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ABSTRACT

Working in the government is both a dream of securing a greener pasture and the opportunity to serve society with a noble intention and values. The main purpose of this study is to establish the factor structure of PSM in the Philippine context. A total of 456 randomly selected government employees from different agencies representing the three big islands of the country, namely Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao, willingly participated in the survey. Data were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis validated the original 40-item and four-indicator-PSM but with a shorter version with only three underlying factors comprising 11 items, namely, Self-Sacrifice with six items, Commitment to Public Interest with two items, and Attraction to Policy Making with three items. Furthermore, Confirmatory Factor Analysis validated the model's goodness of fit and established a significant relationship among the latent variables, signifying the ability to measure public service motivation in the Philippine context. Hence, aside from the lure of a greener pasture, the results highlight the higher public service values as motivating factors. The findings can help the Philippine government tailor the agencies’ respective human resource development programs while maximizing the identified motivation factors to propel individual productivity and effectiveness in public service.
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RESUMEN

Trabajar en el gobierno es tanto un sueño de garantir un pasto más verde como una oportunidad de servir a la sociedad con una intención y valores nobles. El objetivo principal de este estudio es establecer la estructura factorial del PSM en el contexto filipino. Un total de 456 empleados gubernamentales seleccionados al azar de diferentes agencias que representan las tres grandes islas del país, a saber, Luzón, Visayas y Mindanao, participaron voluntariamente en la encuesta. Los datos se analizaron mediante Análisis Factorial Exploratorio y Análisis Factorial Confirmatorio. Los resultados del análisis factorial exploratorio validaron los 40 ítems originales y cuatro indicadores-PSM pero con una versión más corta con solo tres factores subyacentes que comprenden 11 ítems, a saber, el sacrificio personal con seis ítems, el compromiso con el interés público con dos ítems, y la atracción hacia la formulación de políticas con tres elementos. Además, el análisis factorial confirmatorio validó la bondad de ajuste del modelo y estableció una relación significativa entre las variables latentes, lo que significa la capacidad de medir la motivación del servicio público en el contexto filipino. Por lo tanto, aparte del atractivo de un pasto más verde, los resultados destacan los valores más altos del servicio público como factores motivadores. Las descobertas pueden ayudar al gobierno filipino a adaptar los respectivos programas de desenvolvimento de recursos humanos de las agencias y, al mismo tiempo, maximizar los factores de motivación identificados para impulsar la productividad individual y su eficacia en el servicio público.

Palabras clave: Motivación del servicio público, gobierno, interés público, elaboración de políticas, auto-sacrificio.
INTRODUCTION

Many people dream of landing a job in the government sector. In most countries, the government is the biggest employer with various agencies and services needing a sizeable workforce, such as the United States of America with 19.23 million in 2022 (Statista, 2024a), Canada with 39,566,248 in 2023 (Government of Canada, 2024), United Kingdom with 5.93 million in 2023 (Office for National Statistics, 2024), Japan with 2.8 million in 2023 (Statista, 2024b), and China with 740.4 million in 2023 (Statista, 2024c). However, despite the attractiveness of the job (Jin & Rainey, 2020), government employees have to deal with stereotyping (Bertman et al., 2024). Some of them are not comfortable dealing with the bad image of other public officials and people's perception of those working in the government (Lee et al., 2024). Others have to deal with balancing the demands of work (Le et al., 2024; Sciepura & Linos, 2024; Singh et al., 2024), private life concerns (Weiβmüller et al., 2024), job exhaustion (Hur & Abner, 2024; Nagarajan et al., 2024; Sciepura & Linos, 2024), and job dissatisfaction (Huynh et al., 2024; Qui et al., 2022). Nevertheless, working in the government remains an attractive and is one of the sought after jobs.

The Philippine government is also the biggest employer in the country, with a total of 1,979,564 permanent positions (Department of Budget and Management, 2024) and 832,812 Contract of Service and Job Order employees for national agencies (Presidential Communications Office, 2024), excluding those in the local government units (DILG). In short, working in the government is also a dream for many Filipinos. But what is the motivation of Filipinos to join the government? Are the obvious greener pastures stand out as the main reason? This paper investigates the motivation of those already in public service using the Public Serve Motivation (PSM) questionnaire.

