KJPS
Korean Journal of Policy Studies

Kwon, N. (2021). Job Switch From the Private Sector to the Public Sector: The Characteristics of the Switchers. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, *36*(2), 35–70.

Articles

Job Switch From the Private Sector to the Public Sector: The Characteristics of the Switchers

Namho Kwon [a]

Keywords: turnover, sector switch, private sector, public sector, individual characteristics

Vol. 36, Issue 2, 2021

While significant attention has been directed to the job switchers from the public sector to the private sector, there have been few studies about the job switchers in the opposite direction. This paper examines whether sector switchers' characteristics from the private to the public sector are different from stayers. It is related to a broader set of questions that ask how employees' characteristics and sector switching are related. The empirical analysis using the National Survey of College Graduates (2003, 2006, 2010, and 2013) shows the switchers' characteristics. First, females and unmarried employees were more likely to switch their jobs from the private to the public sector from 2003 to 2006. However, these gender and marriage status differences became insignificant from 2010 to 2013. Second, black employees were more likely to move from the private to the public sector for the whole period. Third, the more educated employees seemed to have more freedom to change their private to public careers. Fourth, employees with experience in government-funded projects were more likely to switch jobs from the private to the public. Fifth, workers who showed a low satisfaction level in job security and considered PSM as an essential job principle were more likely to shift across sectors from the private to public. This paper's findings highlight a neglected sector switch from private to public and open a window into the extent and characteristics of employees who switch their jobs from the private to the public sector.

I. Introduction

In many aspects, the public sector differs from the private sector (Nutt, 1999). Rainey and Bozeman (2000) investigated similarities and differences observed between private and public sector organizations. These differences make jobs in the private sector and public sector different (more or less attractive to workers) in many aspects such as salary, job security, working conditions, and employment relationships (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Karl & Sutton, 1998; Markovits et al., 2010). Furthermore, a worker makes a decision on turnover based on these aspects of his or her job (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Ertas, 2015; Fry, 1973).

Some workers decide to switch jobs, and the others decide to secure the current job even if the two groups of workers have a similar job or work for the same company. What makes this different turnover decision? Various factors can impact the turnover decision, including worker's characteristics, firm's characteristics, economic situation, labor market structure, etc. (Doeringer & Piore, 1985; Miller, 1984; Rosenfeld, 1992). Some scholars have tried to answer the question by focusing on workers' characteristics such as education, race, gender, and ability (Jovanovic, 1979; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Mueller & Price, 1990). This paper focuses on investigating the characteristics of job-switching workers following Anderson et al. (1994, p. 205) argument that workers' characteristics are a primary source of variance in turnover decisions.

While great attention has been directed to the job switchers from the public sector to the private sector, there has been little analysis of the job switchers of the *opposite direction* (Su & Bozeman, 2009, p. 1106). Only recent years have seen a few papers about understanding the job switchers from the private sector to the public sector (e.g., see Bozeman & Ponomariov, 2009; De Graaf & van der Wal, 2008; Su & Bozeman, 2009). These recent studies pave the way for further research on the behaviors of sector switchers out of the private sector into the public sector.

The main focus of this paper is on the sector switchers moving from the private to the public sector. The purpose of this paper is to examine whether the characteristics of sector switchers from the private sector into the public sector are different from stayers. Our research is related to a broader set of questions that asks how employees' characteristics and sector switching are related. Employees would choose to switch sectors (or jobs) for many reasons. It would be reasonable to think that the sector switchers from the public to the private sector probably have systematically different reasons from the sector switchers of the opposite direction.[1]

a Assistant Professor, School of Public Administration, Soongsil University, Korea, E-mail: namhokwon@gmail.com.

1 The empirical literature on the switchers from the private sector to the public sector is very rare.

Knowing the differences in the characteristics of sector switchers from the private to the public sector and those who stay in the private sector is beneficial. First, the boundary between the two sectors has been blurring (Billis, 2010; Dees & Anderson, 2017). This means that more people can switch sectors with fewer efforts or difficulties. Second, the private sector is believed to be more efficient than the public sector (e.g., Grossman et al., 1999; Hall & Lobina, 2005). Based on this belief, many countries have tried to reform their public sector to increase its efficiency by privatization (e.g., Pack, 1987; Sheshinski & López-Calva, 2003). So, bringing people with work experience in the private sector to the public sector can make the reform successful. In other words, the public sector would be more efficient by hiring workers with knowledge, skills, and experience from the private sector. Third, it may not be easy for the public sector to attract qualified and skillful people from the private sector, mainly because of the wage gap between the two sectors (Borjas, 2002). Therefore, knowing the characteristics of those who are more likely to switch from the private sector to the public sector is beneficial for the public sector to attract more qualified and skillful workers.

This paper is structured as follows. Section II reviews research on switching job sectors and introduces the main hypotheses of this study. Section III explains the empirical methods and data. Section IV empirically examines the characteristics of job switchers from the private sector to the public sector. Section V concludes with a summary of key results, policy implications, avenues for future research.

II. Switching Job Sectors and Relevant Studies

People keep finding better jobs across sectors (Mortensen & Pissarides, 1999). However, switching job sectors is not an easy decision for people because it reflects the change of workplace environment, and it contains some uncertainty for their changes. Job switching between job sectors (private and public) would probably be a more complicated decision than job switching within a sector because of the differences between the two sectors. The differences between the private and public sectors seem to be decreasing over time (Boyne, 2002; Poole et al., 2006). However, it does not mean that there are no significant differences among sectors. The literature clearly shows the differences between the public and private sectors (Allison, 1983; Rainey & Bozeman, 2000).

Some theories explain job sector switch behavior assuming that people decide to change their job sector based on their current job status and expectation for future job expectations. Person-organization fit theory (P-O fit theory) argues that employees' behavior and attitude can be explained with the relationship between employees and the organizational work environment (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Rynes & Cable, 2003). When employees' characteristics do fit with organization's characteristics, they are more satisfied, more productive, and want to stay in their current work environment (Galletta et al., 2011; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007; Schneider et al., 2000; Wynen et al., 2013). In the opposite case, employees have less satisfaction with their job and want to switch their jobs.

The characteristics of employees include employees' personal goals and value on their job (Edwards & Cable, 2009), so it covers various personal attitudes and behaviors on the job such as satisfaction and importance on salary or public service motivation (PSM). Social exchange theory claims that employees determine their attitude and behavior depending on the fulfillment of their self-interest through personal and organizational exchanges (Blau, 1964). Therefore, employees who feel treated fairly and receive what they think are more motivated to perform on a high level and stay with the organization. Conservation of resource theory assumes that people are trying to support, foster, contain, protect the existing resources that they are valuable (Hobfoll, 2011, 2012; Hobfoll & Lilly, 1993). When employees feel that they lack resources, such as low benefits and satisfaction, they tend to leave the organization.

Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) theory also explains the employees' job sector switch (Schneider, 1987). This theory explains that people look for and tend to be easily attracted toward an organization similar to themselves or goes well with their own interest or personality (Liu et al., 2010). Schneider (2001) argues that workers judge their P-O fit and seek to find jobs in organizations with characteristics similar to their own. Also, the organization selects someone who has a similarity to the organization (Kristof, 1996; Werbel & DeMarie, 2005). People leave the organization if they are not mixed well with the organization. These theories enhance the understanding of why employees decide to switch their job sector under their current employees-organization relationship.

Many other factors affect job sector switch decisions from the private to the public sector (Akerlof et al., 1988). In other words, the job sector switching from the private sector to the public sector can also be understood by various theories. First, a highly competitive organizational environment, job security, and pension issues in the private sector can motivate people to move to the public sector providing greater job security and generous pension (Greenhalgh et al., 1988; Lewis & Frank, 2002; Su & Bozeman, 2009). Second, employees' desire to increase their satisfaction or expectation on their work leads to change their job sector (Bozeman & Ponomariov, 2009). For example, the workforce environment in pursuit of profit than public interest makes people (especially those who have high publicness) decide to change the job sector to fulfill their interest and expectation to their job (Perry, 1996). Third, institutional factors affect the job sector switch, especially women and minority groups (Llorens et al., 2007). Women and minority groups get more protection against discrimination and wage penalties in the public sector than in the private sector (Lewis & Frank, 2002). Fourth, the decrease in the gap between the private and public sectors makes people easy to switch the job sectors (Boyne, 2002; Poole et al., 2006).

Here are the main hypotheses of this study based on the theories and previous empirical studies. Millard and Machin (2007) describe more women than men working in the public sector. However, the pattern of male and female employment in the private sector was the opposite of the pattern in the public sector. Mayer (2014) also argued that the ratio of female full-time workers in state and local governments is higher than the ratio of female full-time workers in the pri-

vate sector. Hypothesis 1 [Gender]: If other things are equal, then female employees would be more likely to switch sectors from private to the public sector than male employees.

Deep-rooted African American disadvantages can exist in the private sector (Kamarck, 2007). Wilson et al. (2013) argue that if an employer's discretion increases, then African Americans are more disadvantaged. Knowing that the private sector allows more discretion than the public sector, I think that minority groups would be more likely to work in the public sector if other things are equal. Lewis and Frank (2002) empirically show that minorities prefer public-sector jobs to private-sector jobs. Hypothesis 2 [Race]: If other things are equal, then non-white employees would be more likely to switch sectors from the private to the public sector than white employees.

Workers with a higher level of human capital have more access to numerous job opportunities (Ng & Feldman, 2009). In general, the level of education of public-sector workers is higher than private-sector workers (Mayer, 2014; Millard & Machin, 2007). Similarly, Blank (1985) finds that the probability of public-sector employment rises significantly with education. Hypothesis 3 [Education]: If other things are equal, then employees with higher education would be more likely to switch sectors from private to public than employees with lower education.

Workers with government-funded projects would be more likely to move from the private to public sectors for two reasons. First, there can be a selection. A person with more interest in the public sector would choose to work for a private firm with public-sector-like attributes and decide to engage in government-funded projects. Second, workers with experience in government-funded projects can develop an interest in working for the public sector. Hypothesis 4 [Experience]: If other things are equal, then employees with experiences of government-funded projects would be more likely to switch sectors from private to public.

People with a high degree of risk aversion would be more likely to want to work in the public sector (Bellante & Link, 1981; Blank, 1985; Pfeifer, 2011). In general, public-sector jobs have a higher level of job security than private-sector jobs (Munnell & Fraenkel, 2013). Mussagulova et al. (2019) find that job security is one of the main motives for working in the public sector. Hypothesis 5-1 [Satisfaction on job security]: If other things are equal, employees with lower job security satisfaction would be more likely to switch sectors from private to public. Hypothesis 6-1 [Importance of job factors: Job security]: If other things are equal, employees who think job security is an important job factor would be more likely to switch sectors from private to public.

Public-sector employees are known to have more prosocial and altruistic proclivity (Mussagulova et al., 2019; Perry & Wise, 1990; Ritz et al., 2016). Wright and Christensen (2010, p. 156) argue that PSM of workers in the public sector was higher than private-sector employees. Carpenter et al. (2012) also find a positive relationship between the level of PSM and attraction to the public sector. Hypothesis 5-2 [Satisfaction on PSM]: If other things are equal, employees with lower satisfaction on PSM would be more likely to switch sectors from the private to the public sectors. Hypothesis 6-2 [Importance of job factors: PSM]: If other things are equal, then employees who think PSM is an important job factor would be more likely to switch sectors from private to public.

In this study, I include both satisfaction and importance on job aspects. Studies found that the relationship between satisfaction and importance is higher for those aspects rated as more important than for those aspects rated as less important (Ewen, 1967; Schaffer, 1953). However, as Locke (1969) pointed out, there exists a discrepancy between satisfaction and importance. The levels of satisfaction and importance are not necessarily the same or proportional for each person. In other words, satisfaction would result from the difference between 'what is wanted' and 'what is obtained.'

Moreover, 'what is wanted' is related to the importance of the job aspect. For example, there are two workers, *A* and *B*. Suppose *A* thinks of a salary as an important job factor, while *B* thinks of a salary as an unimportant job factor. The more important the job factor, the greater the potential range of satisfaction on the job factor (Locke, 1969). Besides the range, *A*'s satisfaction level on salary should likely be lower than *B*'s if other things between the two workers are the same (or very similar).

