

ค่านิยมในการทำงานของข้าราชการไทย:
ทัศนะจากข้าราชการที่ได้รับการบรรจุและแต่งตั้งใหม่
**Work Values of Thai Civil Servants:
A Newcomer's Perspective¹**

ธนากร มูลพงศ์ Dhanakorn Mulaphong²
ปรีyanุช วัฒนาภูล Preeyanuch Watthanakul³

บทคัดย่อ

การศึกษานี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาค่านิยมในการรับราชการของข้าราชการใหม่ซึ่งได้รับการบรรจุและแต่งตั้งระหว่างปีงบประมาณ 2549-2550 ใน 14 กระทรวง จำนวน 70 คน รวมทั้งศึกษาปัจจัยส่วนบุคคลที่จะมีอิทธิพลต่อค่านิยมในการรับราชการของข้าราชการไทยรุ่นใหม่ เครื่องมือที่ใช้วัด ได้แก่ แบบสอบถามซึ่งบรรจุค่านิยมในการทำงาน 16 ค่านิยมของ Karl & Sutton (1998) และค่านิยมที่สอดคล้องกับบริบทระบบราชการไทยอีก 5 ค่านิยม ผลการศึกษาพบว่า ข้าราชการรุ่นใหม่ให้ความสำคัญกับความมั่นคงในงานมากที่สุด รองลงมา คือ การได้ทำงานที่น่าสนใจ และความภาคภูมิใจเมื่องานสำเร็จ ตามลำดับ ผลการทดสอบความแปรปรวนร่วมของตัวแปรพหุพนวท์

¹ This research was funded by the Colonel Jinda na Songkhla Foundation of the Office of the Civil Service Commission (OCSC). An earlier version of this article was presented at Thailand's 2nd National Conference on Human Resource and Organization Management, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA), Bangkok, Thailand, November 20, 2009. We are grateful to Assistant Professor Dr. Werawat Punnitamai, Assistant Professor Dr. Kasemsam Chotchakornpant, and Ms. Pornpen Ratanopas (Human Resource Officer, Expert Level of the OCSC) for their insightful comments.

² He is now a research assistant at the Graduate School of Public Administration (GSPA), NIDA, Bangkok, Thailand.

³ She is now a lecturer at the Department of Political Science, Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University, Mahasarakham, Thailand.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dhanakorn Mulaphong. E-mail: dhanakorn.m@hotmail.com

96 การจัดการภาคีและภาคเอกชน

เมื่อควบคุมอายุ รายได้เฉลี่ยครัวเรือน และจำนวนของผู้ที่ต้องดูแลแล้ว ไม่พบความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติระหว่างค่านิยมในการรับราชการที่ข้าราชการรุ่นใหม่ ยึดถือ นอกจากนี้ ผู้วิจัยยังพบว่า เพศ อายุ รายได้เฉลี่ยครัวเรือน และจำนวนของผู้ที่ต้องดูแลมีอิทธิพลต่อค่านิยมในการรับราชการอีกด้วย ในตอนท้าย ผู้วิจัยยังได้เสนอแนวทางในการประยุกต์ใช้ผลการศึกษา มีแนวคิดลักษณะใจและแรงจูงใจในการบริการสาธารณะ เป็นอาทิ

คำสำคัญ: ค่านิยมในการทำงาน ข้าราชการ ผู้ที่ได้รับการบรรจุแต่งตั้งใหม่ การบริหารงานบุคคลภาครัฐ ระบบราชการไทย

Abstract

The purposes of this study were to investigate the work values of 70 newcomers in the area of Thai civil service employed during fiscal years 2006 to 2007 in 14 ministries and to examine the factors influencing their work values. The original 16 work value items by Karl and Sutton (1998), with 5 additional Thai bureaucracy-related work value items, were used as measuring instruments. We found that newcomers ranked job security as highest in importance, followed by interesting work and full appreciation of work done. The results of the Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) revealed that there were no significant main or interaction effects between gender, age, educational level, academic major, household income, and number of dependents on any of the work values. Also, as hypothesized, gender, age, household income, and number of dependents were related to work values. Theoretical and practical implications (i.e., psychological contract and public service motivation) are discussed.

Keywords: work values, civil servants, newcomers, public personnel management, Thai bureaucracy, psychological contract, public service motivation (PSM)

Introduction

Since the revolution in 1932, with the transition from absolute monarchy to democracy, bureaucracy has played an important role in Thai administration due to the vulnerability and instability of Thai politics. From 1932 to 2007 there were nine coups and during that time 17 constitutions were promulgated, with an average of 5 years per constitution. For every coup, the bureaucracy has been a significant pillar of the administration. This phenomenon has been described as the Bureaucratic Polity (Dhiravegin, 2005, 2006; Neher, 1979; Riggs, 1964, 1966).

During the regimes of absolute monarchy, working in government service was an ideal for Thai workers and at the time the role of civil servants was to work for the kings. Meanwhile, the kings formulated policy, the civil servants implemented it, and would receive rank and pension from the monarchs (Graham, 1924). In addition, civil servants were classified as the elite in the society and seemed to be a ladder elevating the social status of Thais.

After the revolution, according to democratic values, bureaucrats should have been an important mechanism for governments or politicians in implementing their policy or election campaigns (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2009; Dhiravegin, 2005). Instead, the Thai bureaucracy has played a vital role as both policy formulator and executor due to unstable political situations (Dhiravegin, 2005; Sutton, 1962; Vinijnaiyapak, 2008).

Nowadays, Thai bureaucracy consists of a workforce of more than 1,275,350 civilians (Bureau of Position Classification and Compensation Development, OCSC, 2007) and the expenditure budget for income payment is 461,718.6 million Baht or 27.8 percent of total disbursement (Bureau of Budget, 2008). These facts reflect the role of the bureaucracy and civil servants as an important mechanism for the country's development.

The objectives of this study are to investigate the work values of Thai civil servants, particularly newcomers to *bureaucracy* employed during fiscal years 2006 to 2007 in 14 ministries and to examine the personal factors influencing those newcomers' work values since the newcomers represent the "new wave" of change in bureaucracy. Also, it is expected that the empirical findings will be beneficial in policy formulation of public personnel management.

Work Values

Definition

According to Rokeach (1973), values can be defined as the enduring belief which persons or societies consider as a favorable mode of conduct or end-state. In individual's values are comprised of several related values and are hierarchically arranged in the value system (Kluckhon, 1951; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Rokeach, 1973). The first-ranked values in importance influence an individual's behaviors (Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960; Almeida & Pinto, 2004; Crace & Brow, 1966; Super & Sverko, 1995). A number of scholars have pointed out that work values are associated with general values (Roe & Ester, 1999) and are affected by one's life values as well (Elizur & Sagie, 1999; Spence, 2003). In addition, work values have been defined as the motive drive affecting preference of type of work and work environment (Pine & Innis, 1987; Roe & Ester, 1999; Super & Bohn, 1970). Values, in turn, are termed as the beliefs affecting work behaviors (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Moreover, some scholars argue that work values can be reflected by job outcomes (Licata, 2007; Roe & Ester, 1999).

Type of Work Values

Generally, work values have been classified into two types: intrinsic work values and extrinsic work values. The first values represent the internal factor of work content affecting employees, such as challenging work, pleasing work, and interesting work (Van Schuur, 1997). Intrinsic work values affect the employee's pride in his or her work and job involvement (Butler & Vodanovich, 1992; Maslow, 1968), including self-esteem (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Elizur, 1984). Conversely, extrinsic work values have been defined as the factors which are the outcome of work or job benefits, such as salary, bonus, or other rewards (Elizur, 1984), as well as job security (Van Schuur, 1997) and social rewards (Simerson, 1984). Moreover, Licata (2007) has noted that both types of work values are related to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. On the one hand, intrinsic work values respond to psychological states, especially the need for esteem and the self-actualization stage. On the other hand, extrinsic work values relate to fundamental needs, such as physiological needs or the need for safety.