While rewards could be considered one motivator in applying for a government job (Li et al., 2022; Rajibul & Kijima, 2021), researchers are exploring other factors. For instance, scholars reported various analyses linking PSM to several factors, such as career growth opportunity (Ng et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2024), transformational leadership (Alamri, 2023; Wongpreedee & Sudhipongpracha, 2024), communal narcissism (Fennimore, 2021), organizational politics (Park & Lee, 2020), organizational prestige (Bright, 2021), mortality salience (Liu et al., 2023), and among others. Most of these factors are intrinsic motivations that propel an individual to consider public service. Hence, when one joins the government, there is so much at stake for personal and professional gain.

Aside from intrinsic motivation, employees consider the higher value in pursuing a career in the government. Palma et al. (2021) found that those who have good intentions for the sake of society also possess the attribute of helping specific public service clients. If they work in social services agencies, they have the heart to serve their constituents, especially the most in need in society. Hence, the real meaning of public service is exemplified by people with this kind of attitude and perspective. In addition, scholars view PSM from a scientific standpoint. For example, Wang et al. (2020) look at PSM from the lens of cognitive science, highlighting the values of Care, Fairness, Authority, Loyalty, and Sanctity. They emphasized the higher values in public service more than what material things the government, as an employer, can provide. Other scholars argued on the importance of looking at PSM on the ethical or moral compass (Azhar & Steen, 2023; Lee et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2020), emphasizing a noble service for the common good. The motivation for public services must not only be about earning money and security but also a respectable, patriotic, and transcendent act of any citizen (Wang et al., 2024). Thus, working in the government is an avenue of serving a transcendental purpose.

Having the greatest number of employees, the Philippine government can look into the motivation of government workers and maximize its influence on realizing the goals and objectives of public service in the respective agencies and units. The article's main purpose is to determine the factor structure of PSM in the Philippine context. Using the PSM questionnaire developed by Perry (1996), this study explores the public service motivation of Filipino government workers. The data analysis would provide scientific information on the constructs of the existing PSM through the chosen questionnaire and validate or invalidate these constructs in the Philippine context. The findings of the study contribute to the literature on the continuous debate on the appropriate constructs on why people prefer to work in the government and how their motivation is intertwined with the higher purpose in public service beyond personal glory.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Respondents and Sample

There were 456 respondents from all over the country, comprising the three big islands in the Philippines: Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The data were collected in the first quarter of 2020, just over half of the term of President Duterte’s six-year term of office. Due to the difficulty of securing the total population of each government agency and the intention of getting responses from majority of the agencies in the government, snowball sampling was employed. The respondents were
from the different Local Government Units (LGU) and National Agencies (NAs), such as the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Budget and Management (DBM), Commission on Audit (COA), Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Department of Education (DepEd), Philippine National Police, and Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR). Most respondents were women (225 or 62.8%) compared to men (133 or 37.2%).

**Instrument and Data Collection**

The survey was conducted online using Google Forms. The questionnaire contained a short explanation of the purpose of the survey. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, each questionnaire did not bear the names of the respondents. The questionnaire was adopted from the instrument developed by Perry (1996) and composed of 24 items. Of the 24 items, three items were for the subscale of Attraction to Policy Making (APM), five items for Commitment to Public Interest (CPI), eight items for Compassion (COM), and eight for Self-Sacrifice (SS). The respondents were asked to agree to each statement using a 5-point Likert scale (5 strong agreement, one strong disagreement).

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). EFA was used to reduce the data of unobserved factors to determine the common factors that can explain the structure of the measured variables (Watkins, 2018). To ensure sampling adequacy, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion was employed (Watkins, 2018). A scree plot of eigenvalues and other analyses were performed to identify the factors. In subjecting the data to CFA, several tests were conducted, such as ensuring the fit indices, such as Absolute Fit, Relative Fit, and Parsimony Fit of both hypothesized and modified models, ensuring compliance with the threshold values. After satisfying these initial requirements, several estimate values were considered, such as Regression Weights, Covariances, and Correlations, to test the hypotheses.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data were gathered from the survey with 456 government employees in the Philippines as respondents. These data were subjected first to Exploratory Factor Analysis to identify the underlying factors using the PSM instrument developed by Perry (1996). Then, the identified underlying factors were subjected to validation through the Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted for the data obtained from the 24-item Public Service Motivation questionnaire developed by Perry (1996). Several tests were performed to identify the number of factors, including Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion, scree plot of eigenvalues, and other analyses. KMO is used to measure sampling adequacy. In the first run of EFA, the results yielded a KMO value of .836, which is within the acceptable value. It means that the sample size qualifies for factor analysis. Another supporting information is Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity with a p-value of .000, which means at least one significant correlation between two items. Looking at the Principal Components Analysis summaries showing Eigenvalues and Percent of Variance Explained, six components/factors were identified. However, only 52.823% of the cumulative percent of variance was explained, which is below the acceptable 60.0%. In an investigation of the Communalities table, there were items with low loadings. These items (PSM4, PSM5, PSM9, PSM13, PSM17, and PSM18) were removed and EFA was run again. The results, as shown in Table 1, revealed a KMO value of .818 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity p-value of .000, reaffirming sampling adequacy and the presence of at least one correlation between at least two items.