III. Data and Empirical Methods

A. Data

This study uses data from the National Survey of College Graduates (NSCG).[2] The website of NSCG describes the data as follows:

> *"What is the NSCG?: The National Survey of College Graduates (NSCG) is a study by the National Science Foundation (NSF), an independent agency of the U.S. government. The U.S. Census Bureau collects and processes the survey data for NSF. The NSCG has been conducted since the early 1970s and is the most important source of information on the education and career paths of the Nation's college-educated population."*

This survey is conducted once every two or three years and provides the various characteristics of the college graduates of the United States. The characteristics include detailed demographic, education-related information such as education level from bachelor, master, doctoral to professional degree, current and past job-related information including job sector, salary, training, working hours. Using unique individual identifiers in 2003, 2006, 2010, and 2013 survey year, I construct a panel dataset. So, I can track all employees over time and across different employers. I compare two cohorts over the periods from 2003 to 2006 and from 2010 to 2013. Here is the reason why I split the four surveys into two periods: 2003-2006 and 2010-2013 instead of making a single panel data using the four surveys. Eighty-

2 The data was downloaded at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/nscg.html. (Retrieved July 23, 2020)

four point five percent of people in 2003 show up in 2006, while 42.5% of people in 2010 show up in 2013 (i.e., 27,448 out of 64,601 in 2010 show up in 2013). However, no one shows up in all four surveys.

This study excludes individuals in the lower 1% quartile or higher 99% quartile of annual salary. I only include people who got an annual salary of more than $14,000 and less than $237,000 from 2003 to 2006 and more than $14,500 and less than $298,000 from 2010 to 2013. With the exclusion of these outliers, I can use a more realistic population of employees. I only consider full-time employees working more than 35 hours per week and 52 weeks per year.[3]

The dependent variable of the analyses of this paper is switching job sectors (Variable's name: *Sector switching*). From NSCG, employees were asked the following survey question: 'which one of the following best describes your principal employer?'. Respondents choose one job sector among business/industry sector, government, and educational institution. Business/industry sector consists of three subsectors: 1) for-profit, 2) self-employed, not-incorporated, and 3) non-profit. Based on the information on job sector switches over the periods, I make a dummy variable whether employees switch their sector or not: set to 1 if employees who worked for-profit business/industry sector in 2003 or 2010, and employed in government in 2006 or 2013, 0 if respondents are not employed in government in 2006 or 2013. In short, the stayers in the private sector get 0, and sector switchers from the private sector to the public sector get 1 for the dependent variable.

The key explanatory variables are defined as follows. *Gender* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the employee is male. *Race* is a categorical variable with five categories: White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Others. *Education* measures the level of schooling of the employee: Bachelor, Master, and Doctoral/Professional. *Job mismatch* measures to what extent the employee's job is related to his/her highest degree: Closely related, Somewhat related, and Not related. The question in the 2013 NSCG survey for this variable is *"To what extent was your work on your principal job related to your highest degree?"* I use three-point Likert scales: closely related = 1, somewhat related = 2, not related = 3. Whether the employee's job is related to government projects is measured by *Government-funded project* variable. The question in the 2013 NSCG survey for this variable is *" Thinking back now to 2012, was any of your work during 2012 supported by contracts or grants from the U.S. government?" Satisfaction on principal job: Security* is a variable that measures the employee's satisfaction level on job security. The question in the 2013 NSCG survey for this variable is *"Thinking about your principal job held during the week of February 1, please rate your satisfaction with that job's security."* Similarly, *Satisfaction on principal job: PSM* is a variable that measures the employee's satisfaction level on job's contribution to society. Respondents choose one among four options to each factor: very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, and very satisfied. I use four-point Likert scales: not important at all = 1, somewhat unimportant = 2, somewhat important = 3, very important = 4. The variables measuring the importance of job factors are *Importance of Job factors: Security and PSM*. The question in the 2013 NSCG survey for these variables is *" When thinking about a job, how important is each of the following factors to you?"* Job satisfaction and job importance have additional aspects such as salary, benefits, location, opportunity for advancement, intellectual challenge, level of responsibility, and degree of independence.

I use several independent variables to figure out the factors that affect employees' sector switching decisions. Employees' age is categorized into five groups: 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, and 60s and over (Variable's name: Age). Marriable is a dummy for whether the employee is married (=1) or not (=0). Work-related training participation status is used in our analysis(Variable's name: General training). Respondents select yes or no to the survey question: 'during the past 12 months, did you attend work-related training, such as workshops or seminars?'. Besides these variables, I include *Supervisor* status and education/job-related variables (*Salary*, *Professional meeting*, *Size of employer*, *Location of employer*, and *Job category*). *Supervisor* is based on the survey question "did you supervise the work of others as part of the principal job you held during the week of [survey reference date]?" *Salary* is transformed as a log annual salary. *Professional meeting* is based on the survey question "during the past 12 months, did you attend any professional society or association meetings or professional conferences?" In the survey, employer size is defined as how many people worked for your principal employers, and categorized by eight groups: 1-10, 11-24, 25-99, 100-499, 500-999, 1,000-4,999, 5,000-24,999, and over 25,000 employees (*Size of employer)*. Similarly, employer's location is categorized by four groups: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West (*Location of employer)*. The National Survey of College Graduates(NSCG) is focused on employees in the science and engineering workforce. Therefore, the survey provides seven categories of jobs: Computer and math science, Life and related science, Physical and related sciences, Social and related sciences, Engineering, S and E related fields, and Non-S and E fields *(Job category)*.

B. Empirical Methods

I employ logit regression to identify the determinants of sector switching decisions because I have a dichotomous dependent variable. The dependent variable *Sector switching* is 1 if the employee switched sectors from the private to public and is 0 if the employees stayed in the private sector.

$$\log\left\{\frac{P(Sector\ switching=1|X)}{1-P(Sector\ switching=1|X)}\right\}= \beta_0+\beta_1 x_1+\ldots+\beta_k x_k \quad (1)$$

$$P(Sector\ switching=1|X_1,\ldots,X_k)= \frac{\exp\left(\beta_0+\beta_1 X_1+\ldots+\beta_k X_k\right)}{1+\exp(\beta_0+\beta_1 X_1+\ldots+\beta_k X_k)} \quad (2)$$

3 Accessed January 25, 2021. http://www.bls.gov/cps/lfcharacteristics.htm

Where $P(Sector\ switching = 1)$ is the probability of the employee switches his/her job from the private sector to the public sector. The explanatory variables are expressed by the vector X that includes x_1 though x_k. The explanatory variables included in logit regressions are *Age, Gender, Marriage, Race, Education, Job mismatch, Government funded project, Salary, Supervisor, General training, Professional meeting, Size of employer, Location of employer, Job category, Satisfaction on principal job, and Importance of job factor*.