Impact of Work Values

A number of academics insist that work values influence an individual's occupational choice (Holland, 1959; Johnson, 2001; Osipow, 1973; Sagiv, 2002; Super, 1957; Thorndike, Weiss, & Dawis, 1968). They have also been considered the source of motivation in action (Roe & Ester, 1999) and work satisfaction (Taris, Feij, & van Vianen, 2005; Waskom, 1981). In addition, work values enable the prediction of work achievement (Atkinson, 1964; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1991; Morrison, 1975; Wu, 1976), length of employment, and intention to leave the job (Johnson, 2001; Taris et al., 2005). Also, work values are associated with organizational commitment (Johnson, 2001; Oliver, 1990; Pelled & Hill, 1997), especially intrinsic work values (Butler & Vodanovich, 1992; Elizur, 1996; Putti, Aryee, & Liang, 1989).

Work Values of Thai Civil Servants

Job Security: Is It the Strength of Thai Bureaucracy?

Karl and Sutton (1998) conducted a comparative study of work values between public officials ($N=47$) and employees of private companies ($N=170$) in the U.S.A. The study found that public officials paid attention mostly to interesting work, job benefits, job security, and work environment. Nonetheless, study in European countries, namely the Netherlands, Denmark, United Kingdom, and Sweden, reflect that employment security is given highest priority by government officials (Willems, Janvier, & Henderickx, 2006, p. 615).

In the case of Thai bureaucracy, even if the disbursement of bureaucrats is not competitive in the labor market, each year a large number of people become interested in being bureaucrats. As Preecha Watcharapai, Former Secretary of the OCSC stated, "In 2004, the total number of applicants who favor working in Thai bureaucracy was more than 280,000 people" (Jiamrojananon, 2007). In addition, a report of the Center of Recruitment and Selection of the OCSC illustrates that the total number of applicants was 238,481 in 2008 (Recruitment and Selection Center, OCSC, 2008).

The phenomenon mentioned above is explainable with several justifications; for example, Thai bureaucracy offers more job security than the private sector. It is noteworthy that no matter how many times Thailand encounters political instability and economic recession, Thai bureaucracy continues to thrive; meanwhile the private sector is rather sensitive. Yet, there is no empirical finding that indicates if the new generation of Thai labor is in favor of being public officials due to job security. Thus, we pose the following research question:

Research Question 1: Will newcomers to Thai civil service rank job security as most important nowadays?

Traditional Work Values of Thai Civil Servants: Myth or Reality?

Before the 1932 revolution, the monarch was the center of power, ruler, and policy formulator, whereas the bureaucrats served the king and implemented the monarch's policies. In addition, divinity made the monarch's retinue status different from the general people (Sutton, 1962), who were designated by rank such as Khun, Laung, Phraya, etc. (Wiruchnipawan, 2004). As a result, Thai bureaucrats received high respect from people (Graham, 1924; Raksasataya, 1990; Sutton, 1962). Wiruchnipawan (2004) concluded that bureaucrats' values at the time were comprised of the values ascribed to the monarch (to serve the monarch), the values of Phraya (praise of bureaucrats, anticipation of rank and honor, and abuse of positions), the value of being a master of other people, and the values of power.

However, Thailand has been transformed into a democratic regime since 1932 and this is considered to be a step toward modernizing society (Sutton, 1962). Nowadays, the Thai government continues to reinvent the bureaucracy to be efficient and effective, to respond to the people, and to gain a competitive advantage in the global arena. In doing so, it is essential to transform the values of Thai civil servants from traditional work values to modernized ones, for example, the creative bureaucratic values declared by the OCSC: moral courage, integrity and responsibility, transparency and accountability, nondiscrimination, and result orientation (Rupkumdee & Kunakornsakul, 2001). Still, it is interesting to investigate whether the mentioned values exist in the new generation entering government service. Thus, we pose the following research question:

Research Question 2: Will the traditional of Thai civil service work values (i.e., power, high social status, and respect from people) be held by the young people nowadays?

Factors Affecting Work Values

Age

Age is one of the factors influencing work values (Cherrington, Condie, & England, 1979; Kovach, 1987) and it is applied as a variable for testing work values in much research. Susman (1973), for example, discovered that older employees placed more importance on pride in accomplishment than younger ones. Likewise, Gruenberg (1980) found that older workers gave more importance to intrinsic work values than extrinsic work values. Also, Kuhn (1995) indicated that older employees worked for personal satisfaction rather than reward and advancement and emphasized a good workplace environment (Karl & Sutton, 1998). Otherwise, past research found that money was given highest priority by younger workers (Cherrington et al., 1979). However, according to Osborn-Jones (2004) and Hsieh (2006), a relation between age and work values was not found.

Gender

Past research has insisted that differences in gender account for different work values. For instance, Ben-Shem and Avi-Itzhak (1997) revealed that females rather underscored the work of social services whereas males concentrated on power, money, and independence. Also, females relied on ethics more than males. However, Osborn-Jones (2004) argued that gender was not related to work values.

Academic Performance

Trank, Rynes, and Bretz (2002) examined the relation between capacity and academic achievement and their effect upon workplace selection. The results showed that graduates with high academic achievement were fond of challenging and interesting work. In the meantime, Johnson (2001) discovered that employees that had high academic achievement placed more importance on achievement and power-related rewards than employee with lower academic achievement. Moreover, a study of Henley Management College in 2000 revealed that 476 talented workers that had graduated at a high level from college considered self-fulfillment as most important, followed by a sense of accomplishment and fun and enjoyment of life. (Osborn-Jones, 2004).

Academic Major

Previous studies found that workers with various academic backgrounds hold work values variously (Rosenberg, 1957). To illustrate, students studying commerce, hotel management, and finance focused on economic return most (Rosenberg, 1957; Super & Bohn, 1970). However, students in the fields of social science, social welfare, premedical study, and education were attracted most by work concerned with assisting other people (Rosenberg, 1957; Super & Bohn, 1970). On the other hand, students in the areas of engineering, natural science, and agriculture paid attention to work helping other people least (Rosenberg, 1957).

Economic and Social Factors

Center (1948) and Peter and Hansen (1966) discovered that employees from lower economic and social classes emphasized job security and economic

return most. Further, Karl and Sutton (1998) found that those with greater household incomes gave more consideration to ethical and honest management than those with lower incomes. Furthermore, workers that had to look after a number of dependents considered job security and interesting work most. In the same way, Yuprasert (1976) pointed out the relation between social and economic status and work values in a sampling of first year students in Thailand.

Other Factors

Hartung, Leong, Grotti, Goh, and Gaylor (1998) discovered only children were more attracted by extrinsic and intrinsic rewards than the eldest child or lateral child. In terms of settlement factor, Elder and Conger's (2000) study revealed that employees from rural communities exhibited altruism and focused on job security more than employees from urban communities. Additionally, Johnson (2002) showed that those that had faith in religion tended to concentrate more on unselfishness and job security.

Nevertheless, most studies concerning the factors affecting work values have been conducted outside Thailand. Some of the studies' findings revealed contrasts perhaps due to variations in sampling, contexts, and period of time. This study examines how differences in personal factors impact Thai civil service newcomers' work values and the factors that affect these work values. We therefore hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no differences in work values in terms of age, gender, educational level, academic major, household income, or number of dependents among newcomers to Thai bureaucracy.

