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Public Service Values

Abstract

This paper details an approach for empirically eliciting and examining public service values and their impact on decisions made by public servants. The approach involves adaptation of the Schwartz Portrait Values Questionnaire (Schwartz 2001, 2006) such that it 1) elicits values relevant to an individual’s public service role rather than broad personal values, and 2) incorporates values omitted by the Schwartz framework, including those identified by Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) and others. To examine the impact of public service values on specific public management decisions, we use structured decision context statements similar to Tetlock (1986). We find that 1) the adapted instrument maps favorably to the Schwartz personal value space; 2) the public service values space includes value sets that expand and refine the personal value space defined by Schwartz; and 3) the public service values elicited can be used to predict decisions made by respondents in specific public service decision contexts.
Public Service Values

Introduction

In this paper, we propose a new approach to the measurement and analysis of public service values (PSV). We view this new approach as an evolution of the public service motivation (PSM) framework, which has clearly established both the unique nature of values in the public service and the potential power of these values for explaining the behavior of public servants. This paper 1) provides a theoretical framework for the expanded study of public service values, 2) outlines an approach for instrumentation, contextualization, and analysis, and 3) demonstrates the potential utility of this approach by reporting on the results of a pilot study using the PSV methodology.

The study of human values has proven to be of enduring interest in a range of intellectual endeavors. Concerted efforts to operationalize and measure human value systems have persisted in psychology, sociology and philosophy for nearly a century (Beyer 1922; Allport and Vernon 1931). Management scholars have asserted that values matter in understanding the behavior of managers and their subordinates at least since the 1960s (England 1967). The field of public management—including scholars and practitioners—has also begun to develop a literature that focuses on the values that do or should guide those engaged in professional public service (Rutgers 2008). This interest in values by public management scholars has been particularly focused on comparisons between the public and private sectors, particularly in response to the New Public Management movement (Jos and Tompkins 2004). Some argued that those individuals choosing careers in public service had fundamentally different motivating values than those choosing other career paths (Perry and Wise 1990; Houston 2000; Houston 2006; Lyons, Duxbury et al. 2006; Buelens and Van den Broeck 2007; van der Wal and Huberts 2007; de Graaf and van der Wal 2008). Other authors have been more prescriptive, arguing that different values should guide public servants than those guiding private sector employees (Heintzman 2007). Active streams of research continue to evolve in public values (Schmidt and Posner 1986; Selden, Brewer et al. 1999; Kernaghan 2000; Lynn 2001; Kernaghan 2003; Langford 2004; Schreurs 2005; Lyons, Duxbury et al. 2006; Salminen 2006; Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007; van der Wal and Huberts 2007; Rutgers 2008; van der Wal, de Graaf et al. 2008; van der Wal and van Hout 2009) and public decision making (Lindblom 1959; Tetlock 1986; Simon 1997; Nutt 2006).

Among the most prevalent manifestations of this line of research has been public service motivation, which has garnered the interest of scholars from across the globe (Perry and Wise 1990;
Perry 1996; Alonso and Lewis 2001; DeHart-Davis, Marlowe et al. 2006; Coursey and Pandey 2007; Moynihan and Pandey 2007; Paarlberg and Perry 2007). The study of public service motivation and the associated discussion of public values and public decision-making have been a dominating force in academic and practitioner conferences alike.

**PSV: The evolution of PSM**

In their 1990 introduction to the concept of public service motivation, Perry and Wise link the values of public servants to their job-related actions: “In calling for a recommitment of Americans to the values associated with public service, political leaders assume that such motives can be translated into effective and efficient bureaucratic behavior”. We argue that despite valuable contributions made by public service motivation research and research in public values, vital questions remain unanswered, including:

1. What values are most commonly invoked by public administrators to justify action?
2. To what extent does context affect the salience of particular values?
3. To what extent are public service values malleable, e.g. by programs in public administration or on-the-job training and experience?
4. What variation and/or patterns in public service values exist among individual administrators and across sectors and subsectors?
5. To what extent do public service values compete with other values that might not be widely considered to be compatible with serving the public interest?
6. How do public service values change over time?

The explicit study of public service values should seek to provide valuable insights into these questions.

The past two decades of research in public service motivation (PSM) have resulted in strong evidence that public service motivation is a phenomenon with important implications for employee sector choice (Perry and Wise 1990; Houston 2000), human resource practice (Alonso and Lewis 2001), and organizational behavior (Paarlberg and Perry 2007). Much of the PSM literature has focused on issues associated with the identification and measurement of a particular set of personal value constructs as captured in the 6 dimensions of public service motivation (attraction to public policy making, commitment to the public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion). These dimensions were identified as constructs particularly unique and valuable to individuals making
decisions about whether or not to pursue work in the public sector and how to make decisions in the public service work setting.

We argue that the set of potentially relevant public service values is even broader than the set identified by Perry and Wise in 1990. Given the importance of the values identified by the PSM literature for describing and explaining public sector behavior, we posit that a broader view of public service values would help to provide valuable information for understanding the rich diversity of specific preferences, decisions, and behaviors of public servants.

We define public service values as the subset of social, professional, ethical, and other values that are related directly to a person’s role as a public servant, and would be acknowledged by that public servant as reasonable, legitimate and relevant in carrying out the functions of a given position in the public sector. Though public service values motivate professional action, they are distinct from contemporary applications of public service motivation theory. We suggest that the current research in public service motivation is more concerned with a person’s motivation to be in the public service than distinguishing between the many ways in which the specific actions of public servants can be justified.

Other research on personal and organizational values suggest that the values encompassed by PSM are merely a subset of the broader constellation of personal values (Rokeach 1973; Schwartz 1992). Scholarship in public management and related fields in the past decade has broadened the spectrum of values relevant in the public sector to include dozens of values that are relevant to the practice of government. Such scholarship includes lists and taxonomies of potentially relevant values (Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007), discussions of the role of values in the public service (van Wart 1996; 1998; Kernaghan 2003), descriptions of the role of moral and ethical values in the public service (Tsirogianni and Gaskell 2011), efforts at eliciting personal values in a public service context, and some work directly relating personal and organizational values to the decisions made by individual public servants (Wright 2007). This broader range of relevant public service values—which encompasses and complements the dimensions of the PSM scale—suggests that the current state of inquiry may benefit from a measurement tool that allows for an expanded view of the full range of values at play in public service decision making.

PSM research has been broadening from questions of sector and occupation selection into behaviors, attitudes, and decisions of public servants, and the theory is applied in a variety of sector, subsector, international, and operational contexts despite its limited application in these venues. We
therefore view PSV as a natural evolution of PSM—a next step in a rich and vital area of public administration scholarship. Among the legacies of PSM are the quantification of personal indicators that affect choices relevant to the public sector, an increased understanding of the fundamental and inherent differences between the public and private sectors, active discussions about the role of the public interest in the motivations and decision processes of public servants, and the potential impact of personal value preferences on actions taken in the public sphere. Despite these strengths and contributions, the PSM approach is limited by both instrumentation and methodology. Though some researchers have worked to refine and update the PSM instrument, the PSM scale remains a largely acontextual measure, tailored to the public sector as a whole but not particularly adaptable to subsectors or subfields within the sector, and somewhat limited in the scope of actions that can be explained or predicted.