Here are some theoretical and empirical backgrounds of choosing control variables.[4] Based on the conservation of resource theory, workers should be more likely to leave the organization if they feel they lack resources such as low benefits and satisfaction. I regard Salary, General training, Professional meeting, Satisfaction on principal job, and Importance of job factor as some forms of benefits and satisfaction. Tai et al. (1998) indicate that age, tenure, income, and professional rank have an impact on turnover. Healy et al. (1995) find that age does not show a strong statistical relationship with a decision to leave an organization. However, Ng and Feldman (2009) argue that age–voluntary turnover relationship would be stronger than Healy et al. (1995). Lewis and Frank (2002) find that older Americans prefer public-sector jobs than young Americans. Ahituv and Lerman (2011) find that married workers are more likely to get higher wages and job stability than unmarried workers. On the other hand, Fang (2007) argues that marital status does not significantly impact turnover intention. A skills-job mismatch would harm performance and result in layoffs (Collings & Mellahi, 2009). Chavadi et al. (2021) show that Job mismatch has a positive relationship with turnover intention. Similarly, Ju and Li (2019) argue that education-job mismatch negatively affects job tenure (years). Even and Macpherson (1996) say that the labor turnover of large firms is lower than small firms. Idson (1993) proposes that larger firms' greater capacity to develop long-term relationships with their workers would lower turnover rates.

IV. Empirical Results

I check whether all variables mentioned above are different between switchers from the private sector to the public sector and the stayers using a series of t-tests. Table 1 (years: 2003-2006) and Table 2 (years: 2010-2013) provide the differences in the mean of the variables between two groups, including t-tests of whether the mean differences are statistically significant.

According to these results, the sector-switching group significantly differs from the stayer group in several factors. Notably, switchers from the private(business/industry profit) sector to the public sector(government) show lower salary, more government funding experience, lower level of satisfaction on job security, benefit, an opportunity for advancement, and intellectual challenge, higher level of satisfaction on PSM(contribution on society) than the stayers. The sector-switching group also puts more importance (and is more satisfied) in PSM on their job than non-switchers.

The results of a series of t-tests of each explanatory variable are drawn, not controlling other explanatory variables. The logit regression results using the NSCG data for 2003-2006 and 2010-2013 are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. Table 3 and Table 4 present all of the estimates for seven models with different sets of explanatory variables. The coefficient of each explanatory variable represents the change in the log-odds of switching jobs from the private sector into the public sector from a one-unit increase in the explanatory variable, holding the other variables in each model. More generally, a positive coefficient indicates that the probability of the sector switching from the private sector into the public sector rises with an increase in the explanatory variable after accounting for the effects of the other explanatory variables.

The sign of the coefficients of the variables in Table 3 and Table 4 has essential information. However, the magnitude of the coefficients does not have a particular meaning in the context of the logit regression. Therefore, I present the estimates of marginal effects in APPENDIX, Table A and Table B. Table A is based on Model 7 in Table 3, and Table B is based on Model 7 in Table 4. Most of the main variables of interest show statistical significance.

The first hypothesis of this paper (H1: Gender) can be tested using the explanatory variable '*Gender*'. Female workers were more likely to switch their jobs from the private to the public sector than male workers from 2003 to 2006.[5] This empirical result is consistent with the previous studies. Millard and Machin (2007) showed more women than men working in the public sector, but the pattern of male and female employment in the private sector was the opposite of the pattern in the public sector. Mayer (2014) also argued that female workers held about 57% of full-time jobs in state and local governments, but women accounted for about 42% of all the full-time jobs in the private sector.

The coefficients of '*Race*: *Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Others*' suggest that minorities were generally more likely to switch jobs from the private sector to the public sector (H2: Race). Interestingly, the probabilities of switching sectors from the private into the public of black workers were higher than any other race. This empirical result is related to Kamarck (2007) that explained the existence of deep-rooted African American disadvantages in the private sector. Also, Wilson et al. (2013, p. 975) argued, "Study of Income Dynamics sample indicate that the 'new government business model,' characterized by increased employer discretion has disproportionately disadvantaged African Americans."

4 The theoretical and empirical backgrounds of the explanatory variables directly related to the hypotheses of this paper are discussed in *IV. Empirical Results*.

5 However, these gender status differences became insignificant from 2010 to 2013.

Table 1. Comparison of Mean Values for Sector-Switching Group and Stayer Group (2003-2006)

T-test of Mean Difference	Stayers in Private Sector			Switchers from Private to Public Sector			Mean Difference	
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Age								
Age_20s	19118	0.066	0.248	294	0.065	0.246	0.001	
Age_30s	19118	0.329	0.470	294	0.381	0.486	-0.052	*
Age_40s	19118	0.353	0.478	294	0.323	0.468	0.030	
Age_50s	19118	0.210	0.407	294	0.218	0.413	-0.008	
Age_60s	19118	0.042	0.201	294	0.014	0.116	0.028	**
Male	19118	0.778	0.416	294	0.677	0.468	0.101	***
Married	19118	0.784	0.411	294	0.738	0.440	0.046	*
Race							0.000	
White	19118	0.720	0.449	294	0.639	0.481	0.081	***
Black	19118	0.045	0.208	294	0.085	0.279	-0.040	***
Asian	19118	0.157	0.364	294	0.133	0.340	0.025	
Hispanic	19118	0.057	0.232	294	0.095	0.294	-0.038	***
Other	19118	0.020	0.140	294	0.048	0.213	-0.028	***
Education							0.000	
Bachelor	19118	0.630	0.483	294	0.622	0.486	0.007	
Master	19118	0.295	0.456	294	0.316	0.466	-0.021	
Doctoral, Professional	19118	0.075	0.264	294	0.061	0.240	0.014	
Job mismatch							0.000	
Closely related	19118	0.579	0.494	294	0.517	0.501	0.062	**
Somewhat related	19118	0.283	0.450	294	0.296	0.457	-0.013	
Not related	19118	0.138	0.345	294	0.187	0.391	-0.049	**
Government funded project	19118	0.155	0.362	294	0.340	0.475	-0.185	***
Annual salary	19118	82270	34430	294	67355	32608	14915	***
Log annual salary	19118	11.232	0.425	294	11.008	0.477	0.224	***
Supervisor	19118	0.505	0.004	294	0.497	0.029	0.008	
General Training	19118	0.622	0.485	294	0.633	0.483	-0.010	
Professional meeting	19118	0.469	0.499	294	0.469	0.500	0.000	
Job category							0.000	
Computer and math sciences	19118	0.260	0.439	294	0.231	0.422	0.029	
Life and related sciences	19118	0.017	0.129	294	0.024	0.153	-0.007	
Physical and related sciences	19118	0.028	0.165	294	0.041	0.198	-0.013	
Social and related sciences	19118	0.008	0.088	294	0.020	0.142	-0.013	**
Engineering	19118	0.273	0.446	294	0.262	0.440	0.011	
S and E-Related Fields	19118	0.183	0.387	294	0.184	0.388	-0.001	
Non-S and E Fields	19118	0.231	0.421	294	0.238	0.427	-0.007	
Satisfaction on							0.000	