Hypothesis 2: The work values of newcomers to Thai civil service can be predicted by gender, age, educational level, academic major, household income, and number of dependents.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample for this study comprised 105 new civil servants appointed during fiscal years 2006 to 2007 in 14 ministries. Data were collected via a questionnaire sent by e-mail to the new civil servants. Seventy respondents completed the questionnaire (67% response rate). Of the respondents, 37 were female and 33 were male, with a mean age of 28.63 years ($SD = 3.04$ years). Thirty-nine percent of the respondents were employed in the position of C3 and 61% in C4. They were working during the organizational entry phase, with an average of 7.74 months of work experience ($SD = 1.94$). Twenty-seven respondents held a bachelor's degree, while 43 respondents graduated with a master's degree. Of those respondents with academic majors that had studied in college or university, 35 were from the disciplines of the social sciences and 35 were from the sciences/health sciences. The total household income ranged from 50,000 to 3,000,000 Baht, while the average number of dependents was .56 ($SD = .97$).

Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of the original 16 work value items by Karl and Sutton (1998) (e.g., interesting work, good wages, job security, ethical, and honest management, etc.). With regard to the Thai context, however, we introduced five more aspects of values in this study: three aspects of traditional work values of Thai civil servants (respect from people, power, and high social status) and two aspects of creative bureaucratic values of the OCSC (moral courage and integrity and responsibility) (Rupkumdee & Kunakornsakul, 2001). These five additional aspects of work values were examined for content validity by 3 panels on psychology, public administration, and public personnel

management. Using the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC), the values found ranged from .67 to 1, indicating that all added values were appropriate for this study (Rovinelli & Hambleton, 1977).

To summarize, the work values in this study consisted of 21 values: (1) Job security, (2) Interesting work, (3) Full appreciation of work done, (4) Promotion and growth in company/organization, (5) Feeling "in" on things, (6) Good working conditions, (7) Sympathetic help on personal problems, (8) Good wages, (9) Ethical and honest management, (10) Integrity and responsibility, (11) Moral courage, (12) Personal loyalty to workers, (13) Job training, (14) Tactful disciplining, (15) Flexible work schedule, (16) Company benefits, (17) High social status, (18) Respect from people, (19) Amount of travel involved in job, (20) Commute time to and from work, and (21) Power.

Measures

As noted earlier, individuals' values are comprised of various values in the value system. Each value can be arranged hierarchically and is related to others (Kluckhon, 1951; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Rokeach, 1973) and is the primacy influence on the individual's behavior (Allport et al., 1960; Almeida & Pinto, 2004; Crace & Brow, 1966; Super & Sverko, 1995). Hence, the ipsative measurement methodology was applied. The forced choice format was employed to ask respondents to rank the order of the values set (e.g., job security, good wages, power, etc.) (Baron, 1996; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998, p. 359). A large number of academics, such as Allport et al. (1960), Cable and Judge (1997), Chatman (1991), and Meglino, Ravlin, and Adkins (1989) have used this technique in their study; they particularly believed that this method fit the nature of values (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998).

Analyses

Respondents were asked to rank 21 values ranging from 1 (the most important) to 21 (the least important) and the results were organized by mean rankings in order to answer research questions 1 and 2. For hypothesis 1, we conducted a 3-way Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) to examine the differences in work values between gender, educational level, academic major, age, household income, and number of dependents. Last, we performed a multiple regression analysis to examine the hypothesis 2; how gender, age, household income, and number of dependents affected the work values of new public officials.

Results

Table 1 illustrates the means (M), standard deviations (SD), and intercorrelations among variables. Thus, the problem of multicollinearity was not found in the study. Note that we controlled for gender (0 = male, 1 = female), position (0 = C3, 1 = C4), educational level (0 = bachelor's degree, 1 = master's degree), and academic major (0 = sciences/health sciences, 1 = social sciences). The results of the mean rankings comparison (see Table 2) revealed that all new civil servants valued Job Security highly ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 3.91$). Likewise, newcomers classified by gender ($M_{male} = 3.91$, $SD = 3.97$; $M_{female} = 3.89$, $SD = 3.82$), educational level ($M_{bachelor's} = 3.63$, $SD = 3.56$; $M_{master's} = 4.07$, $SD = 4.24$), academic major ($M_{sciences} = 3.74$, $SD = 3.46$; $M_{social sciences} = 4.06$, $SD = 4.47$), household income ($M_{below \$250,000} = 3.03$, $SD = 3.12$; $M_{\$250,001-500,000} = 4.74$, $SD = 4.51$; $M_{above \$500,001} = 4.61$, $SD = 4.63$), and number of dependents ($M_{none} = 3.67$, $SD = 3.94$; $M_{some} = 4.43$, $SD = 4.08$) placed Job Security as the first priority, followed by interesting work

and full appreciation of work done (excepted female respondents with household income less than 250,000 Baht and those that looked after dependents gave importance to full appreciation of work done in second place and interesting work third place). Therefore, research question 1 was supported.

In terms of considering the comparison of mean rankings of traditional work values (respect from people, power, and high social status), Table 2 shows that newcomers least emphasized traditional work values, particularly power, which was considered least important. Thus, the research question 2 was rejected.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female)	.53	.50	-							
2. Age	28.63	3.04	0.02	-						
3. Position (0 = C3, 1 = C4)	.54	.50	0.05	0.05	-					
4. Educational level	.61	.49	0.19	0.15	0.86**	-				
			(0 = Bachelor's degree, 1 = Master's degree)							
5. Academic major	.50	.50	-0.20	0.14	0.23	0.21	-			
			(0 = Sciences/health sciences, 1 = Social sciences)							
6. Household income	8,468.57	446,363.71	-0.04	0.15	0.22	0.18	0.02	-		
7. Number of dependents	.56	.97	0.04	0.08	-0.09	-0.12	-0.16	-0.13	-	
8. Job security	3.90	3.97	0.00	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.19	0.04	-
9. Interesting work	5.04	4.36	0.06	0.25*	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.16	0.08	0.11
10. Full appreciation of work done	5.24	3.08	-0.02	-0.07	0.07	0.16	0.07	0.19	-0.05	0.33*
11. Promotion and growth	6.87	4.52	0.20	0.13	-0.01	-0.03	0.03	0.24*	-0.04	0.22
			in company/organization							
12. Feeling "in" on things	7.07	3.61	-0.13	0.08	0.19	0.24*	0.15	0.14	0.03	0.36*
13. Good working conditions	8.11	4.20	-0.24	-0.38**	-0.17	-0.17	-0.13	-0.18	0.12	-0.20
14. Sympathetic help on personal problems	8.17	4.03	-0.25*	-0.26*	-0.23	-0.26*	-0.19	-0.12	0.25*	-0.18
15. Good wages	8.79	5.65	0.02	0.08	0.01	-0.03	-0.19	0.01	-0.04	0.30*
16. Ethical and honest management	9.66	4.03	-0.30*	0.09	-0.09	-0.07	0.24*	-0.20	-0.20	-0.26*
17. Integrity and responsibility	9.71	6.77	-0.03	0.14	-0.04	-0.01	0.09	-0.22	0.06	-0.50*
18. Moral courage	10.09	5.41	-0.03	0.06	0.03	0.04	-0.09	0.03	0.15	-0.26*
19. Personal loyalty to workers	11.94	3.84	-0.01	-0.11	0.16	0.12	0.05	0.30*	-0.02	0.11
20. Job training	12.47	3.71	0.21	0.01	-0.16	-0.12	0.01	-0.11	0.00	-0.08
21. Tactful disciplining	12.54	3.90	0.10	-0.10	0.04	0.06	-0.09	0.03	0.17	0.26*
22. Flexible work schedule	13.99	3.74	0.08	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.00	-0.08	0.02	-0.21
23. Company benefits	14.93	4.02	0.09	0.11	0.01	-0.03	0.05	-0.01	-0.19	0.15
24. High social status	14.93	5.31	0.04	-0.10	0.13	0.15	0.01	0.08	-0.28*	-0.21
25. Respect from people	16.00	5.05	0.02	-0.03	0.22	0.19	0.03	0.01	-0.17	-0.20
26. Amount of travel involved in job	16.13	4.56	-0.05	-0.12	-0.11	-0.21	0.10	-0.14	-0.03	-0.21
27. Commute time to and from work	16.26	4.76	0.18	0.07	-0.23	-0.24*	-0.05	-0.24*	0.07	-0.15
28. Power	18.87	2.92	-0.01	0.10	0.16	0.20	-0.06	0.12	-0.02	0.18