The public service motivation scale was designed to answer specific questions regarding the motivation of some individuals to serve the public by becoming public officials. Expansion of these motivational bases to a broader range of contexts allows public service motivation to ask, what would a person with high levels of public service motivation do in a given context? What would a person with low levels of public service motivation do? Which of the 6 dimensions of PSM is the primary driver of this action? The broader PSV approach allows for additional inquiries. For example, how do the values of individuals in one public subsector differ from those of another? In a particular decision context, which values are most frequently considered by public servants? Which values are invoked to justify one action, and which values are used to justify its alternative? Which values are most commonly invoked by public servants in defending or explaining their decisions? By broadening the scope of potentially relevant public service values and providing a methodology designed to situate this constellation of values in a particular decision context, the PSV approach stands to add significant value to the questions raised by the scholars of PSM.

**Developing a theory of public service values**

Jørgensen and Bozeman note that in general, “the study of public values is often hamstrung by more general problems in the study of values” (p. 354). The study of public service values is further confounded by a lack of clarity about whether such values ought to be considered personal values (as in the PSM approach), societal values (as in the public values approach), or professional values (as frequently invoked in practice through codes of ethics and professional values statements). We believe it is possible to overcome these barriers to the study of public service values by adapting a widely
 validated empirical approach to the elicitation of personal values and adapting it for use in the study of values invoked in an explicitly professional public service setting. Such adaptation requires an understanding of 1) personal value constructs, 2) ways in which public service values differ from personal values, and 3) issues of measurement and conceptualization.

Concerns among policy makers, scholars and practitioners about the values guiding public employees—particularly following trends encouraging the use of private sector values and practices in public management (Kernaghan 2003)—have led to the formulation of formal public service values codes in several countries including Canada (Office of Public Service Values and Ethics 2003), Australia (Australian Public Service Commission 2009), and the United Kingdom (Office of the Civil Service Commissioners 2006). Concerns about the principles actually guiding practice have led a number of governments around the world to articulate values meant to guide public servants in the performance of their professional duties (Tait 1997; Kernaghan 2003). Similarly, professional associations such as the U.S. National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) and the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) have adopted standards and codes that attempt to enumerate and codify public service values (Mandell 2009).

Despite these efforts, much of the values research by scholars in the field of public administration has connected only peripherally with research in personal values from other fields. A rich body of literature describes personal values and the mechanisms involved in value-based reasoning and decision-making and suggests that personal values are integral to the way individuals reason about actions they take (Tetlock 1986; Skitka and Tetlock 1993; Weber 1993; Korsgaard, Meglino et al. 1996; Marini, Fan et al. 1996; Fiske and Tetlock 1997; Lockwood 1999; Oliver 1999; Tetlock 2000; Jackson 2001; Hemingway and Maclagan 2004; McGuire, Garavan et al. 2006; Fritzsche and Oz 2007; Leikas, Lonnqvist et al. 2009; Suar and Khuntia 2010).

Despite their generally acknowledged importance, Schreurs (2005) argues that there continues to be a substantial lack of clarity about the definition of values in the field of public administration. At the same time, there is fairly broad agreement on common features of the value set. Following a review offered by Schwartz and Bilsky, we understand values in general to be “(a) concepts or beliefs, (b) about desirable end states or behaviors (c) that transcend specific situations, (d) guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and (e) are ordered by relative importance” (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987 pg. 551). This is consistent with the definition offered by Rescher (1969) and provides us with a working definition of a value:
V is one of N’s values if and only if N is prepared to invoke V favorably – and to acknowledge the legitimacy of its invocation by another – in the rationalization of action.

In pursuit of a universal system of observing and categorizing personal values, Schwartz (Schwartz 1992; Schwartz, Melech et al. 2001) catalogued and validated a system of ten personal value sets in 20 countries with more than 8,000 respondents. Since 2002, the European Social Survey has included a shortened version of Schwartz’s Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) (Schwartz 2011). Figure 1 presents the Schwartz value framework.

The Schwartz framework asserts that there are ten universal personal value sets (hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, conformity, tradition, security, power, and achievement) that undergird the decisions of all individuals. Each value set pursues a particular objective or value goal (e.g. the goal of achievement values is achieving personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards; the goal of power values is to achieve social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources; see table 1). Schwartz contends that all personal values can be empirically mapped within these value sets, using an analytic approach called smallest space analysis.

The Schwartz personal values framework has been used extensively in personal values research in various fields, including the field of public administration (e.g., Lyons, Duxbury et al. 2006). This personal values set, however, lacks many of the societal values that are uniquely relevant to decisions in the public sector. Indeed, an examination of the various taxonomies of societal public values suggests at least some values (e.g. transparency, neutrality) do not naturally fit within a personal value framework and would be rarely, if ever, invoked in personal decision-making outside an organizational setting. It is clear, however, that such values are very likely to be invoked by individual decision makers in making decisions in their roles as public servants. While the Schwartz personal value framework appears to successfully describe the preferences of individuals, they may not accurately capture the preferences of societies in aggregate. The primary challenge in the study of public service values is to represent the unique set of values that must be invoked personally by individuals in behalf of larger groups—often in behalf of whole communities or even nations.

In 1998, Van Wart called for the creation of a “field of public administration values,” (1998, pg xix) and enumerated five value sources used in public sector decision making: individual, professional, organizational, legal and public interest. Though Van Wart elucidates many of the motivations for engaging in the systematic study of public service values, he fails to adopt a single, specific definition of public values and this affects the measurement approaches he prescribes (Rutgers 2008).
In response to Van Wart’s research agenda, several public administration scholars have been working to identify the set of values that are uniquely applicable to a public service setting and by which citizens and scholars might evaluate the processes and outcomes of government. Rutgers (2008) examines multiple efforts to categorize and classify public values and finds that most efforts fail to offer a reasoned justification for the classifications offered. Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007), for example, performed a literature review with the purpose of identifying the values most commonly invoked as values ascribed to government in the literature of public administration and generated a list of some 72 values they organized based on the aspects of public administration affected by invoking the values. As they note, such analysis is absent both history and context, and self-consciously makes no claims regarding the results of invoking any value or value set. Nonetheless, the initial taxonomy of values has the advantages of providing “an overall impression of the scope of public values, … creat[ing] room for contemplation,” and “identify[ing] closely related values and weed[ing] out synonyms” (358).

The Jørgensen and Bozeman inventory of public values provides a valuable starting point for examining public service values. It is important to note one fundamental difference, however, in the way we operationalize the concept of a “public service value” as compared with the conceptualization of “public values” as conceived by Bozeman. Whereas Bozeman (2007) conceptualizes public values as “providing normative consensus about (1) the rights, benefits, and prerogatives to which citizens should (and should not) be entitled; (2) the obligations of citizens to society, the state and one another; (3) and the principles on which governments and policies should be based” (37), we define public service values as the justifications invoked by public servants for actions taken in the public sphere.