T-test of Mean Difference	Stayers in Private Sector			Switchers from Private to Public Sector			Mean Difference	
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.		
principal job								
General	19118	3.288	0.690	294	3.163	0.687	0.125	***
Security	19118	3.056	0.882	294	2.925	0.887	0.131	**
PSM	19118	3.088	0.808	294	3.054	0.837	0.034	
Salary	19118	3.203	0.715	294	3.010	0.840	0.193	***
Benefit	19118	3.184	0.773	294	3.037	0.883	0.147	***
Location	19118	3.400	0.773	294	3.391	0.762	0.009	
Opportunity for advancement	19118	2.838	0.873	294	2.643	0.869	0.195	***
Intellectual challenge	19118	3.255	0.777	294	3.088	0.826	0.167	***
Level of responsibility	19118	3.326	0.715	294	3.190	0.742	0.135	***
Degree of independence	19118	3.491	0.684	294	3.361	0.743	0.130	***
Importance on principal job							0.000	
Security	19118	3.573	0.582	294	3.616	0.559	-0.043	
PSM	19118	3.118	0.743	294	3.296	0.684	-0.178	***
Salary	19118	3.610	0.514	294	3.558	0.543	0.052	*
Benefit	19118	3.624	0.539	294	3.650	0.499	-0.026	
Location	19118	3.437	0.610	294	3.500	0.565	-0.063	*
Opportunity for advancement	19118	3.341	0.667	294	3.367	0.625	-0.026	
Intellectual challenge	19118	3.593	0.548	294	3.599	0.531	-0.006	
Level of responsibility	19118	3.346	0.630	294	3.361	0.618	-0.014	
Degree of independence	19118	3.531	0.575	294	3.483	0.577	0.048	
Size of employer							0.000	
less than 10	19118	0.092	0.289	294	0.061	0.240	0.030	*
11 - 24	19118	0.057	0.231	294	0.048	0.213	0.009	
25 - 99	19118	0.099	0.298	294	0.116	0.320	-0.017	
100 - 499	19118	0.134	0.341	294	0.156	0.364	-0.022	
500 - 999	19118	0.058	0.234	294	0.075	0.264	-0.017	
1,000 - 4,999	19118	0.138	0.345	294	0.214	0.411	-0.076	***
5,000 - 24,999	19118	0.159	0.366	294	0.129	0.336	0.030	
over 25,000	19118	0.263	0.440	294	0.201	0.401	0.063	***
Location of employer							0.000	
Northeast	19118	0.212	0.408	294	0.139	0.347	0.072	***
Midwest	19118	0.231	0.421	294	0.129	0.336	0.102	***
South	19118	0.303	0.459	294	0.452	0.499	-0.150	***
West	19118	0.255	0.436	294	0.279	0.449	-0.024	

*p<.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Table 2. Comparison of Mean Values for Sector-Switching Group and Stayer Group (2010-2013)

	Stayers in Private Sector			Switchers from Private to Public Sector			Mean Difference	
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Age								
Age_20s	9488	0.10	0.30	110	0.15	0.35	-0.049	*
Age_30s	9488	0.30	0.46	110	0.34	0.47	-0.038	
Age_40s	9488	0.31	0.46	110	0.25	0.43	0.064	
Age_50s	9488	0.23	0.42	110	0.25	0.43	-0.019	
Age_60s	9488	0.07	0.25	110	0.03	0.16	0.042	*
Male	9488	0.73	0.44	110	0.69	0.46	0.040	
Married	9488	0.76	0.43	110	0.65	0.48	0.104	**
Race							0.000	
White	9488	0.62	0.48	110	0.58	0.50	0.041	
Black	9488	0.07	0.25	110	0.16	0.37	-0.099	
Asian	9488	0.20	0.40	110	0.15	0.35	0.058	
Hispanic	9488	0.08	0.28	110	0.09	0.29	-0.007	
Other	9488	0.02	0.16	110	0.02	0.13	0.007	
Education							0.000	
Bachelor	9488	0.60	0.49	110	0.55	0.50	0.049	
Master	9488	0.34	0.47	110	0.35	0.48	-0.010	
Doctoral, Professional	9488	0.06	0.24	110	0.10	0.30	-0.040	
Job mismatch							0.000	
Closely related	9488	0.59	0.49	110	0.57	0.50	0.015	
Somewhat related	9488	0.28	0.45	110	0.25	0.43	0.037	
Not related	9488	0.13	0.34	110	0.18	0.39	-0.053	
Government funded project	9488	0.15	0.36	110	0.44	0.50	-0.288	***
Annual salary	9488	92990	42483	110	81270	36627	11720	***
Log annual salary	9488	11.34	0.47	110	11.21	0.46	0.130	***
Supervisor	9488	0.45	0.50	110	0.42	0.50	0.027	
General Training	9488	0.58	0.49	110	0.60	0.49	-0.016	
Professional meeting	9488	0.35	0.48	110	0.44	0.50	-0.084	*
Job category							0.000	
Computer and math sciences	9488	0.16	0.37	110	0.15	0.35	0.019	
life and related sciences	9488	0.03	0.18	110	0.02	0.13	0.015	
Physical and related sciences	9488	0.04	0.20	110	0.08	0.28	-0.041	**
Social and related sciences	9488	0.01	0.08	110	0.02	0.13	-0.011	
Engineering	9488	0.26	0.44	110	0.22	0.41	0.037	
S and E-Related Fields	9488	0.16	0.37	110	0.16	0.37	0.001	
Non-S and E Fields	9488	0.33	0.47	110	0.35	0.48	-0.020	
Satisfaction on principal job							0.000	
General	9488	3.30	0.69	110	3.12	0.79	0.186	***

