181-197
- (2000). Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 471-488
- Perry, J. L. , Hondeghem, A. and Wise, L. R. (2009). Revisiting the motivational bases of public service: twenty years of research and an agenda for the future. Paper presented for The international Public Service Motivation Research Conferences, Bloomington, Indiana, 2009.
- Phillips, M. (1982). "Motivation and Expectation in Successful Volunteerism" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 11, 1: 118-125
- 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. (2003). *Understanding & Managing public organizations* (3rd, ed.), Jossey-Bass press.
- Rainey, Hal G. and Paula Steinbauer. (1999). Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9 (1), 1-32.
- Rosenberg, M. (1957). *Occupations and Values*. Glencoe, III.: Free press.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation ,social development, and well-being. *American Psychologists*, 55, 68-78
- Schneider , B . 1987 . ' The People Make the Place ' , *Personnel Psychology* , 40 , 437 – 53 .
- Scholl, R. W. (1981) Differentiating Organizational Commitment from Expectancy as a Motivating Force *The Academy of Management Review*, 6(4), 589-599
- Scott, p. and Pandey, S.K. (2000). Red tape and public service motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25(2), 155-80
- Steijn, B. (2008). Person-environment fit and public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1): 13-27.

- Su, X. and B. Bozeman (2009) "Do Expectations Meet Aspirations? The Relation of Public Managers' Job Choice Motives to Job Satisfaction," *International Review of Public Administration*, 14, 1, 1-9.
- Su, X. and B. Bozeman (in press). "Dynamics of Sector Switching: Hazard models predicting changes from private sector jobs to public and nonprofit sectors, *Public Administration Review*.
- Taylor, J. (2008). Organizational influences, public service motivation and work outcomes: An Australian study. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 67-88.
- Thompson, J. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Theuvsen, L. (2004). Doing better while doing good: motivational aspects of pay-for-performance effectiveness in nonprofit organizations. *Voluntas: internal journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations*.15(2), 117-136
- Urban Institute. (2005).*NCCS-GuideStar national nonprofit research database: special research version*. Urban Institute.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2009). The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance: More robust evidence of the PSM–performance relationship. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(1), 53–78.
- 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. and Christensen, R. K. (2007). Public service motivation: A longitudinal analysis of the job attraction-selection-attrition model. Paper prepared for presentation at the 9th Public Management Research Conference, Tuscon, Arizona, October 25-27.
- Wright, B. E.(2001) Public-sector work motivation: a review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(4), 559-86

Endnote

¹ The exact specification of the questions was as follows: We are interested in the factors that motivated you to accept a job at your current organization. Please indicate the extent to which the factors below (some personal and family, some professional) were important in making your decision to take a job at your current organization. *[Please mark X only one box in each row]*

² To be more accurate, salary does not load well in any of six dimensions, suggesting that salary, though highly appreciated, is not a strong motivator. This may largely be attributable to the narrow variations of salary in both public and nonprofit sectors. The loading coefficients regarding "organization's reputation for opportunities for women or minorities" and "overall quality and reputation of this organization" are not strong enough to reach .50.