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

Variable	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female)										
2. Age										
3. Position (0 = C3, 1 = C4)										
4. Educational level (0 = Bachelor's degree, 1 = Master's degree)										
5. Academic major (0 = Sciences/health sciences, 1 = Social sciences)										
6. Household income										
7. Number of dependents										
8. Job security										
9. Interesting work	-									
10. Full appreciation of work done	0.47**	-								
11. Promotion and growth in company/organization	0.01	0.08	-							
12. Feeling "in" on things	0.42**	0.49**	-0.08	-						
13. Good working conditions	-0.10	-0.05	-0.24*	-0.15	-					
14. Sympathetic help on personal problems	-0.20	-0.17	-0.19	-0.18	0.60**	-				
15. Good wages	0.19	0.27*	0.26*	0.06	-0.06	-0.05	-			
16. Ethical and honest management	-0.12	-0.17	-0.27*	0.02	0.12	0.09	-0.17	-		
17. Integrity and responsibility	-0.10	-0.41**	-0.40**	-0.26*	0.05	0.10	-0.37**	0.26*	-	
18. Moral courage	-0.04	-0.26*	-0.10	-0.06	-0.06	0.04	-0.49**	0.21	0.36**	-
19. Personal loyalty to workers	0.08	0.37**	0.06	0.26*	0.05	0.03	0.03	-0.02	-0.29*	-0.03
20. Job training	-0.08	-0.15	-0.02	-0.16	0.10	0.12	-0.17	-0.20	0.15	-0.21
21. Tactful disciplining	0.05	0.14	-0.16	0.20	-0.20	-0.09	0.03	-0.05	-0.33**	-0.08
22. Flexible work schedule	0.11	-0.10	-0.10	-0.25*	0.06	0.03	-0.03	-0.16	-0.14	-0.16
23. Company benefits	-0.04	-0.01	0.32**	-0.24*	-0.10	-0.23	0.37**	-0.19	-0.42**	-0.50**
24. High social status	-0.38**	-0.31**	-0.08	-0.32**	-0.23	-0.11	-0.49**	-0.10	0.23	0.22
25. Respect from people	-0.32**	-0.42**	-0.16	-0.22	-0.22	-0.19	-0.51**	0.13	0.20	0.42**
26. Amount of travel involved in job	-0.34**	-0.18	-0.12	-0.09	-0.08	-0.15	-0.22	-0.12	0.11	-0.06
27. Commute time to and from work	-0.24**	-0.34**	-0.01	-0.31**	0.11	-0.10	0.11	0.08	0.05	-0.30*
28. Power	-0.06	0.30*	0.21	0.10	-0.41**	-0.24*	0.29*	-0.23	-0.27*	-0.25*

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

Variable	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1. Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female)										
2. Age										
3. Position (0 = C3, 1 = C4)										
4. Educational level (0 = Bachelor's degree, 1 = Master's degree)										
5. Academic major (0 = Sciences/health sciences, 1 = Social sciences)										
6. Household income										
7. Number of dependents										
8. Job security										
9. Interesting work										
10. Full appreciation of work done										
11. Promotion and growth in company/organization										
12. Feeling "in" on things										
13. Good working conditions										
14. Sympathetic help on personal problems										
15. Good wages										
16. Ethical and honest management										
17. Integrity and responsibility										
18. Moral courage										
19. Personal loyalty to workers	-									
20. Job training	-0.12	-								
21. Tactful disciplining	0.25*	-0.19	-							
22. Flexible work schedule	-0.13	0.22	0.20	-						
23. Company benefits	-0.06	-0.04	-0.13	0.12	-					
24. High social status	-0.23	-0.14	-0.12	-0.11	-0.08	-				
25. Respect from people	-0.12	-0.22	-0.08	-0.03	-0.13	0.70**	-			
26. Amount of travel involved in job	-0.29*	0.21	-0.15	-0.01	-0.06	0.18	0.14	-		
27. Commute time to and from work	-0.29*	0.27*	-0.17	-0.02	0.37**	-0.11	-0.18	0.10	-	
28. Power	-0.11	-0.28*	0.01	-0.06	0.20	0.17	-0.09	0.06	-0.11	-

Note. N = 70. * p < .05. ** p < .01.

Table 2: Mean Rankings and Standard Deviations for All 21 Work Values of Thai Civil Service Newcomers and a Comparison of Ranking between Position, Gender, Educational Level, Academic Major, Household Income, and Number of Dependents

Work values	Thai civil service newcomers			Position			Gender			Educational level											
	(N = 70)			C3			C4			Male			Female			Bachelor's degree			Master's degree		
	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank
Job security	3.90	3.97	1	3.72	3.85	1	4.05	4.12	1	3.91	4.19	1	3.89	3.82	1	3.63	3.56	1	4.07	4.24	1
Interesting work	5.04	4.36	2	4.78	4.39	2	5.26	4.37	2	4.79	4.39	2	5.27	4.37	3	4.30	3.76	2	5.51	4.67	2
Full appreciation of work done	5.24	3.08	3	5.00	3.29	3	5.45	2.92	3	5.30	3.27	3	5.19	2.94	2	4.63	2.65	3	5.63	3.30	3
Promotion and growth in company/organization	6.87	4.52	4	6.91	4.28	5	6.84	4.78	4	5.91	3.83	4	7.73	4.96	7	7.04	4.45	5	6.77	4.62	4
Feeling "in" on things	7.07	3.61	5	6.34	3.02	4	7.68	3.97	7	7.58	4.07	5	6.62	3.13	4	6.00	2.60	4	7.74	4.00	7
Good working conditions	8.11	4.20	6	8.88	4.74	7	7.47	3.64	6	9.15	4.59	7	7.19	3.64	5	9.00	5.14	7	7.56	3.45	6
Sympathetic help on personal problems	8.17	4.03	7	9.16	4.24	8	7.34	3.69	5	9.21	4.10	8	7.24	3.77	6	9.48	4.34	8	7.35	3.62	5
Good wages	8.79	5.65	8	8.75	5.71	6	8.82	5.68	8	8.67	6.24	6	8.89	5.15	9	9.00	5.94	6	8.65	5.52	8
Ethical and honest management	9.66	4.03	9	10.06	3.83	11	9.32	4.21	9	10.91	3.92	11	8.54	3.84	8	10.00	3.57	11	9.44	4.32	9
Integrity and responsibility	9.71	6.77	10	9.97	6.90	10	9.50	6.75	10	9.94	7.08	9	9.51	6.58	10	9.78	6.85	9	9.67	6.80	10
Moral courage	10.09	5.41	11	9.91	5.21	9	10.24	5.64	11	10.24	5.18	10	9.95	5.68	11	9.81	5.03	10	10.26	5.69	11
Personal loyalty to workers	11.94	3.84	12	11.28	3.66	12	12.50	3.96	13	11.97	4.54	13	11.92	3.16	12	11.37	3.79	12	12.30	3.88	13
Job training	12.47	3.71	13	13.09	3.35	14	11.95	3.95	12	11.67	3.85	12	13.19	3.48	14	13.04	3.24	14	12.12	3.97	12
Tactful disciplining	12.54	3.90	14	12.38	4.18	13	12.68	3.69	14	12.12	4.23	14	12.92	3.59	13	12.26	4.17	13	12.72	3.76	14
Flexible work schedule	13.99	3.74	15	13.72	3.97	15	14.21	3.57	15	13.67	4.33	15	14.27	3.15	15	13.89	4.00	15	14.05	3.61	15
Company benefits	14.93	4.02	16	14.91	4.29	18	14.95	3.83	16	14.55	4.28	16	15.27	3.80	17	15.07	4.21	18	14.84	3.94	16
High social status	14.93	5.31	17	14.19	5.66	16	15.55	5.00	18	14.70	5.17	17	15.14	5.50	16	13.96	5.59	16	15.53	5.11	19
Respect from people	16.00	5.05	18	14.78	5.68	17	17.03	4.25	20	15.88	4.60	19	16.11	5.48	19	14.78	5.59	17	16.77	4.58	20
Amount of travel involved in job	16.13	4.56	19	16.69	4.35	19	15.66	4.73	19	16.36	4.76	20	15.92	4.42	18	17.30	3.92	19	15.40	4.81	18
Commute time to and from work	16.26	4.76	20	17.44	4.13	20	15.26	5.08	17	15.36	4.90	18	17.05	4.55	20	17.70	3.48	20	15.35	5.25	17
Power	18.87	2.92	21	18.38	3.32	21	19.29	2.50	21	18.91	2.88	21	18.84	3.00	21	18.15	3.49	21	19.33	2.43	21