Whereas Bozeman’s public values are society-level outcomes that are achieved by the collective action of a wide range of public and private actors, public service values are justifications for action, and pertain explicitly to action taken by individual public servants. The two sets of values may indeed have significant overlap; it is common for public servants to invoke broadly accepted social outcomes (i.e. public values) to justify their actions. However, the operational role of public values (society-level outcomes) and public service values (individual-level justification for action) differs substantially in practice. We submit that the current public values literature lacks the micro-theoretical grounding to provide an understanding of the psychological dimensions that impact the individual decisions of individual public servants. By re-introducing concepts related to the measurement and conceptualization of values from the field of psychology, we hope to enhance the current literature on public values by shifting the unit of analysis back to the individual decisionmaker.
The study of public sector decisions—whether examined at the personal or societal level—is complicated by some difficult challenges. In particular, the articulation and study of public service values is made complex by the fact that well-accepted and widely-endorsed values are often in conflict with each other (Simon 1946; Kaufman 1956; Kernaghan 2000; O’Kelly and Dubnick 2006). The work of public administrators requires tenuous balances to be struck between principles that are, by their very nature, inherently in opposition. Public administrators may embrace the values of equality, justice, objectivity, public safety, freedom, and civic engagement on their face, but when these values come into conflict, it is less apparent which values should reign supreme either in general or even in specific cases (Kernaghan 2000).

Vickers (1973) asserts that one of the many factors constantly at work to change the standards for public action is a shifting and persuasive public discourse that frequently appeals to broad social concepts such as equality, justice and liberty. These “abstract qualitative words” come in complementary and paradoxical pairs (freedom and order, independence and collaboration, justice and mercy). Vickers considers each member of such a pair to be a value. This view of values as members of contradictory value pairs resonates with several streams in the current policy process literature (e.g., Kingdon 2003), policy analysis (Paris and Reynolds 1983) and recent thinking on social values (Tsirogianni and Gaskell 2011). Other recent work, however, suggests that such value pairs are not static; rather, the pairing of values as situational opposites is strikingly fluid and sensitive to context (van der Wal,2009, Tetlock 1986).

Such value conflicts are at the root of public debates about important issues in the work of government: Should the use of racial or ethnic characteristics by law enforcement officials be prohibited even if it reduces crime overall? Should a city provide a permit to a white supremacist group for a public rally even though hate speech will be prominent during the rally? Should citizen involvement be required in public decision processes even if it hinders the ability of an agency to fulfill its mission and duties? Values—concepts or beliefs that guide behavior—guide the actions of public managers in making difficult choices in their roles as public servants. While the values to which public servants appeal for making their decisions may be socially derived, it is at the individual level that these values are actually weighed, evaluated, and ultimately selected as justifications for public action. This individual-level application of value-based reasoning is particularly pivotal in situations where the opposing values are perceived as being equally valued by society at-large. In such cases, two opposing actions may be equally justifiable based on socially derived public values. It is in these cases that the value hierarchies of individual public servants are most critical—if either choice is equally justifiable to
the public, the public servant has tremendous discretion over which value to favor and which choice to make.

Several past attempts to construct inventories or hierarchies of values have done so by focusing primarily on whether or not a particular value is important (Perry 1996; van Wart 1998; Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007), implicitly or explicitly constructing dichotomous value pairs as a positive value (e.g. “involving citizens”, “being effective”) and its negative opposite (e.g. “not involving citizens”, “being ineffective”). This approach creates false dichotomies in which positive values will almost certainly be preferred over their negative counterparts. In practice, the interesting and discriminating question facing public administrators is often a choice between two (or more) actions, each of which is equally justifiable to the public based on different public values. To illustrate with a public engagement example, a participatory process question is rarely framed as the query, “should citizen involvement be included in public decision processes?” Rather it is framed as a choice between two justifiable actions each representing a potentially valid alternative value perspective: “Should citizen involvement be included in public decision processes even if it hinders the ability of an agency to fulfill its mission and duties?” Depending on the value orientation of the particular civil servants involved, there may be significant variation in the answer to the second question even if there was broad agreement on the first.

Tetlock (1986) suggests a value pluralism model in which “people are likely to think about an issue domain in integratively complex ways to the degree that issue domain activates conflicting values that people perceive as (a) important and (b) approximately equally important” (819). Van der Wal (2009) finds that value pluralism is particularly relevant in the public sphere, and that “some of the classical public values show signs of multiplicity, hybridity, and conflict, both internally and in relation to one another” (220).

By identifying the set of possible values that might justify either of the manager’s decisions, we can begin to order the manager’s individual public service value profile based on the actual decision made by the manager. If the manager chooses to solicit citizen involvement, we know that in this context, she finds civic engagement to be more justifiable than effectiveness. A collection of action justifications made by managers facing similar situational contexts can yield a broader view of the values in common use in those contexts. With sufficient replication, a map of values in common use across subsectors, professions, supervisory status, context, or other relevant groupings may be generated.
An empirical hierarchy of values emerging from the stated preferences, rationalizations and actions of public administrators can provide an instructive picture of how public service values are invoked, affected by context, how they change (or do not change) over time, and what patterns exist across and within subsectors. Previous research on the study of public values has found that not only are they pluralistic within cultural contexts, they also differ significantly across cultural contexts, adding another layer of potential complexity (van der Wal, Pevkur et al. 2008). An empirical approach to the study of values across contexts would provide a basis for understanding how the values of public administrators affect their actions and how the relationship of values and actions are limited or altered by socio-cultural considerations and other contextual variables.

The PSV approach and methodology

We propose a theoretical framework in which personal values form a public service value “space.” Individual values, motivations, and beliefs form a pool from which relevant constructs can be selected and applied dependent upon context. In order to effectively apply this framework in a measurement context, we propose a measurement approach that 1) maps the value space by identifying value concepts relevant to public sector decision-making and their relationships relative to one another, and 2) mimics the process of making individual decisions such that relevant values may be invoked in support of—or opposition to—a proposed course of action.

The PSV approach involves the combination of two different types of instrumentation. The first is a questionnaire that elicits public service values in a manner based on the work of Schwartz (Schwartz 1992; Schwartz, Melech et al. 2001). The Public Service Value Questionnaire (PSVQ) includes 40 questions. The second instrument is a decision scenario instrument based on the work of Tetlock (1986) that can be tailored to the context, scenario, or topic of interest by the individual researcher. Descriptions of each instrument and its development is elucidated below. First, it is useful to have a general understanding of the overall PSV methodology. The PSV approach involves the following steps:

1. Administration of the Public Service Value Questionnaire, which identifies respondents’ affinity for specific values using a methodology based on the work of Schwartz (Schwartz, Melech et al. 2001).
2. Elicitation of decision preferences on the topic of interest using a decision context and scenario that asks the respondent to make a decision on a dichotomous (yes or no) question (Tetlock)
3. Gathering information for sensitivity analysis in the decision scenario by asking the respondent to identify how certain they are that they made the correct decision based on the information provided (Tetlock 1986).

4. Mapping the “value space” of respondents using Smallest Space Analysis to determine, for the particular respondent pool, the relative positions of each value, allowing for the identification of clusters relationships between value constructs.

5. Regression (logit or probit) of the decision preferences of respondents on the elicited values to identify the values most relevant for supporting or opposing the decision identified in the decision scenario.