	Stayers in Private Sector			Switchers from Private to Public Sector			Mean Difference	
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Security	9488	3.16	0.82	110	2.87	0.95	0.291	***
PSM	9488	3.13	0.80	110	3.32	0.83	-0.189	**
Salary	9488	3.15	0.75	110	3.05	0.86	0.106	
Benefit	9488	3.17	0.80	110	3.00	0.87	0.170	**
Location	9488	3.41	0.78	110	3.35	0.81	0.065	
Opportunity for advancement	9488	2.83	0.88	110	2.57	0.91	0.262	***
Intellectual challenge	9488	3.23	0.79	110	3.09	0.87	0.135	*
Level of responsibility	9488	3.30	0.73	110	3.18	0.76	0.121	*
Degree of independence	9488	3.48	0.70	110	3.42	0.73	0.060	
Importance on principal job							0.000	
Security	9488	3.68	0.53	110	3.72	0.49	-0.034	
PSM	9488	3.19	0.74	110	3.37	0.63	-0.187	***
Salary	9488	3.72	0.47	110	3.67	0.47	0.049	
Benefit	9488	3.71	0.51	110	3.70	0.48	0.009	
Location	9488	3.50	0.59	110	3.51	0.62	-0.006	
Opportunity for advancement	9488	3.40	0.67	110	3.41	0.67	-0.012	
Intellectual challenge	9488	3.59	0.56	110	3.55	0.55	0.040	
Level of responsibility	9488	3.37	0.63	110	3.27	0.65	0.096	
Degree of independence	9488	3.54	0.58	110	3.47	0.60	0.065	
Size of employer							0.000	
less than 10	9488	0.08	0.27	110	0.08	0.28	-0.002	
11 - 24	9488	0.05	0.22	110	0.06	0.25	-0.013	
25 - 99	9488	0.10	0.30	110	0.13	0.33	-0.027	
100 - 499	9488	0.13	0.34	110	0.17	0.38	-0.041	
500 - 999	9488	0.07	0.25	110	0.06	0.25	0.003	
1,000 - 4,999	9488	0.13	0.34	110	0.17	0.38	-0.038	
5,000 - 24,999	9488	0.17	0.38	110	0.15	0.35	0.029	
over 25,000	9488	0.26	0.44	110	0.17	0.38	0.089	**
Location of employer							0.000	
Northeast	9488	0.22	0.41	110	0.18	0.39	0.034	
Midwest	9488	0.23	0.42	110	0.12	0.32	0.116	***
South	9488	0.30	0.46	110	0.44	0.50	-0.138	***
West	9488	0.25	0.43	110	0.26	0.44	-0.012	

*p<.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Table 3. Logit Regression Results: Switching from the private sector to the public sector (2003-2006)

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	1.076*	1.076*	1.099*	1.132*	1.170*	1.099*	1.148*
		(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)
	Age: 30s	1.392**	1.376**	1.394**	1.452**	1.491**	1.408**	1.452**
		(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)
	Age: 40s	1.319**	1.283**	1.284**	1.363**	1.388**	1.301**	1.315**
		(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.59)
	Age: 50s	1.452**	1.412**	1.400**	1.481**	1.507**	1.419**	1.421**
		(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.60)
Gender	Male	-0.280*	-0.290**	-0.295**	-0.241*	-0.235	-0.260*	-0.261*
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)
Marriage	Married	0.077	0.096	0.094	0.063	0.056	0.095	0.086
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.533**	0.537**	0.537**	0.487**	0.530**	0.484**	0.520**
		(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.24)
	Asian	0.028	0.036	0.015	-0.022	-0.019	-0.031	-0.043
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
	Hispanic	0.316	0.31	0.3	0.234	0.261	0.221	0.244
		(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
	Others	0.764***	0.740***	0.736**	0.756***	0.768***	0.724**	0.734**
		(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.29)
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.391	-0.404	-0.381	-0.343	-0.328	-0.353	-0.327
		(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.31)	(0.32)
	Degree: Master	-0.095	-0.112	-0.094	-0.055	-0.049	-0.075	-0.063
		(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	0.106	0.083	0.079	0.151	0.152	0.103	0.1
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
	Not related	0.337*	0.314	0.309	0.398**	0.401**	0.335*	0.339*
		(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.20)
Government funded project	Participated	1.056***	1.077***	1.072***	1.034***	1.032***	1.067***	1.058***
		(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-1.248***	-1.272***	-1.226***	-1.235***	-1.198***	-1.226***	-1.151***
		(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.20)
Supervisor	Supervisor	0.254*	0.287**	0.290**	0.234*	0.236*	0.276**	0.283**
		(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
General training	Participated	0.111	0.119	0.13	0.107	0.103	0.132	0.139

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Professional meeting	Participated	0.083	0.096	0.098	0.057	0.066	0.076	0.081
		(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	-0.305	-0.281	-0.257	-0.343	-0.307	-0.27	-0.231
		(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
	11~24	0.095	0.126	0.122	0.082	0.089	0.141	0.13
		(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.33)
	25~99	0.252	0.278	0.281	0.243	0.26	0.291	0.298
		(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
	100~499	0.334	0.348	0.335	0.329	0.335	0.346	0.33
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
	500~999	0.452*	0.467*	0.466*	0.450*	0.456*	0.471*	0.465*
		(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)
	1000~4999	0.753***	0.765***	0.760***	0.757***	0.768***	0.775***	0.772***
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
	5000~24999	0.168	0.173	0.173	0.166	0.178	0.173	0.18
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	-0.313	-0.309	-0.312	-0.311	-0.322	-0.299	-0.313
		(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
	South	0.574***	0.581***	0.574***	0.564***	0.562***	0.581***	0.576***
		(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)
	West	0.410**	0.422**	0.421**	0.399**	0.401**	0.424**	0.424**
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-0.063	-0.032	-0.019	-0.122	-0.162	-0.076	-0.102
		(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.47)
	Physics and related sciences	0.119	0.13	0.125	0.104	0.104	0.116	0.1
		(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
	Social and related sciences	0.702	0.733	0.71	0.61	0.636	0.661	0.68
		(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.51)
	Engineering	0.001	0.022	0.003	-0.005	-0.032	0.019	-0.027
		(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
	S and E-Related Fields	-0.043	0.002	-0.02	-0.099	-0.104	-0.04	-0.069
		(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.21)
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.175	-0.136	-0.141	-0.21	-0.215	-0.166	-0.177
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
Satisfaction on principal job	General	-0.088						