Note. Respondents were asked to rank the order of all 21 work values (1 = most important; 21 = least important)

Table 2 : (Continued)

Work values	Academic major						Household income (per year)						Number of dependents					
	Sciences (N = 35)			Social sciences (N = 35)			below ₩250,000 (N = 33)			₩250,001-500,000 (N = 19)			above ₩500,001 (N = 18)			None (N = 49)		
	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank
Job security	3.74	3.46	1	4.06	4.47	1	3.03	3.12	1	4.74	4.51	1	4.61	4.63	1	3.67	3.94	1
Interesting work	4.80	4.34	2	5.29	4.42	2	4.91	4.39	3	5.21	5.00	2	5.11	3.77	2	4.86	4.33	2
Full appreciation of work done	5.03	2.61	3	5.46	3.52	3	4.45	2.66	2	5.68	3.67	3	6.22	2.92	3	5.16	2.90	3
Promotion and growth in company/organization	6.74	4.84	5	7.00	4.25	4	5.79	3.52	4	7.16	5.11	4	8.56	5.16	8	7.10	4.72	5
Feeling "in" on things	6.54	3.29	4	7.60	3.87	7	6.00	2.78	5	8.11	4.15	5	7.94	3.98	6	6.71	3.41	4
Good working conditions	8.66	4.62	6	7.57	3.73	6	8.12	3.56	7	9.32	3.16	8	6.83	5.82	4	8.04	4.44	7
Sympathetic help on personal problems	8.91	4.37	8	7.43	3.55	5	7.36	3.13	6	10.26	3.14	10	7.44	5.49	5	7.63	3.97	6
Good wages	9.86	5.86	10	7.71	5.29	8	8.67	5.61	8	9.05	6.30	7	8.72	5.31	9	9.04	5.83	8
Ethical and honest management	8.71	4.28	7	10.60	3.57	11	10.21	3.50	10	8.84	4.61	6	9.50	4.36	10	10.33	4.00	11
Integrity and responsibility	9.11	6.26	9	10.31	7.28	10	10.33	6.40	11	10.32	7.26	9	7.94	6.98	6	10.02	6.59	10
Moral courage	10.54	4.96	11	9.63	5.87	9	9.39	4.62	9	10.37	6.60	11	11.06	5.53	11	9.73	5.13	9
Personal loyalty to workers	11.74	4.20	12	12.14	3.50	12	11.03	2.67	12	10.95	4.34	12	14.67	4.00	15	11.92	3.75	12
Job training	12.43	3.78	13	12.51	3.69	14	12.85	3.39	14	12.63	3.93	13	11.61	4.09	12	12.45	3.76	14
Tactful disciplining	12.89	4.48	14	12.20	3.24	13	12.33	3.29	13	13.21	4.59	14	12.22	4.26	13	11.94	3.57	13
Flexible work schedule	14.00	3.87	15	13.97	3.66	15	15.00	1.92	15	13.58	4.73	15	12.56	4.67	14	13.86	3.36	15
Company benefits	14.71	4.27	16	15.14	3.80	17	15.58	3.38	17	13.68	4.23	16	15.06	4.75	16	15.37	3.94	16
High social status	14.86	5.17	17	15.00	5.53	16	15.52	5.05	16	13.74	6.67	17	15.11	4.14	17	15.53	4.84	17
Respect from people	15.83	5.01	19	16.17	5.15	19	16.85	4.40	18	14.63	6.90	19	15.89	3.61	20	16.61	4.47	20
Amount of travel involved in job	15.69	4.63	18	16.57	4.51	20	17.18	3.93	19	15.21	5.05	20	15.17	4.90	18	16.29	4.48	19
Commute time to and from work	16.51	4.43	20	16.00	5.13	16	18.15	4.00	20	13.89	5.27	18	15.28	4.28	19	16.08	5.04	18
Power	19.03	2.95	21	18.71	2.93	21	18.33	2.90	21	19.26	3.07	21	19.44	2.77	21	18.63	2.91	21

Note. Respondents were asked to rank the order of all 21 work values (1 = most important; 21 = least important). Household income was categorized into 3 groups (below ₩250,000, ₩250,001-500,000, and above ₩500,000). Number of dependent was categorized into 2 groups (none = number of dependents = 0, some = number of dependents > 1).

Hypothesis 1, we conducted a 3-way Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) to examine the differences in 21 work values between gender, educational level, academic major, age, household income, and number of dependents.

We tested this hypothesis with the MANCOVA for the following reasons. First, with respect to the nature of individual values, which are comprised of several related values and are hierarchically arranged in the value system (Kluckhon, 1951; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Rokeach, 1973), these correspond with the basic assumption of MANCOVA, which provides comparisons of group differences on a set of related dependent variables (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Huberty & Morris, 1989). Thus, we determined the set of 21 work values as dependent variables. Second, the MANCOVA analysis allows the researcher to use the set of nonmetric variables as the independent variable and also provides a block for metric variables or so-called covariates as the control variables (Hair et al., 2010; Huberty & Morris, 1989). In this study, gender, level of education, and academic major were used as independent variables; and age, household income, and number of dependents were used as covariates. Third, this sort of analysis reduces the problem of Type I error from analyzing the variance of univariate several times (Hair et al., 2010; Huberty & Morris, 1989).

The result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity had a statistical significance of $\chi^2 (230, N = 70) = 726.08, p < .001$, indicating that the 21 work values were related to each other and corresponded with the theory of the nature of values and the basic requirement of the MANCOVA.