6. Regression (linear) of the decision preferences of respondents — weighted by the certainty measure — on the elicited values to identify the impact of values on the strength of conviction relative to the decision context.

7. Inclusion of the relevant values, as identified by 1-6 above, in more sophisticated models of the decision scenario, controlling for all appropriate covariates.

The approach outlined above identifies the basic procedure for applying the PSV approach to a deeper understanding of any decision scenario faced by a given population of public servants. The data from this approach—particularly the values elicited through use of the PSVQ—could obviously be used in a variety of other ways to deepen our understanding of public service values. For example, the value space maps of different groups of respondents could be compared to map the differences and similarities of public service values across subsectors, across time, by levels of education and experience, and myriad other factors.

**Development of the PSVQ**

Public service values are the set of values that uniquely describe justifications for action in a public service setting. For this reason, we began the development of the Public Service Values Questionnaire with Jørgensen and Bozeman’s (2007) inventory of public values. This inventory was based on a literature review of relevant scholarly work on the topic of values in the public sector. Given their systematic effort at creating this inventory, we felt it a natural starting place for our inventory.

As discussed previously, the Jørgensen and Bozeman list of public values was not adapted for individual-level value mapping. To begin the process of formulating these values at the personal level, we hypothesized where we expected each public value to appear if mapped to one of the ten value sets.
identified by Schwartz. During this process we encountered four types of problems: 1) some key public service values appeared to be missing from the Jørgensen and Bozeman list, 2) some public values did not seem to clearly fit in any of the personal value sets as identified by Schwartz, 3) some public values seemed to cluster around subtopics within value sets identified by the Schwartz framework, suggesting that some of the Schwartz value sets were too broad to adequately describe the public service context, and 4) following mapping of the public values into the personal values framework, some Schwartz value sets (hedonism in particular) were left functionally empty.

The Jørgensen and Bozeman inventory of public values did not contain values that, at the time of the inventory, may have appeared in praxis but not in academic literature. We therefore consciously sought to identify enunciations of public service values in practice, including codes of ethics and other public service value statements. Among the supplemental sources considered were the NASPAA accreditation standards (NASPAA 2009), values articulated by the British Office of the Civil Service Commissioners (2006), and a small set of values identified as important by the authors.iii We also added a small subset of potentially relevant values directly adapted from Schwartz with the intent of using these values to validate the instrument and to orient our work in the larger context of the personal values framework.

Even after compiling this somewhat larger list of public service values, the hedonism value set still had virtually no potential public service values included. This is not surprising given that a strong body of literature including a significant body of empirical work finds that public servants tend to be less extrinsically motivated than their private sector counterparts, and that public servants should subjugate personal gains to the pursuit of public interest (e.g., Rainey 1982; Crewson 1997). However, in the interest of creating a balanced framework and in light of some findings that suggest that some extrinsic motivations can be important to public servants (Crewson 1997), we selected a small set of values from other scholarship (Schwartz, Melech et al. 2001) that we expected to map within the hedonism value set.

Following this mapping of public values to the personal value framework, we identified a value goal for each value set. The value goal defines the value set by identifying the goal toward which application of any of the goals in the set should be working. In other words, value goals identify the desired outcome of the action resulting from application of the values within that value set. In some cases, the Schwartz goal statements lacked either clarity or parallel structure, so we edited these for consistency while remaining true to the original intent of the value goals identified by Schwartz, resulting in some
differences in operationalization between our value goals and those articulated in Schwartz’ original theory.

Some public values comprised value sets (such as transparency and objectivity) that did not appear to map into the Schwartz personal value framework. For these value sets, we developed value goal descriptions and hypothesized where they would appear in a mapping of public service values relative to the other values. We did the same for subsets of values that mapped into the Schwartz framework but between which we expected greater delineation in a public service value context.

This initial mapping process resulted in a list of 97 values, mapping to 12 value sets and 17 hypothesized value goals. This list of value sets, theoretical and operational value goals, and list of potential public service values are identified in Table 1, which includes references to the source(s) for each value, value set, and value goal.

The Schwartz questionnaire focuses on eliciting personal values by providing statements that describe a value held by an individual and asking “how much like you is this person?” This approach provides a broad view of the personal values that guide individuals. Values applied in the personal lives of individuals, however, differ from the values they consider when acting as workers and employing the values of the organization they represent (Korsgaard, Meglino et al. 1996; Lyons, Higgins et al. 2010). We have adapted the PVQ from a personal orientation to a professional one and created a Public Service Values Questionnaire (PSVQ) that includes items for eliciting public values specifically in relation to a public service work setting. This is done by altering the statements from a format that provides general statements about espoused values to one that 1) explicitly identifies the individual for comparison as a public servant and 2) identifies a public service context for the application of the value described. The revised prompt reads, “Each of the following statements indicates a value that is often associated with the role of a public servant. Imagine a public official who is guided by the value indicated in their role as a public employee. Please indicate how much that public servant is like you.” While this adaptation was developed independently, it is consistent with the suggestion made by Tsirogianni and Gaskell (2011).

In order to operationalize the list of potential public service values for use in the PSVQ, we generated appropriate statements for each of the values we identified. We used parallel structure to 1) avoid aberrations in the data based on phrasing, 2) elicit values in a manner generally consistent with
Schwartz, and 3) clearly identify both the value and its operational definition. Each question on the PSVQ uses the following format:

“He/She believes that [value] is important. He/She believes that public servants should [operational definition of value].”

To use social justice as an example, we used the following phrasing:

“He/She believes that social justice is important. He/She believes that public servants should seek justice for everybody, even for people they don’t know.”

To ensure that the PSVQ statements effectively elicited the values they were intended to represent, and that these values could be reasonably expected to map within the value sets we had hypothesized, five independent coders (including the researchers and their research assistants) independently matched each PSVQ value statement with the value set goals we had identified. To accomplish this, we created an electronic survey that presented each value statement and asked the coder to select the most appropriate value goal from a list of value goal descriptions (see column 3 of table 1). Following the coding exercise, we excluded all statements that did not have either unanimous (16 statements) or nearly unanimous (4 out of 5 coders; 20 statements) agreement regarding the match of the value statement and the value goal. We then edited the instrument such that each value set included at least two value statements. This process resulted in the final 40 value statements included in the PSVQ instrument. The bolded values in the “Value” column of Table 1 indicate the values for which corresponding statements were ultimately included in the final instrument.

The complete list of the 40 statements comprising the PSVQ is found in the appendix. The PSVQ presents the value statements tailored to the gender of the respondent (female respondents received statements using the pronoun “she” and male respondents received statements using the pronoun “he”), followed by a prompt to indicate the extent to which the person described in the statement is similar to the respondent. Responses were solicited on a 7-point ordinal scale from “not at all like me” (1) to “just like me” (7).

Development of the decision scenarios

We are interested in mapping public service values and identifying their relevance to decision-making in the public service context. Because not all value constructs are relevant to every context (Kelly 1955, 1991), examination of value preferences requires identification of specific contexts in which the
values are to be applied. Because public service value tradeoffs in situ generally involve conflict between two justifiable choices (Tetlock 1986; Kernaghan 2000; van der Wal and van Hout 2009), it is imperative that the instrument and resulting analysis in combination should enable the identification of both poles of constructs relevant to the decision context.