**Table 1. KMO and Bartlett’s Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett’s Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>2118.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>df 153, Sig. .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Own elaboration with the research data (2024)

Table 2 shows the analysis results, which yielded six (6) factors with an eigenvalue greater than one and the equivalent percentage of variance explained. The cumulative percentage is 60.697% and is already within the acceptable range.
Initially, Oblimin Rotation was used to determine if the factors are orthogonal or oblique. Looking at the Component Correlation Matrix, the coefficients are not greater than 0.5, meaning the factors are not strongly correlated and, therefore, are orthogonally related. Hence, a Varimax Rotation was applied. Looking at the Rotated Component Matrix, as shown in Table 3, Factor 1 has items PSM22, PSM23, PSM20, PSM21, PSM24, and PSM19, meaning these items are strongly related. This means that what they are measuring is relatively the same. Factor 2 has items PSM7, PSM6, and PSM8. Factor 3 has items PSM3, PSM2, and PSM1. Factor 4 has items PSM10 and PSM11. Factor 5 has items PSM15 and PSM14. Lastly, Factor 6 has items PSM12 and PSM16.

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSM22: I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society. .799
PSM23: I am one of those rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else. .749
PSM20: Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements. .735
PSM21: I think people should give back to society more than they get from it. .668
PSM24: I believe in putting duty before self. .633
PSM19: Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it. .622
PSM7: Meaningful public service is very important to me. .817
PSM6: I consider public service my civic duty. .745
PSM8: I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests. .602
PSM3: I don’t care much for politicians. (R) .764
PSM2: The give and take of public policy making doesn’t appeal to me. (R) .762
PSM1: Politics is a dirty word. (R) .750
PSM10: Most social programs are too vital to do without. .797
PSM11: I am often reminded by daily events how dependent we are on one another. .785
PSM15: There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support. (R) .692
PSM14: I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves. (R) .687
PSM12: I am rarely moved by the plight of the underprivileged. (R) .765
PSM16: I seldom think about the welfare of people I don’t know personally. (R) .635

After determining the factors and their corresponding items, a reliability test was conducted to determine the reliability of the new factors. Results revealed that Factor 1 got a Cronbach Alpha of .821. For Factor 2, the initial value was only .643, but when PSM8 was deleted, it yielded a value of .773. Factor 3 has a low Cronbach Alpha of .644. It was initially considered discarded but still considered later in the SEM model to see if this factor could be included. The other factors also showed low Cronbach Alphas- Factor 4 with .543, Factor 5 with .401, and Factor 6 with .339. Hence, only three factors were considered.

Since most of the six items under factor 1 belong to the Self-Sacrifice of the original questionnaire, Factor 1 is named Self-Sacrifice. The three items under Factor 2 belong to Commitment to Public Interest; hence, the name is retained. Factor 3 loaded all three items under Attraction to Policy Making. Factor 3 is named the same.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The result of the EFA, as shown in Figure 1, was used for the hypothesized model containing 11 observed variables and three (3) latent variables, namely Self-sacrifice (SS), Commitment to Public Interest (CPI), and Attraction to Policy Making (APM). CFA was performed using Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) version 21. Table 3 shows the values of different fit indices- Absolute Fit, Relative Fit, and Parsimony Fit of both hypothesized and modified models with the threshold values.