Table 3: Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) for Work Values

Effect	Wilks' λ	F	df	Error df	P-value	Partial η^2	β
Age	.65	1.01	21	39	.47	.35	.60
Household income	.70	.79	21	39	.72	.30	.46
Number of dependents	.57	1.43	21	39	.17	.43	.79
Gender (G)	.67	.93	21	39	.56	.33	.55
Educational level (E)	.62	1.12	21	39	.37	.38	.66
Academic major (A)	.68	.87	21	39	.62	.32	.52
G \times E	.81	.43	21	39	.98	.19	.24
G \times A	.65	1.00	21	39	.49	.35	.59

Note. $N = 70$. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2(230, N = 70) = 726.08, p < .001$

The results of the MANCOVA (Table 3) revealed no significant main effects for age, $Wilks' \lambda = .65, F(21, 70) = 1.01, ns.$, household income, $Wilks' \lambda = .70, F(21, 70) = .79, ns.$, number of dependents, $Wilks' \lambda = .57, F(21, 70) = 1.43, ns.$, gender, $Wilks' \lambda = .67, F(21, 70) = .93, ns.$, educational level, $Wilks' \lambda = .62, F(21, 70) = 1.12, ns.$, or academic major, $Wilks' \lambda = .68, F(21, 70) = .87, ns.$. Once again, the interaction effects did not reach standard levels of significance for Gender \times Educational Level, $Wilks' \lambda = .81, F(21, 70) = .43, ns.$, Gender \times Academic Major, $Wilks' \lambda = .65, F(21, 70) = 1.00, ns.$, Educational Level \times Academic Major, $Wilks' \lambda = .71, F(21, 70) = .77, ns.$, or Gender \times Educational Level \times Academic Major, $Wilks' \lambda = .76, F(21, 70) = .58, ns.$. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2 was tested via multiple regression analysis. Table 4 displays the results of this analysis. Gender was negatively associated with good working conditions ($\beta = -.24, p < .05$), sympathetic help on personal problems ($\beta = -.26, p < .05$), and ethical and honest management ($\beta = -.30, p < .01$). That is, female newcomers placed greater value on good working conditions, sympathetic help on personal problems, and ethical and honest management than male newcomers.

Age related significantly and negatively to both good working conditions ($\beta = -.37, p < .001$) and sympathetic help on personal problems ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$). That is, older newcomers ranked good working conditions and sympathetic help on personal problems higher in importance than younger newcomers.

Household income had negative, significant effects on ethical and honest management ($\beta = -.26, p < .05$), integrity and responsibility ($\beta = -.24, p < .05$), and commute time to and from work ($\beta = -.24, p < .05$). In other words, newcomers with greater household incomes placed ethical and honest management, integrity and responsibility, and commute time to and from work higher in importance than newcomers with lower household incomes. Contrary to expectation, household income had significant positive effects on personal loyalty to workers ($\beta = .33, p < .01$), indicating that newcomers with greater household incomes rated personal loyalty to workers lower in importance than newcomers with lower household incomes.

Number of dependents related negatively to both ethical and honest management ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$) and high social status ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$), but positively related to sympathetic help on personal problems ($\beta = .27, p < .05$). These results suggested that new civil servants with a greater number of dependents valued ethical and honest management and high social status higher in importance than new civil servants with fewer dependents, whereas newcomers with a greater number of dependents valued sympathetic help on personal problems lower in importance than newcomers with fewer dependents. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Table 4 : Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Work Values

Predictor	Criterion variable										
	Job security	Interesting work	Full appreciation of work done	Promotion and growth in company/organization	Feeling "in" on things	Good working conditions	Sympathetic help on personal problems	Good wages	Ethical and honest management	Integrity and responsibility	Moral courage
Gender (Male =0, Female = 1)	.00	.05	-.01	.21	-.13	-.24*	-.26*	.02	-.30**	-.04	-.03
Age	-.06	.22	-.10	.09	.06	-.37***	-.27*	.08	.15	.18	.04
Household income	.21	.14	.20	.24	.13	-.11	-.05	-.01	-.26*	-.24*	.04
Number of dependents	.07	.08	-.01	-.03	.05	.14	.27*	-.04	-.23*	.01	.16
<i>F</i>	.76	1.56	.77	2.06	.72	4.97***	4.18**	.13	3.98**	1.43	.48
<i>R</i> ²	.04	.09	.04	.11	.04	.23	.20	.00	.19	.08	.02
Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	-.01	.09	-.01	.05	-.01	.18	.15	-.05	.14	.02	-.03

Table 4 : (Continued)

Predictor	Criterion variable									
	Personal loyalty to workers	Job training	Tactful disciplining	Flexible work schedule	Company benefits	High social status	Respect from people	Amount of travel involved in job	Commute time to and from work	Power
Gender (Male =0, Female = 1)	.01	.20	.10	.08	.10	.06	.03	-.05	.17	-.01
Age	-.16	.03	-.12	.02	.13	-.09	-.01	-.09	.10	.08
Household income	.33**	-.11	.08	-.08	-.05	.06	-.01	-.13	-.24*	.11
Number of dependents	.03	-.02	.18	.01	-.21	-.27*	-.17	-.03	.03	-.01
<i>F</i>	2.07	.94	.95	.20	1.10	1.62	.51	.55	1.73	.36
<i>R</i> ²	.11	.05	.05	.01	.06	.09	.03	.03	.09	.02
<i>Adjusted R</i> ²	.05	.00	.00	-.04	.00	.03	-.02	-.02	.04	-.03

Note. *N* = 70. The numbers in the table (except those in rows marked *F*, *R*², and *Adjusted R*²) are standardized regression coefficients (b). * *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001

Discussion

The purposes of this study were to explore the work values of new civil servants appointed during fiscal years 2006 to 2007 in 14 ministries and to examine the personal factors influencing those newcomers' work values. As we predicted, this study suggested that newcomers underline job security the most. These results correspond with the study of European government officials of Willems et al. (2006). Nevertheless, it is in contrast with the study of Karl and Sutton (1998), which found that public servants in the U.S.A. emphasized interesting work most. The results can possibly be explained by the fact that Thailand at present is encountering both economic and political obstacles-political instability, soaring prices of oil, a decreasing index of economic confidence, lower foreign investment, and a slowdown and removal of its investment base (IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook, 2009). For this reason, it is understandable why Thai workers are searching for job security, including working in a stable workplace as, for example, public agents. However, the results of this study is unlike to survey results of Holmes and Tangtongtavy (1995, 2003), which indicated that Thai workers emphasized primarily "money." It can be noted that Holmes and Tangtongtavy's samplings were from diverse occupations, not stipulated government officials.

One remarkable point is that the newcomers concentrated mainly on interesting work and full appreciation of work done (the second and third ranking). Theoretically, both values are intrinsic work values associated directly with the nature of work. The respondents were aged between 16-34 years and were identified as Young Workers (Dychtwald, Erickson, & Morison, 2006), or so-called millenials, with the characteristics of loving freedom of thinking and making decisions (Reece & Brandt, 2006). Young workers or millenials possess

a good educational background and are high-technology skilled, e.g., skilled in the use of computers, the cell phone, and the internet (Dychtwald et al., 2006). They are quick learners, inventive, and easily accommodate circumstances (Dychtwald et al., 2006). They also have various alternatives in their lives; thus they are not pressured much to make choices between living and working (Dychtwald et al., 2006). Correspondingly, these attributes affect their thought about work i.e., they focus on interesting work predominately. The findings of this study correspond with study of Henley Management College, which investigated talented managers and reported that these groups of people are captivated most by self-fulfillment (Osborn-Jones, 2004). We believe that the results of this study represent a good signal for Thai bureaucracy because the newcomers step into the bureaucrat system as a result of their understanding and appreciation for the nature of bureaucracy. Additionally, their value of achievement and enthusiasm regarding work is the driving force in developing bureaucracy to a high performance organization (HPO).

Alas, this study was not able to explain how differences in personal factors impacted the newcomers' distinction of work values. Yet, multiple regression analysis indicated that gender, age, household income, and number of dependents influenced the value of being a government official. Interestingly, female bureaucrats emphasized ethical and honest management more than the male officials, thus conforming to the study of Hill and Rojewski (1999), which found that females were stricter on ethics. Moreover, our study shows that older bureaucrats highlight good working conditions, which corresponds with the study of Karl and Sutton (1998). In terms of economic factors and household income, new public servants with greater household incomes underscored ethical and honest management more than those with a lower income, which is analogous with the findings of Karl and Sutton (1998). One notable finding was that female bureaucrats and older ones valued good working conditions more

than male government officials and younger ones. Indeed, new public servants that are responsible for a number of dependents stressed high social status and ethical and honest management.