Decision scenarios in the PSV approach serve as the primary dependent variables and should be tailored by the researcher to identify decisions and contexts of interest to the relevant research. For instruction on the development of these scenarios, we closely follow the work of Tetlock. Tetlock (1986) created a protocol for eliciting simulated policy decisions and found that he was able to elicit value hierarchies based on a combination of expressed policy preferences and the knowledge of which values respondents deemed important. We favor the Tetlock approach for examining simulated decisions because it 1) allows for conflict between two potentially justifiable actions, 2) has been validated in a public service context, 3) explicitly employs individual-level values for examining the impact of values on decisions, and 4) provides both context and, by omitting the specific decision details often prevalent in vignette approaches, transcends individual decisions as demanded by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987).

Following Tetlock, each value conflict scenario identifies a topic relevant to the public administrator in his or her role as public servant, and identifies implicit rationales that could justify each of two opposing decisions within the scenario. We generated several value conflict scenarios using the following general structure (see column 1 of table 2 for sample statements):

Should [action to be taken, including some justification] even if/though [value tradeoff consequence of action to be taken]?

The value conflict section of the final survey instrument provides the value conflict scenarios and invites respondents to (a) take a yes or no stand in response to the action suggested and (b) to rate their confidence in the correctness of their policy stands on a 7-point scale. We would like to emphasize that the purpose of the conflict scenarios used in the pilot study presented in this paper (see below) are intended merely to provide initial evidence regarding the potential utility for the PSVQ in describing and predicting the decisions made by public servants. They are not part of the PSVQ itself, and are not intended to represent the full range of decisions made by public servants. They demonstrate, however, the methodology we recommend for phrasing of decision scenarios as part of the PSV approach that can be tailored to virtually any research on the decisions and actions of public servants. We believe that the flexibility in the PSV approach will allow both for consistency (through the PSVQ) and adaptation to a
wide range of research applications. We have identified some key considerations for use in developing scenarios for future research. These considerations include both technical concerns (i.e. whether there is enough variation in the decision scenarios to yield useable results) and substantive concerns (i.e. does the study of this scenario improve our understanding of the world). Decision scenarios most likely to yield useful research results share the following characteristics:

1. The decision can be presented as a dichotomous (yes or no) question.
2. Specific outcome tradeoffs can be identified for either of the two presented options.
3. The decision in the scenario maps to actual decisions commonly made by public servants.
4. The decision involves considerable outcome tradeoffs that are equally justifiable in terms of the broad public interest.
5. There is variation in the responses to the scenario, signifying broad disagreement regarding which decision is the appropriate course of action.
6. The decision has a significant impact on social outcomes.

The study of a broad array of decision scenarios in varying contexts and at different levels of public sector hierarchies (i.e. examining the decisions of politicians, administrators, and street-level bureaucrats) will significantly improve our understanding of the use and application of public service values in practice.

*Analytic techniques*

To describe the values in terms of value sets, value “space,” and the relative locations of public service values, we employ smallest space analysis (SSA) to map values to a two-dimensional space in a manner similar to Schwartz (1992). Smallest space analysis is a variation of multidimensional scaling originally developed by Guttman (Guttman 1968; Elizur, Borg et al. 1991). To determine the impact of individual value preferences on decisions made in value conflict scenarios, we perform logistic regression analysis using the decisions identified by respondents as the dependent variable, with value statement variables as independent variables. In such analysis, the decision to “yes” support the decision is coded 1 and the decision to “no” not support the decision is coded 0.

*Results of a pilot study using the PSV approach*

In order to pilot test the PSV approach to mapping public service values and examine the impact of public service values on decisions in a public service setting, we conducted a small-scale study using
current students and recent alumni of a NASPAA-accredited public administration program. The objectives of the pilot study were to:

1. Verify that the PSVQ elicited values in a manner consistent with Schwartz, and that Public service values derived from the Schwartz personal values framework would empirically map within the universal personal value sets described by Schwartz.
2. Determine whether public service values are sufficiently different from general personal values (i.e. the Schwartz personal values framework) to justify use of the new PSVQ instrument rather than the Schwartz Portrait Values Questionnaire in the study of public service values
3. Establish face validity to the claim that the appropriate and relevant public service values elicited through the PSVQ would appear as significant predictors in decision scenarios
4. Demonstrate that different decision scenarios elicit different predictor values from the PSVQ. In other words not all values are equally relevant to every public sector decision context.

We used e-mail to invite 370 current students and recent alumni to participate in the study. The potential respondent pool included executive MPA (EMPA) students and graduates (each with a minimum of four years of prior work experience) and current and past students of a full-time MPA (MPA) program (with widely varying prior work experience). From this group, 129 individuals (35%) provided useable responses. Of these, 55 percent were current or former EMPA students and 45 percent were current or former MPA students. The average age of respondents was 33.4 years (EMPA 38.5 years, MPA 27.2 years). The average work experience was seven years (EMPA 10.0 years, MPA 2.8 years), and 55 percent of respondents were full-time employees at the time of the survey. The final electronic survey instrument used in the pilot study included three sections: 1) twelve hypothetical public sector decision scenarios (see column 1 of table 2), 2) the 40 statement PSVQ, and 3) demographic and work-related information.

Our first objective was to demonstrate that public service values consistent with the personal values framework would map within the value sets described by Schwartz (1992). To map the values, we used smallest space analysis (SSA). It should be noted that as Schwartz and colleagues have validated their approach in over 20 countries, they have routinely found slight empirical variations from their theoretical model. Schwartz (1992) reports these variations by counting the number of “correct locations” in the SSA and the number of moves required to “fit [the] ideal structure.” A correct location means that the sample SSA placed the value in the theoretically expected location in relationship to other values. The number of moves for a value location that does not fall where expected is simply a count of the number of segments (see Figure 1) away from its theoretical location. The correct location is an indication of how well the data fit the model exactly, and the number of moves indicates how well
the data fit the model approximately. Out of 40 samples that Schwartz reports, none fit the model perfectly for all values, but Schwartz reports that the number of correct locations varied from 73 percent to 98 percent and the average number of moves required to fit the expected structure was 2.4.

The overall results of the SSA for our sample are shown in Figure 2. The figure reports the SSA location of each value item and the value sets as we describe them based on the empirical evidence. The items indicated with filled circles indicate items adapted from the original Schwartz instrument. Of the nine items borrowed from the Schwartz questionnaire, six of them map within regions predicted by the personal values framework. The exceptions are:

- Responding to the needs of others ... try to support those they know.
- Being decisive ... be leaders and make important decisions
- Creativity ... be able to experience and express independent thought and creative ideas.

Responding to others was expected to map into the benevolence value set but appeared in the community/responsiveness value set (1 move). Decisiveness appeared as an achievement value rather than as a value within the power value set as expected (1 move). Creativity, which mapped to the stimulation value set, was expected to map into the self-direction value set but this value set did not materialize as hypothesized. If self-direction had been observed as a value set, we would expect it to appear between the stimulation set and the community/responsiveness set (because this marks the beginning of what would have been universalism in the Schwartz framework). Because creativity appears on the opposite side of the other stimulation items, we consider it 1 move away from its hypothesized value set. Note that in none of these cases did the values map outside of the broad value set categories (i.e. self-transcendence, openness to change, self-enhancement) identified by Schwartz. We believe that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the PSV approach is reasonably consistent with the findings of Schwartz.