Table 2. Principal Components Analysis Summaries: Eigenvalues and Percent of Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.360</td>
<td>24.222</td>
<td>24.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>9.815</td>
<td>34.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>8.051</td>
<td>42.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>6.699</td>
<td>48.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>54.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>5.846</td>
<td>60.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Own elaboration with the research data (2024)
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For the hypothesized model, the standardized estimates showed that all loadings have values greater than 0.5. However, the chi-square was very large (110), though this was a small concern given the large sample size (456), which likely results in being significant. Looking at the overall fit, the results showed CMIN/df=2.693, GFI=.957, RMSEA=.061, PCLOSE=.089, NFI=.919, CFI=.947, TLI=.928, IFI=.947, PCFI=.706, and PNFI=.685. These values, except for the large chi-square, suggest that the hypothesized model can still be improved by looking at different indices.

Re-specifying the model was then performed. First, a look into the factor loadings yielded at least 0.5. Second, no value was greater than two on the Standardized Residual Covariances. Third, the modification indices were investigated for suggestions. High values were found between e1 and e2 and e2 and e3. Hence, drawing covariances (double-headed arrow) correlating these errors could help improve the model. CFA was run again, and the results showed a more improved model, as shown in Figure 1. Moreover, the following indices, as shown in Table 3, were found to be compliant with the threshold values- CMIN/df=1.964, GFI=.971, RMSEA=.046, PCLOSE=.647, NFI=.943, TLI=.959, IFI=.971, PCFI=.689, and PNFI=.669. These values proved that the model fit well. Also, the paths between latent variables were statistically significant. Hence, the final PSM construct comprised 11 items loaded to 3 latent variables.

Table 3. Fit indices for the Hypothesized and Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Index</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Hypothesized Model</th>
<th>Modified Model</th>
<th>Threshold Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>110.405</td>
<td>76.584</td>
<td>$&lt;2$ or $3$: Good and $&lt;5$: permissible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square/Degree of Freedom</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df (CMIN/df)</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>$2$ to $5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of CMIN</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>$&gt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>0 (no fit)-1 (perfect fit) (Should be $&gt;0.90$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>$&lt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>$&lt;0.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>$&gt;0.90$/$&gt;0.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis Index</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>$&gt;0.90$/$&gt;0.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>$&gt;0.85$/$&gt;0.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Fit Indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Comparative Fit Index</td>
<td>PCFI</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>0 (no fit)-1 (perfect fit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony Normred Fit Index</td>
<td>PNFI</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>0 (no fit)-1 (perfect fit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Own elaboration with the research data (2024)

Figure 1. Hypothesized Model

**Note:** Own elaboration with the research data (2024)
Hypothesis testing: Structural Equation Modeling

Three hypotheses were proposed to determine the relationship between Self-Sacrifice and Commitment to Public Interest, Self-Sacrifice and Attraction to Policy Making, and Commitment to Public Interest and Attraction to Policy Making. A look into the regression weights of the standardized estimates, as shown in Figure 2 and Table 4, revealed that all loadings of each latent variable are significant. This means that all the statements significantly measure the latent variable. Moreover, to validate if the latent variables measure the overall public service motivation of the respondents, correlation coefficients, as shown in Table 5, are considered. Overall, all the latent variables are significantly correlated to each other. Specifically, a moderate correlation coefficient of 0.54 for Self-Sacrifice and Commitment to Public Interest was found. Also, a negligible correlation coefficient of 0.013 was established between Commitment to Public Interest and Attraction to Policy Making. However, a negative coefficient of 0.69 was seen between Self-Sacrifice and Attraction to Policy Making. It means that the significant correlation of the latent variables validates their significance in measuring PSM in the Philippine context.

Table 4. Regression Weights of the Factor Loadings to each of the Latent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSM24 --- SS</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>10.939</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM19 --- SS</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>12.783</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM21 --- SS</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>13.448</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM23 --- SS</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>9.799</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM20 --- SS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM22 --- SS</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>13.473</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM7 --- CPI</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>8.962</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM6 --- CPI</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM3 --- APM</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>6.629</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM2 --- APM</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>6.520</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM1 --- APM</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Own elaboration with the research data (2024)

Table 5. Correlation Coefficients between the Latent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS --- CPI</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS --- APM</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI --- APM</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Own elaboration with the research data (2024)

Figure 2. Modified Model (Standardized Estimates)

Note: Own elaboration with the research data (2024)
The result of the EFA yielded only three latent variables: Self-Sacrifice, Attraction to Policy Making, and Commitment to Public Interest. It is interesting to note that the name of the latent variable follows the name of the original indicators of the Public Service Motivation developed by Perry (1996) because the items loaded to each latent variable are consistent with the original groupings. However, of the 24 items from Perry’s questionnaire, only 11 were finally loaded in the analysis using Structural Equation Modelling to satisfy the model’s goodness of fit. However, before that indicator, Compassion from Perry’s questionnaire was no longer included in the present model.