Implications

Prior to this study, Putti et al. (1989) revealed that intrinsic work values correlated significantly with organizational commitment rather than extrinsic work values (e.g., disbursement and benefits provided by the organization). Likewise, Elizur (1996) found that an interesting and challenging job, and achievement intention, correlated significantly with organizational commitment.

Once again, our results indicate that newcomers focus mainly on intrinsic work values (i.e., interesting work and full appreciation of work done). Consequently, public sector managers should seek appropriate ways to meet their work values; for instance, job enrichment, job enlargement, or self-managed teams (Karl & Sutton, 1998, p. 352). Undoubtedly, when the newcomers' values are responded to, organizational commitment will be extended.

Another point is that a psychological contract approach should be proposed as an instrument to promote the work values of newcomers. A psychological contract can be defined as an unwritten contract that refers to the exchangeable relationship between employees and employers/organizations (Argyris, 1960; Calo, 2006; Kotter, 1973; Levinson, Price, Munden, & Solley, 1962; Rousseau, 1989; Schein, 1965). The application of such a psychological contract is expected to enhance understanding between newcomers and employers/organizations. To demonstrate, public executives should realize that newcomers need job security; meanwhile, workers should recognize that they are supposed to hard work and be loyal. Insofar as both learn from each others' expectations and react to one another properly, the level of perceived

organizational support (POS), trust, commitment, and citizenship behavior will be high (Calo, 2006; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2003; Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004; Larwood, Wright, Desrochers, & Dahir, 1998).

Ultimately, the principal mission of a bureaucracy is to serve the people; therefore, public officials should have the impulse of public service motivation, personal satisfaction to respond to the fundamental philosophy of the institution or public agents (Perry & Wise, 1990). The study of Wright and Pandey (2008) pointed out that those values which public servants count on play the role of mediator between public service motivation and job satisfaction. In other words, if civil servants exhibit motivation for public service at a high level, including value congruence with public agents, their performance satisfaction will ensue. In conclusion, in order to fulfill the commitment to serve the nation and people effectively and efficiently, it is the responsibility of every single concerned agent to seek out ways to harmonize bureaucrats' values with the organizational mission.

Limitations and Future Directions

Our study has at least four limitations that should be addressed. First, the social desirability bias, a tendency of respondents to present themselves in a way that makes them look positive with regard to norms and standards (Ganster, Hennessey, & Luthans, 1983), should be considered, especially when respondents are asked to report on values that may be incongruent with social desirability (e.g., power, respect from people, and high social status). A future normative technique may help address this issue because it permits the researcher to develop a set of items or statements describing values (e.g., "A person should strive to be successful at his or her job.") and asks respondents to rate them (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). As a result, the researcher could embrace some

items which might be discordant with social norms (e.g., "A person should strive to hold a high-ranking government position in order to gain a lot of benefits or, Having a high-ranking government position will make your life easier") and that provide respondents with an opportunity to rate the extent to which these values are favored instead of directly ranking a set of values, as with the ipsative method employed in this study. Such a technique may help the researcher to gain more accurate information about an individual's work values and scores derived from a rating system that can be analyzed by more sophisticated statistical techniques as well (cf. Baron, 1996; Hicks, 1970; Karl & Sutton, 1998, p. 525; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998, pp. 359-360).⁴ Next, our study involved cross-sectional data; consequently, the results can be applied only to a certain period of time. Future research may apply a longitudinal study to examine the transformation of newcomers' values and attitudes over time. Another limitation of this study is that we include only two-fifth aspects of the creative *bureaucratic* values. Research in the future might incorporate all five creative *bureaucratic* values and explore their existence and the extent to which they are endorsed by civil servants. Finally, the results of this study are based on quantitative techniques, and future research may employ the qualitative method to acquire in-depth data in order to make the research more comprehensive.

⁴ This differs from Meglino and Ravlin's (1998, pp. 360-361) work, which addressed the idea that the ipsative methods could minimize social desirability effects in measuring work values when compared with the normative methods. The authors, however, believe that in order to gain more accurate information about the work values that are rooted in Thai bureaucracy (and also the Thai culture), such as power, respect from people, and high social status, but which seem to be adversative in relation to present social standard discourse, the normative technique may be a way to extract their existence.

124 การจัดการการคัดเลือกบุคคล

In the future, other samplings should be selected, such as bureaucrats of ages, civil servants of the High Performance and Potential System (HiPPS), government scholarship students, etc. Alternatively, comparative study should be employed to examine the work of the sampled groups, for instance, comparing the staff in the public and private sectors or comparing executives and subordinates. Of course, the factors affecting work values could be investigated as well.

Last, in order to enhance our understanding of civil servants' attitudes and behaviors, the relations between the values of being a bureaucrat, the psychological contract, and public service motivation should be explored.

In a nutshell, we expect that understanding the work values that newcomers possess may be the key meeting the needs of the newcomers to Thai bureaucracy. These empirical findings would be beneficial in policy formulation for public personnel management.

References

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Almeida, L., & Pinto, H. (2004). Life values inventory (LVI): Portuguese adaption studies. *The Canadian Journal of Career Development*, 3(1), 28-34.

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Homewood: Dorsey Press.

Atkinson J. W. (1964). *An introduction to motivation*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Baron, H. (1996). Strengths and limitations of ipsative measurement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(1), 49-56.

Ben-Shem, I., & Avi-Itzhak, T. (1991). On work values and career choice in freshmen students: The case of helping vs. other professions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 369-379.

Bureau of Budget. (2008). *Thailand's budget in brief fiscal year 2008*. Retrieved December, 25, from <http://www.bb.go.th/FILEROOM/CABBBIWEBFORMENG/DRAWER04/GENERAL/DATA0000/00000010.PDF>

Bureau of Position Classification and Compensation Development, OCSC. (2007). *Civilian workforce in Thailand 2007 (in Thai)*. Bangkok: Teeranusornkampim.

Butler, G., & Vodanovich, S. J. (1992). The relationship between work values and normative and instrumental commitment. *Journal of Psychology*, 126, 139-146.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 546-561.

Calo, T. J. (2006). The psychological contract and the union contract: A paradigm shift in public sector employee relations. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(4), 331-342.

References

Center, R. (1948). Motivational aspects of occupational stratification. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 187-217.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-485.

Cherrington, D. J., Condie, S. J., & England, J. L. (1979). Age and work values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(3), 617-623.

Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 904-930.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 927-946.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange relationships: An examination of psychological contracts and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 774-781.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2003). The employment relationship in the U.K. public sector: A psychological contract perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(2), 213-230.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Neuman, J. (2004). Individual dispositions and the psychological contract: The moderating effects of exchange and creditor ideologies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 150-164.

Crace, R., & Brown, D. (1996). *Life values inventory*. Chapel Hill, NC: Life Values Resources.

References

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2009). *Public administration: An action orientation* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson.

Dhiravegin, L. (2005). The relationship between the elected state officers and the career technocrats [Electronic Version]. Retrieved October 29, 2008, from http://www.dhiravegin.com/detail.php?item_id=000260

Dhiravegin, L. (2006). Three types of constitution in Thai politics [Electronic Version]. Retrieved October 29, 2008, from http://www.dhiravegin.com/detail.php?item_id=000412

Dychtwald, K., Erickson, T. J., & Morison, R. (2006). *Workforce crisis: How to beat the coming shortage of skills and talent*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109-132.