The second objective of the study was to determine whether or not public service values are sufficiently different from personal values to justify use of the PSVQ. While the overall structure of the SSA image for our sample is strikingly similar to the Schwartz framework, there are several additions (indicated by asterisks). These additions are value sets for equity, neutrality, stability, social justice, transparency/citizen influence, community/responsiveness, and group interest. Note that fully half of this graph (the right side) describes items that would have been subsumed under the “universalism” value set in the personal values framework.
We expected universalism to be separated into three distinct value sets (universalism, equity/justice, and group interest), and for transparency, neutrality, citizen influence and cooperation to emerge as new and unique value sets. The values we expected to define each of these value sets are listed in table 1. We had expected that a public service context would result in three value sets (universalism, equity, and group interest) in place of Schwartz’ broader concept of universalism. In fact, values that had appeared in the “universalism” category in the Schwartz model span six public service value sets, including equity, neutrality, stability, social justice, transparency/citizen influence, and community/responsiveness. Group interest mapped as a unique space encompassing stakeholder interest (as predicted), moral values, and collaboration. The citizen influence and transparency value sets, predicted to be reflective of different value goals, appear indistinguishable according to this value map, appearing in precisely the same value space and encompassing all of the values predicted for either value set. Figure 3 presents a public service values framework based on our empirical work.

Though some of the specific values did not map as predicted by Table 1, it is clear from the value map that the Schwartz framework alone would have been inadequate to describe the full range of public service values as articulated in the framework suggested by mapping responses to the PSVQ. Though not necessarily in locations predicted by the original framework, each of our hypothesized value sets emerged in some form through the empirical analysis. Additionally, some observations can be made about values that are not synonymous but are clearly related (i.e. transparency and citizen influence, community and responsiveness) and others that suggest values that merit additional consideration as unique public service value goals (e.g. stability). The Schwartz theory places hedonism on the boundary and in both openness to change and self-enhancement. Our data place it between achievement and power, both of which are self-enhancement value types for Schwartz. It is also difficult to interpret group interest as appearing between achievement and stimulation. These anomalies suggest that larger more diverse samples and further replication will be required to fully explicate the multidimensional structure of public service values.

The third objective of the pilot study was to verify that the values measured by the PSVQ would be useful in predicting how public servants make decisions. The decision scenarios included in this pilot are presented in table 2. The first column identifies the scenarios presented to respondents. The second column of the table reports the percent of survey respondents who responded that they would agree (a “yes” response) with the decision presented. This dichotomous response was used as the dependent variable in a logistic regression in which the respondent’s value scores from the 40-item PVSQ were the
only explanatory variables. It should be stressed that no attempt was made to develop definitive
explanatory models for the decision scenarios; the purpose of this step in the PSV approach is merely to
identify the contextually relevant values from the larger set of public service values. We were also
interested in the proportion of the decision variation that could be explained using PSVQ values alone.
The third column of Table 2 reports the pseudo-$R^2$ for each model. The pseudo-$R^2$ values range,
depending on the model, from about 0.16 to 0.36, with an average explanatory value of about 0.27. This
means that, on average, about a quarter of the variation in the decisions made by individual
respondents can be explained using the PSVQ alone.\textsuperscript{vii}

The last two columns of Table 2 report the public service values that were found to be statistically
significant (95 percent confidence level) in explaining the probability of either a yes or no decision. Each
statistically significant public service value is accompanied by the percent change statistic, indicating the
substantive influence each value had on the ultimate decision indicated by respondents. These values
represent the percentage change in the probability of a “yes” or “no” decision associated with a 10%
increase at the mean of the given value dimension, other values held constant.

The fourth objective of the pilot study was to verify that different decision scenarios would share
covariation with different values. In other words, we hoped to demonstrate that public sector decisions
are not always supported by the same set of values. Given that the PSM approach focuses on 6
dimensions that are important to public servants, we needed to provide at least initial evidence that
these 6 dimensions, however valuable, are not sufficient for predicting, describing, and explaining the
vast array of public sector decisions.

Indeed, the results of our pilot study suggest that the PSV approach provides an effective method
for eliciting unique value constellations that vary by scenario and context. In no case were the identified
value subsets the same across decision scenarios. Several values appeared more than once across the
decision scenarios, including (in alphabetical order) altruism (3), collaboration (3), democracy (2),
effectiveness (3), efficiency (2), enthusiasm (2), government neutrality (3), legality (3), national security
(3), political neutrality (2), protection of minorities (2), responding to others (2), responsiveness (2),
salary (3), and self-interest (2). Despite this overlap of individual values, the percent change coefficients
suggest that the relative importance of each of these values differs based on context. Values that were
used to support one decision were often used to oppose another.
We also found that several values were not correlates of the decision scenarios we examined. Values such as public interest, impartiality, neutrality, security of information, and others did not appear as statistically significant predictors of either positive or negative decisions in any of the scenarios presented. This does not mean that these values are unimportant in the public sector. Rather, it suggests that these values are not likely to be invoked in defense of the particular actions examined in this study. These values may be highly relevant, however, to other types of decision scenarios faced in the public sector. Replication in a variety of contexts and using a variety of decision scenarios will help to establish how, when, and how frequently particular public service values are used to justify actions. It is also possible that there was insufficient variation in some of these values to prove statistically useful in predicting decisions. In other words, these are values which may have been invoked with similar frequency by people on either side of an issue.

Most of the values in table 2 have strong face validity and correspond to our general understanding of how issues are formulated in the eyes of public sector decision-makers. A preference for citizen involvement (scenario 2), for example, is supported by decisiveness, democracy, and altruism, but opposed by those who value efficiency and enthusiasm. However, consistent with the work of Tetlock, values and value tradeoffs appear to be complex. Some of the empirical results appear surprising or even counterintuitive. In this early stage of development of the PSV approach, it is imperative to distinguish between rich findings that demonstrate integrative complexity, and findings that suggest issues with instrumentation. The relevance of the value “national security,” for example, in support of hate speech rally permits (scenario 1) and English-only initiatives (scenario 6) and against citizen surveys (scenario 10) is not immediately apparent. Likewise, the value of salary appears in support of overturning illegal policies (scenario 3), in opposition to citizen initiatives (scenario 4), and in support of novel budgeting approaches (scenario 11). In refining the PSV approach, it is important that the values as elicited are measured effectively and that the values are indeed public service values and broadly relevant to decisions made in the public sector. The case examples suggested by these two particular values suggest the possibility of muddying the analysis with values that are either poorly articulated in the PSV, conflated with other values and/or unmeasured sociopolitical influences, or understood differently by researchers than by practitioners. The salary example further suggests that some values, while relevant to public service work generally, may not actually be public service values as defined in this paper, and should be excluded. Future work should refine and further validate the values included in the PSVQ and their phrasing.
What is clear from Table 2 is that public service values appear to be important variables in understanding public service decisions, and that the PSVQ has the potential to provide significant insight to the decision-making processes of public servants. One intriguing observation from the table is that the conflicts were not interpreted as simply value A vs. value B. Rather, the conflicts often appear to be a constellation of values on both sides of the issue. In some scenarios, four or five value differences explain nearly one-third of the variation in decisions made. We view this as good evidence in support of the utility of the PSV approach, suggesting that refinement of the PSVQ and replication of the study is merited.