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.09)						
	Security		-0.187***	-0.144*			-0.191***	-0.144*
			(0.07)	(0.08)			(0.07)	(0.08)
	PSM		-0.04	0.024			-0.106	-0.029
			(0.08)	(0.09)			(0.08)	(0.09)
	Salary			0.066				0.064
				(0.11)				(0.11)
	Benefit			-0.087				-0.098
				(0.10)				(0.10)
	Location			0.108				0.077
				(0.08)				(0.09)
	Opportunity for advancement			-0.058				-0.07
				(0.10)				(0.10)
	Intellectual challenge			-0.031				-0.025
				(0.11)				(0.10)
	Level of responsibility			-0.051				-0.068
				(0.11)				(0.12)
	Degree of independence			-0.101				-0.053
				(0.10)				(0.10)
	Security				0.022	0.05	0.054	0.081
					(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.14)
	PSM				0.254***	0.305***	0.300***	0.325***
					(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)
	Salary					-0.250*		-0.263*
						(0.14)		(0.14)
	Benefit					0.071		0.097
						(0.14)		(0.14)
Importance of job factors	Location					0.185*		0.172
						(0.11)		(0.11)
	Opportunity for advancement					-0.044		-0.046
						(0.11)		(0.11)
	Intellectual challenge					-0.006		0.003
						(0.14)		(0.15)
	Level of responsibility					0.101		0.126
						(0.13)		(0.13)
	Degree of independence					-0.310**		-0.282**
						(0.13)		(0.13)

	Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Constant	7.944***	8.572***	8.210***	6.575***	6.767***	7.073***	6.887***
	(2.08)	(2.10)	(2.25)	(2.18)	(2.15)	(2.19)	(2.32)
Observations	17797	17797	17797	17797	17797	17797	17797
Pseudo R2	0.0833	0.0858	0.0877	0.0857	0.0901	0.0896	0.0953

The data for regression estimations presented in this table are drawn from the NSCG database sponsored by the National Science Foundation and conducted by the Census Bureau. Regression specifications are estimated in STATA 14 using the logit algorithm. The dependent variable is a dummy variable '*Sector switching*.' Robust standard errors are estimated.

Table 4. Logit Regression Results: Switching from the private sector to the public sector (2010-2013)

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	1.259*	1.406**	1.445**	1.300*	1.317*	1.417**	1.496**
		(0.68)	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.69)	(0.67)	(0.69)
	Age: 30s	1.074*	1.173*	1.185*	1.128*	1.156*	1.174*	1.226*
		(0.64)	(0.64)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.64)	(0.63)	(0.64)
	Age: 40s	0.885	0.918	0.904	0.918	0.918	0.905	0.91
		(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.64)	(0.65)	(0.64)	(0.65)
	Age: 50s	1.112*	1.072*	1.052*	1.119*	1.113*	1.061*	1.048*
		(0.64)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)	(0.63)
Gender	Male	0.002	0.047	0.053	0.065	0.075	0.07	0.094
		(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Marriage	Married	-0.191	-0.198	-0.202	-0.205	-0.204	-0.206	-0.205
		(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.715**	0.686**	0.683**	0.689**	0.745**	0.644**	0.688**
		(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.31)
	Asian	-0.152	-0.161	-0.153	-0.174	-0.164	-0.196	-0.175
		(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.31)
	Hispanic	0.002	-0.051	-0.062	-0.056	0.016	-0.102	-0.059
		(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.35)
	Others	-0.579	-0.548	-0.545	-0.535	-0.487	-0.568	-0.517
		(0.73)	(0.73)	(0.73)	(0.74)	(0.74)	(0.73)	(0.73)
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.779**	-0.774**	-0.738**	-0.815**	-0.818**	-0.762**	-0.736**
		(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)
	Degree: Master	-0.551	-0.559	-0.547	-0.600*	-0.594*	-0.56	-0.545
		(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	-0.042	-0.02	-0.054	0.031	0.025	-0.008	-0.024
		(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)
	Not related	0.295	0.448	0.375	0.418	0.413	0.457	0.408
		(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)
Government funded project	Participated	1.559***	1.478***	1.480***	1.541***	1.516***	1.482***	1.454***
		(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-0.572***	-0.607***	-0.536**	-0.641***	-0.570**	-0.578***	-0.445*
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.25)
Supervisor	Supervisor	-0.1	-0.116	-0.09	-0.117	-0.097	-0.119	-0.076
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)
General training	Participated	-0.015	-0.084	-0.022	-0.083	-0.069	-0.093	-0.028

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)
Professional meeting	Participated	0.371*	0.336	0.356	0.324	0.339	0.329	0.359*
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	0.296	0.165	0.223	0.206	0.249	0.189	0.287
		(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.51)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.51)
	11~24	0.457	0.468	0.491	0.405	0.413	0.463	0.5
		(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.50)
	25~99	0.529	0.513	0.479	0.519	0.514	0.51	0.473
		(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)
	100~499	0.508	0.464	0.425	0.503	0.496	0.466	0.428
		(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
	500~999	0.248	0.249	0.219	0.248	0.252	0.268	0.23
		(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.45)
	1000~4999	0.598*	0.621*	0.617*	0.585*	0.576*	0.634*	0.633*
		(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
	5000~24999	0.249	0.222	0.189	0.237	0.23	0.234	0.203
		(0.35)	(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.34)	(0.35)
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	-0.481	-0.475	-0.451	-0.471	-0.488	-0.462	-0.449
		(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.36)	(0.37)
	South	0.383	0.373	0.385	0.361	0.346	0.368	0.374
		(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.27)
	West	0.214	0.198	0.207	0.195	0.182	0.197	0.194
		(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-0.83	-0.987	-1.042	-0.89	-0.87	-1.018	-1.044
		(0.77)	(0.76)	(0.76)	(0.77)	(0.77)	(0.76)	(0.76)
	Physics and related sciences	0.579	0.548	0.498	0.586	0.581	0.535	0.47
		(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.43)	(0.42)	(0.43)
	Social and related sciences	0.467	0.414	0.428	0.413	0.399	0.371	0.34
		(0.83)	(0.82)	(0.83)	(0.82)	(0.82)	(0.82)	(0.84)
	Engineering	-0.157	-0.188	-0.228	-0.135	-0.166	-0.182	-0.247
		(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)
	S and E-Related Fields	0.038	0.018	-0.044	-0.021	-0.006	-0.019	-0.072
		(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.38)
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.066	-0.044	-0.046	-0.077	-0.065	-0.061	-0.052
		(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Satisfaction on principal job	General	-0.350**						