First, Self-Sacrifice remains a significant factor for Filipinos regarding the respondents’ public service motivation. Statements such as “I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society,” “Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements,” and “Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it” are indicators of the true spirit of Filipino public servants who are willing to set aside personal gain for the sake of the common good. A manifestation of this willingness is explained in the Filipino terms “loob” and “kapwa”. According to Reyes (2015), the “loob” (relational will) and “kapwa” (together with other person) refer to the Filipinos’ relationship-oriented virtue ethics. It means that Filipinos value relationships and are ready to get out of their comfort zones for the sake of others, either in the form of personal action or through service or work-related duties. Additionally, Filipinos are known for their self-sacrifice, as exemplified by the experiences of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) who endure the difficulties of working in a foreign country (Spitzer et al., 2023). Similarly, government workers are known to go the extra mile, just like those in the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and other agencies tasked to support people in need during calamities and emergencies. Thus, as government workers, the respondents considered working in the government as taking personal gain at the backseat in favor of others in the spirit of public service.

Second, Commitment to Public Interest also stood out as one of the indicators of government employees’ motivation. Statements such as “Meaningful public service is very important to me,” “I consider public service my civic duty,” and “I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests” are indicators of their commitment on the people they serve. Though there have been several ideological and ethical perceptions regarding the concept of public interest (Machakraie & Mokhele, 2024), public servants are expected to adhere to the principle of the common good in discharging their duties and responsibilities. They care for the interests of the public instead of their own private lives (Boot, 2024). While the term “In the Public Interest” has been used to justify development projects (Meckelburg & Wardana, 2024) and other programs, which sometimes are controversial, employees’ commitment is grounded on the very basic principle of public service and public interest.

Third, Attraction to Policy Making appears to be one motivational factor for government employees. According to Ritz (2011), “Attraction to Public Policymaking comprises both the power-related components of proximity to the political process (‘politics’) and of participation in the process of policy formulation” (p.1130). While not all have direct participation in policymaking, being in the government has several windows of opportunities that they can either directly or indirectly get involved in the policy-making processes while drawing support and motivation from the citizens (Alcoba & Phinaitrump, 2023). Their eagerness to participate in policymaking is grounded on the basic premise of the love of the country (Tao & Wen, 2023). The lure of working in the government is not only driven by the monetary compensation and rewards but also participation and contribution in crafting laws for the benefit of the people and country in general.

Finally, the results validated the proposed model of PSM in the Philippine Context comprising three latent variables, namely, Self-Sacrifice, Commitment to Public Interest, and Attraction to Policy Making. EFA validates how these three variables measure the public service motivation of Filipino government workers. While the original compassion variable was not anymore included in the model, it does not mean compassion is no longer a motivator for Filipino government workers. The spirit of public service, as revealed in self-sacrifice and even with the other two variables, are acts of compassion.

**FINAL REMARKS**

The factor structure of the public service motivation in the Philippine context drew three latent variables: Self-Sacrifice, Attraction to Policy Making, and Commitment to Public Interest. Further, the analysis validated the relationship between these variables, signifying their measurement of the PSM among Filipinos. The findings further validated the driving force of Filipinos in joining the government sector, highlighting their desire to renounce themselves in the service of fellow Filipinos, their willingness to participate in policy making, and their commitment to serving the public. Without forgetting that the government offers a more secure and financially promising job, popularly termed a greener pasture, other higher-order values are also considered essential for those working in the government. With the factor structure established in the Philippine context, the government can maximize these findings in enhancing human resource development programs and supporting government employees in deepening their intrinsic and extrinsic motivation so they can become effective and efficient in their respective tasks.
Limitations of the study and future research

The study’s findings were limited to measuring the PSM in the context of the Filipinos based on the instrument developed by Perry (1996). With only a limited number of respondents covering only few agencies, a more in-depth analysis could enhance the study’s findings through a qualitative inquiry to go deeper into the motivation of government employees and find unique Filipino determinants in joining the government service.
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