Summary and future directions

The results of the pilot study for the PSV approach suggests that this methodology has great potential for answering important unanswered questions regarding the role of values in the public sector. However, the empirical analysis presented here must be interpreted as very preliminary. The sample was limited in size, respondents were fairly homogeneous in their political views and social backgrounds, and all had a connection to the same graduate program. The validity and ultimate value of the approach is dependent on replication of the approach in a variety of settings, for different subsectors, with different public service populations, and over time. We invite robust validation of the PSVQ instrument such that we can ultimately develop a cohesive and informative body of literature on public service values in the same way that the PSM literature has enjoyed the consistency resultant from consistent use of the PSM constructs. The customizability of the PSV approach for adaptation to different decision contexts should allow a broad range of public management scholars to employ the technique in their own research.

Instrumentation in public values assessment is still in its infancy. Though various approaches and tools have been used to address value-related questions in public administration over the past several decades, efforts to create empirical value profiles have been stymied by normative arguments over what values ought to be espoused by public administrators (Van Wart 1998). Efforts at instrumentation have also largely ignored the dichotomous nature of values and the importance of context. We emphasize that we believe some of the standard, familiar words and phrases used to describe public service values to be internally inconsistent and sometimes conflicting. This ambiguity has resulted in warm debates regarding the role, meaning, interpretation and utility of values. We acknowledge these debates and believe that their existence serves to provide face validity to our claim that most, if not all,
public service values have antipodes that are equally justifiable motivations for public administrator action in some contexts.

Different classes of action and behavior in a public administration context may favor different value applications. Value constructs that are pertinent in some contexts may be completely irrelevant in other contexts. Thus, hierarchies of desirable values may differ based on the context in which they are applied. This is consistent with Follett’s conception of the law of the situation (Parker 1984) and Kelly’s corollary of a construct’s range of convenience (Kelly 1955, 1991; Butt 2008). Though each new situation or context may ostensibly require a re-evaluation of the public service values applicable for making a justifiable decision, both Anderson (1990) and Simon (1997) suggest that such wholesale re-evaluation rarely takes place. Rather, public administrators rely on past practice and heuristics to satisfice—to meet the demands of their role as public administrators without exhaustively considering all possible actions, outcomes, or values.

The creation of value profiles is a useful exercise, and we assert that public service values can and should be assessed at multiple levels of aggregation. Individual profiles may identify value-based reasoning in an individual that is either inconsistent (e.g. using value justifications that do not match the actions taken) or does not match established professional guidelines. Large sets of profiles grouped by service level, sector, subsector, organization/agency, or educational program may be instructive in determining what values emerge among different groups, and may be useful for tracking shifts over time. Comparisons between emergent group-level public service value profiles and individual level profiles may serve to identify potential points of conflict between a job candidate and a field or subsector in which he or she is seeking employment, or might be used by human resource directors to help ensure diversity of thought and approach when hiring new employees.

Similarly, some evidence suggests that the structure of public service values is derived from values and value sets from multiple sources (e.g. personal, organizational, societal) and may be better described by separating out these values into different axes or dimensions (Lyons, Higgins et al. 2010). Thus, even at the individual unit of analysis, additional study regarding the nature, origins, and relative impact of different value sources is an important avenue of study. Such work could have implications for the originators of such value sets, including professional organizations, educational institutions, agencies and departments, and even government as a whole.
Desirable value profiles in the public sector will likely shift over time due to changes in public discourse, theory and scholarship, and other social factors that change over time. Public service values are sensitive to situational context, but also to social culture (Vickers 1970; Vickers 1973; Rutgers 2008). Values are, by nature, socially constructed, socially responsive, and sensitive to input. Therefore, public service value profiles may be expected to differ from sector to sector. Value profiles may also differ based on levels within the hierarchy of an organization.