Elder, G., & Conger, R. (2000). *Children of the land: Adversity and success in rural America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379-389.

Elizur, D. (1996). Work values and commitment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 17(3), 25-30.

Elizur, D., & Sagiv, A. (1999). Facets of personal values: A structural analysis of life and work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 73-87.

References

Ganster, D. C., Hennessey, H. W., & Luthans, F. (1983). Social desirability response effects: Three alternative models. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 321-331.

Graham, W. A. (1924). *The races of Siam*. London: Del More Press.

Gruenberg, B. (1980). The happy worker: An analysis of educational and occupational differences in determinants of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(2), 247-271.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hartung, P., Leong, F., Grotti, S., Goh, D., & Gaylor, M. (1998, August). *Birth order effects on Holland type, occupational interests, and values*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hicks, L. E. (1970). Some properties of ipsative, normative, and forced-choice normative measures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 74, 167-184.

Hill, R. B., & Rojewski, J. W. (1999). Double jeopardy: Work ethic differences in youth at risk of school failure. *Career Development Quarterly*, 47, 267-279.

Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6, 35-44.

Holmes, H., & Tangtongtavy, S. (1995). *Working with the Thais: A guide to managing in Thailand*. Bangkok: White Lotus Books.

References

Holmes, H., & Tangtongtavy, S. (2003). *Working with the Thais: A guide to managing in Thailand* (2nd ed.). Bangkok: White Lotus Books.

Hsieh, C.-L. A. (2006). *A study of the relationship between work values and career choice among hospitality management students in Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Idaho State University.

Huberty, C. J., & Morris, J. D. (1989). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*(2), 302-308.

IMD International (Institute). (2009). IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook [Electronic Version]. Retrieved August 29, from <http://www.imd.ch/research/publications/wcy/upload/sampleprofile.pdf>

Jiamrojananon, W. (2007, 22 November). HR & Management. *Bangkok Business*.

Johnson, M. (2001). Change in job values during the transition to adulthood. *Work and Occupations, 28*(3), 315-345.

Karl, K. A., & Sutton, C. L. (1998). Job values in today's workforce: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public Personnel Management, 27*(4), 515-527.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Value and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California Management Review, 15*, 91-99.

References

Kovach, K. A. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, 30, 58-65.

Kuhn, K. (1995). Social values and bureaucratic morality. In G. Magill & M. D. Hoff (Eds.), *Values and public life: An interdisciplinary study*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Larwood, L., Wright, T., Desrochers, S., & Dahir, V. (1998). Extending latent role and psychological contract theories to predict intent to turnover and politics in business organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 23(2), 100-123.

Levinson, H., Price, C. R., Munden, K. J., & Solley, C. M. (1962). *Men, management, and mental health*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Licata, P. P. (2007). *Multiple generations in the workplace: A study comparing work values of different generations of workers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Capella University.

Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand.

Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424-432.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1991). Value congruence and satisfaction with a leader: An examination of the role of interaction. *Human Relations*, 44, 481-495.

References

Morrison, R. E. (1975). *The relationship of personality traits and the meaning and value of work of community junior college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Missouri, Columbia.

Neher, C. D. (1979). A critical analysis of research on Thai politics. In C. D. Neher (Ed.), *Modern Thai politics: From village to nation* (pp. 457-476). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Oliver, N. (1990). Rewards, investments, alternatives and organizational commitment: Empirical evidence and theoretical development. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 19-31.

Osborn-Jones, T. (2004). Managing human talent: Working with the psychological contract. In D. Rees & R. McBain (Eds.), *People management: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 100-125). New York: Palgrave.

Pelled, L. H., & Hill, K. D. (1997). Employee work values and organizational attachment in North Mexican maquiladoras. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(4), 495-505.

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373.

Peter, H. J., & Hansen, J. C. (1966). *Vocational guidance and career development: Selected readings*. New York: MacMillan.

Pine, G. J., & Innis, G. (1987). Cultural and individual work values. *The Career Department Quarterly*, 35(4), 279-287.

Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Liang, T. K. (1989). Work values and organizational commitment: A study in the Asian context. *Human Relations*, 42, 275-288.

References

Raksasataya, A. (1990). *Thailand: An administrative profile* (2nd ed.). Bangkok: School of Public Administration, National Institute of Development Administration.

Recruitment and Selection Center, OCSC. (2008). *A study of the qualifications of persons who apply to the civil service (in Thai)*. Nonthaburi: OCSC.

Reece, L. R., & Brandt, R. (2006). *Human relations: Principle & practices*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Riggs, F. W. (1964). *A model for the study of Thai society*. Bangkok: School of Public Administration, National Institute of Development Administration.

Riggs, F. W. (1966). *Thailand: The modernization of a bureaucratic polity*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

Roe, R. A., & Ester, P. (1999). Values and work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 1, 1-21.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1957). *Occupations and values*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139.

Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the use of content specialists in the assessment of criterion-referenced test item validity. *Dutch Journal of Educational Research*, 2, 49-60.

Rupkumdee, V., & Kunakornsakul, S. (2001). *The impact of Thai cultures and values on the administration of public organization (in Thai)*. Bangkok: Society of Social Development, National Institute of Development Administration.

References

Sagiv, L. (2002). Vocational interest and basic values. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 10(2), 233-257.

Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Simerson, G. R. (1984). Survey of work values. In D. J. Keyser & R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), *Test critiques* (pp. 678-687). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Spence, J. (2003). *The relationship between cooperative education student work values and work site manager's referent power*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Super, D. (1957). *The psychology of careers*. New York: Harper & Brother.

Super, D., & Bohn, M. (1970). *Occupational psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Super, D., & Sverko, B. (1995). *Life roles, values, and careers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Susman, G. I. (1973). Job enlargement: Effects of culture on worker responses. *Industrial Relations*, 1, 1-15.

Sutton, J. L. (1962). Political and administrative leadership. In J. L. Sutton (Ed.), *Problems of politics and administration in Thailand* (pp. 1-22). Bloomington: Institute of Training for Public Service, Department of Government, Indiana University.

Taris, R., Feij, J. A., & van Vianen, A. E. M. (2005). Met expectations and supplies-values fit of Dutch young adults as determinants of work outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3), 366-382.

References

Thorndike, R., Weiss, D., & Dawis, R. (1968). Canonical correlations of vocational interests and vocational needs. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15*, 101-106.

Trank, C. Q., Rynes, S. L., & Bretz, R. D. (2002). Attracting applicants in the war for talent: Differences in work preferences among high achievers. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(3), 331-345.

Van Schuur, W. H. (1997). Intrinsic and extrinsic work values as a single unfolding scale. In J. Rost & R. Langeheine (Eds.), *Applications of latent trait and latent class models in the social sciences* (pp. 163-171). Munster, New York: Waxmann Verlag GMBH.

Vinijnaiyapak, N. (2008). The influence of Thai political culture on democratic governance. *Journal of Public and Private Management, 15*(3), 91-128.

Waskom, T. E. (1981). *An assessment of work values of industrial arts and vocational industrial students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Willems, I., Janvier, R., & Henderickx, E. (2006). New pay in European civil services: Is the psychological contract changing? *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19*(6), 609-621.

Wiruchnipawan, W. (2004). *Thai government officials' values in the administrative reform Era (in Thai)*. Bangkok: Nititham.

Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). Public service motivation and the assumption of person-organization fit: Testing the mediating effect of value congruence. *Administration & Society, 40*(5), 502-521.

References

Wu, C. D. (1976). *Work values in relation to cultures and student characteristics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Yuprasert, P. (1976). *Work values: A comparative study of American and Thai college freshmen students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona.

136 การจัดการการรัฐและภาคเอกชน