The approach to public service values suggested here may allow scholars in the field of public administration to empirically observe the nuances in the value structure of the public service and make empirical comparisons that will serve to enlighten the normative debates about what values public administrators can and should espouse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value set</th>
<th>Theoretical value goal</th>
<th>Operational value goal</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Universalism\(^1\)  
(Equity/justice) \(^2\)  
(Group interest) \(^2\) | Universalism: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature\(^1\) | Promoting the welfare of society as a whole | Public interest\(^1\)  
Human dignity \(^3\)  
Sustainability \(^3\)  
Common good \(^3\)  
Social cohesion \(^3\)  
Protection of rights of the individual \(^3\)  
Respect \(^4\)  
Altruism \(^1\) |
| | Equity: Support of systems and actions that promote fairness and equality for individuals and groups\(^2\) | Distributing social benefits without discrimination or favoritism | Balancing of interests \(^3\)  
Equal treatment \(^4\), \(^3\)  
Justice \(^3\)  
Social Justice \(^3\)  
Equity \(^3\), \(^3\)  
Fairness \(^3\), \(^4\)  
Vertical equity \(^2\)  
Horizontal equity \(^2\)  
Protection of minorities \(^3\)  
Voice of the future \(^3\)  
Protection of the majority \(^2\)  
Stakeholder or shareholder value \(^3\) |
| | Group interest: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of subsets of people \(^2\) | Promoting the welfare of a group or segment of all people | |
| Benevolence\(^4\) | Benevolence: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact \(^1\) | Promoting the welfare of people with whom one has personal contact | User orientation \(^4\)  
Responding to need \(^1\), \(^3\)  
Advocacy \(^3\)  
Friendliness \(^3\)  
Loyalty \(^2\) |
| Objectivity\(^2\), \(^4\)  
(Transparency\(^2\))  
(Neutrality\(^3\)) | Transparency: Making information and actions available for scrutiny\(^1\) | Allowing access to information | Transparency \(^4\)  
Openness \(^3\)  
Objectivity \(^4\)  
Government neutrality \(^6\)  
Political neutrality \(^6\)  
Impartiality \(^6\)  
Neutrality \(^3\) |
| | Neutrality: Allowing actions and information to pass through you without impacting them \(^2\) | Achieving freedom from bias | |
| Conformity\(^1\) | Conformity: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms \(^1\) | Refraining from potentially unacceptable action | Honesty \(^3\)  
Moral standards \(^3\)  
Ethical consciousness \(^3\)  
Ethical behavior \(^4\)  
Integrity \(^3\)  
Secrecy \(^3\)  
Legality \(^3\) |
| Tradition\(^1\) | Tradition: Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide \(^1\) | Upholding customs derived from social institutions | Rule of law \(^3\)  
Business-like approach \(^3\)  
Political loyalty \(^3\)  
Regime dignity \(^3\) |
| Security\(^1\) | Security: Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self. \(^1\) | Avoiding danger or deterioration of quality | Regime stability \(^3\)  
Stability \(^3\)  
National security \(^1\)  
Security of information \(^2\) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Power: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources</th>
<th>Achieving control or dominance over people and resources</th>
<th>Being in charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achievement: personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards</td>
<td>Achieving competence according to social standards or Achieving success according to social standards</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Competence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Personal success)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robustness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parsimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Hedonism: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself</td>
<td>Achieving personal pleasure and gratification</td>
<td>Good working environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Stimulation: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life</td>
<td>Pursuing excitement and challenge</td>
<td>Adaptableity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>Self-direction: Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring</td>
<td>Preserving independent thought and action</td>
<td>Self-development of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen’s self-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Personal influence: Support of the right of individuals and groups to influence the institutions and policies that affect them</td>
<td>Upholding influence of individuals and groups over the institutions and policies that affect them</td>
<td>Citizen involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Citizen influence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cooperation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will of the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collective choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listening to public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>User democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Schwartz (1992)
2. Added by the authors
4. NASPAA (2009)
5. Lyons et al. (2010)
Table 2: Decision Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Scenario</th>
<th>Percent responding “Yes”</th>
<th>Model “R^2”</th>
<th>Values positively associated with a “Yes” decision</th>
<th>Values positively associated with a “No” decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should a city provide a permit to a white-supremacist group for a public rally even though hate speech will be prominent during the rally?</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Reliability (25.1%) National security (17.2%) Altruism (15.1%)</td>
<td>Respond others (11.0%) Gov. neutrality (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should citizen involvement be required in public decision processes even if it hinders the ability of an agency to fulfill its mission and duties?</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Decisive (18.6%) Democracy (21.0%) Altruism (21.7%)</td>
<td>Efficiency (46.6%) Enthusiasm (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a public agency work to overturn a policy that it believes to be illegal even if the policy has broad popular support?</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Legality (52.4%) Protection minorities (38.6%) Salary (38.7%)</td>
<td>Democracy (120.7%) Transparency (96.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a public manager enforce a recently passed citizen initiative even if it violates the manager’s professional code of ethics?</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Legality (44.8%) Gov. neutrality (11.7%) Altruism (32.9%)</td>
<td>Effectiveness (73.8%) Social justice (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the rights of an unpopular social minority group be defended even if it leads to greater social unrest generally?</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Collaboration (70.5%) Protection minorities (45.2%) Sustainability (71.7%)</td>
<td>Efficiency (160.2%) Challenge (309.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a state agency support an executive order mandating that all state business be conducted in English even if the order is considered to be ethnically biased?</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Collaboration (33.1%) National security (26.0%)</td>
<td>Respond others (12.4%) Political neutrality (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the use of racial or ethnic characteristics by law enforcement officials be prohibited even if it reduces crime overall?</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Equal treat (27.1%) Good benefits (10.0%)</td>
<td>Effectiveness (42.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a public health official support an open public comment period on a new program, even if she expects no new information from the comments and the delay will reduce the impact of the proposed program?</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Moral standards (41.9%) Citizen involvement (30.0%)</td>
<td>Self-interest (26.9%) Gov. neutrality (43.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a mid-level public manager publicly reveal previously overlooked illegal behavior in his department even if doing so will reduce the effectiveness of his department’s efforts to serve the public?</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Effectiveness (60.2%) Responsiveness (44.0%)</td>
<td>Self-interest (24.5%) Regime dignity (44.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a city manager survey the citizenry for their views on a controversial proposal even though such a survey would contribute to a public perception that the manager is weak and unable to make decisions?</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Legality (52.7%) Listen to public (21.4%) Stakeholder (21.4%)</td>
<td>Collaboration (80.3%) National security (72.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a city manager implement an innovative and novel approach to budgeting that she finds very exciting even though it will make the budget process less clear to the public?</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>Being in charge (7.0%) Salary (21.9%) Enthusiasm (15.8%)</td>
<td>Responsiveness (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should a public manager cooperate with managers in other agencies even though such cooperation limits her ability to act independently?</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers in parentheses represent the percentage change in the probability of a “yes” (“no”) decision associated with a 10% increase at the mean of the given value dimension, other values held constant. All reported variables are significant at the 0.05 level or better. *Model did not meet lack of fit criteria.
Figure 1 Theory of Universal Personal Values (Schwartz, 1992)
Figure 2: Empirical Public Service Values map
Figure 3: Public Service Values Framework
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¹ Some of the questions identified here are very similar and/or related to those identified by Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007).

² It is important to distinguish between public service values and public service ethics. The study of public service ethics would include not only an examination of the properties of decisionmaking in the public sector, but would include a normative element suggesting what those properties should be. We make no prescriptive judgments about either the content or process of public sector decisionmaking. Rather, our purpose is to provide a framework for empirical examination of decisions both with and without moral elements. While all decisions in the public sector matter to some degree, not all such decisions are necessarily ethical decisions. In this regard, we agree with the distinction offered by Kernaghan (2000): “Values are enduring beliefs that influence the choices we make from among available means and ends. Clearly, not all values are ethical values, that is, not all values relate to questions of right and wrong, good or evil” (95). This is particularly true in the public sector, wherein the opposing justifications for action are prevalently two desirable but opposing outcomes rather than a good outcome and a bad one.

³ We acknowledge a degree of subjectivity in this process, and that despite efforts to consider multiple national and cultural contexts, some important values might have been missed. One advantage to the PSVQ approach is that virtually any value can be formatted for inclusion on the PSVQ and therefore any important items that were excluded from the present study may be added in subsequent research and mapped into the same value space.

⁴ The Tetlock approach closely resembles the use of conjoint analysis in the identification of value hierarchies, though conjoint analysis is not ultimately necessary. It is useful to note, however, that this approach is imminently compatible with the analytic techniques suggested by Shamir and Shamir (1995). In this paper, Shamir and Shamir also provide an excellent literature review discussing the relative advantages and disadvantages of such a decision prediction approach, particularly vis-à-vis such other techniques as ranking values and use of vignettes.

⁵ In order to generate ordinal decision variables of sufficient range to perform linear regression analysis, it is also possible to recode the dichotomous yes/no responses such that a yes response is coded “1” and a no response is
These can then multiplied by responses on the 7-point confidence scale ("how sure are you that you are right?"). This transformation results in a 14-point scale for each decision scenario ranging from -7 (very sure that no is the correct answer) to 7 (very sure that yes is the correct answer). This new variable can then be used as the dependent variable in a linear regression with responses to the PSVQ value statements as regressors.

Moves are calculated using the Schwartz framework rather than the modified framework.

The authors acknowledge the potential for common method bias in the results of this analysis. Because the dependent and independent variables were measured using the same survey, there may be some cross-contamination impacting our results. Because we were interested in the values as justification of action, we asked the decision scenario questions first, priming respondents to potentially justify those answers when responding to the 40-item PSVQ. While this does not alleviate the problem of common method bias, we hope that it uses such bias to our greatest possible advantage. It is also worth noting that we expect the effects of common method bias to affect all of the scenarios and all of the value statements equally; thus we expect the effect of such bias to ultimately be minimal.