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.14)						
	Security		-0.497***	-0.374***			-0.493***	-0.367***
			(0.10)	(0.12)			(0.10)	(0.12)
	PSM		0.393**	0.528***			0.345**	0.478***
			(0.15)	(0.15)			(0.16)	(0.15)
	Salary			0.1				0.077
				(0.17)				(0.16)
	Benefit			-0.082				-0.07
				(0.14)				(0.14)
	Location			0.068				0.051
				(0.12)				(0.12)
	Opportunity for advancement			-0.288**				-0.306**
				(0.13)				(0.13)
	Intellectual challenge			-0.112				-0.089
				(0.16)				(0.17)
	Level of responsibility			-0.006				-0.008
				(0.18)				(0.18)
	Degree of independence			-0.059				0.001
				(0.13)				(0.14)
Importance of job factors	Security				0.059	0.138	0.088	0.179
					(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.22)
	PSM				0.268*	0.440***	0.187	0.324**
					(0.14)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.15)
	Salary					-0.194		-0.261
						(0.22)		(0.22)
	Benefit					0.036		0.094
						(0.23)		(0.23)
	Location					0.083		0.081
						(0.18)		(0.17)
	Opportunity for advancement					0.016		0.006
						(0.19)		(0.19)
	Intellectual challenge					-0.171		-0.123
						(0.21)		(0.21)
	Level of responsibility					-0.27		-0.257
						(0.19)		(0.20)
	Degree of independence					-0.172		-0.131
						(0.19)		(0.20)

	Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Constant	1.868	1.392	0.823	0.473	1.136	0.285	0.1
	(2.73)	(2.88)	(3.00)	(2.81)	(2.88)	(2.89)	(3.05)
Observations	9637	9637	9637	9637	9637	9637	9637
Pseudo R2	0.1001	0.1137	0.1204	0.0978	0.1046	0.1153	0.1277

The data for regression estimations presented in this table are drawn from the NSCG database sponsored by the National Science Foundation and conducted by the Census Bureau. Regression specifications are estimated in STATA 14 using the logit algorithm. The dependent variable is a dummy variable '*Sector switching*.' Robust standard errors are estimated.

As expected, more-educated workers were more likely to switch jobs from the private sector into the public sector (H3: Education). More precisely, the workers with a doctor or professional degree had significantly higher chances of switching sectors than the workers with a bachelor's degree. These findings link to Millard and Machin (2007, p. 47) that showed a higher level of education of public sector workers over private-sector workers. Mayer (2014, p. 11) also presented a statistic that "On average, public sector employees have more years of education than private-sector workers. In 2013, 53.6% of workers in the public sector had a bachelor's, advanced, or professional degree, compared to 34.9% of private-sector workers"

The coefficients of the explanatory variable 'Government-funded project' are positive and statistically significant, which means that employees with experiences of government-funded projects were more likely to switch sectors from the private to the public sector (H4: Experience). I have to be cautious about interpreting these coefficients in terms of causality. There can be two directions. The first one is that workers in the private sector who experienced government-funded projects can develop an interest in the public sector (such as PSM) and human relationships with government workers. This can make the workers in the private sector switch jobs in the public sector. On the other hand, the other direction can be explained by selection. It is reasonably possible that workers in the private sector with a higher interest in government or public sector should be more likely to be involved in government-funded projects. In addition, the workers whose firm and job are close to the public sector would have less difficulty when they switched into the public sector because of the similarity of work environment, job description, etc. Regardless of these concerns of interpreting the coefficients, what is clear is that employees in the private sector with more experience in government-funded projects had a higher chance to move to the public sector.

The workers in the private sector with a lower level of satisfaction on job security were likely to switch into the public sector (H5-1: Satisfaction on job security). The pattern showed a clear increasing trend: the absolute values of the coefficients increased over time. Interestingly, the coefficients of 'Importance of job factors: Security' are positive but not statistically significant (H6-1: Importance of job factors: Job security). These empirical findings suggest that employees in the private sector would consider their satisfaction on job security more seriously to decide their turnovers to the public sector. Previous studies showed that the public sector has higher job security. In other words, stability of employment is greater in the public sector than in the private sector. Munnell and Fraenkel (2013, p. 31) emphasized the higher level of job security in the public sector: "public sector worker is less likely to lose a job than a private-sector worker." Mussagulova et al. (2019, p. 123) also suggested that one of the primary reasons for joining public service is job security. These job choices can be related to the degree of risk aversion of an individual worker. Individuals with a high degree of risk aversion would be more likely to want to work in the public sector (Bellante & Link, 1981; Blank, 1985; Pfeifer, 2011).

As expected, those who place a higher priority on PSM (contribution to society) were more likely to switch jobs from the private to the public sector (H6-2: Importance of job factors: PSM). The pattern was apparent for both periods of 2003-2006 and 2010-2013. Interestingly, workers in the private sector with a higher level of satisfaction on PSM were also likely to join the public sector in the second period (2010-2013) (H5-2: Satisfaction on PSM). PSM appeared to be one of the essential factors workers consider when deciding to switch sectors from private to public. Public servants are known to have more prosocial and altruistic proclivity (Mussagulova et al., 2019; Perry & Wise, 1990; Ritz et al., 2016). Wright and Christensen (2010, p. 156) mentioned that PSM of workers in the public sector was higher than private-sector employees. They also showed that PSM increased the likelihood of choosing a job in the public sector as an employee's subsequent job, while PSM would not clearly predict the employee's first job, which is highly consistent with the findings from hypotheses on PSM of this paper. Jeon and Robertson (2013) showed that the workers with a higher level of PSM were less likely to leave the public sector, which suggested PSM could be used as one of the employee-retention strategies of the public sector.

This paper focuses on finding the difference in characteristics between sector-switchers from the private to the public sector and the stayers. However, investigating the difference in characteristics between the sector-switchers from the private to public and the sector-switchers of the opposite direction is worth investigating. Table C and Table D in APPENDIX present logit regression results using the sector-switchers of the opposite direction, from the public sector to the private sector. Comparing the results in Table 3, Table 4, Table C, and Table D gives us valuable information. The coefficients of the main variables related to the hypotheses in Table 3 and Table 4 have mostly a different sign from the coefficients in Table C and Table D. These results reinforce the main empirical results that there are significant difference in characteristics between the sector-switchers from the private to the public sector and stayers.

V. Conclusion

With this study, I aimed to answer the following central research question: "*Are the characteristics of sector switchers from the private sector into the public sector are different from stayers?*" By addressing this question, I tested eight related hypotheses. The findings confirm that the sector switchers from the private sector to the public sector were different in many aspects: (1) Females and unmarried employees were more likely to switch their jobs from the private to the public sector from 2003 to 2006. (2) Black employees were more likely to move from the private to the public sector for the whole period. (3) The more educated employees seemed to have more freedom to change their private to public careers. (4) Employees with experience in government-funded projects were more likely to switch jobs from the private to the public. (5) Workers who showed a low satisfaction level in job security and considered PSM as an essential job principle were more likely to switch from the private sector to the public sector.

Anderson et al. (1994, p. 205) clearly argued that "Over-

all, there is no simple story of one factor being the dominant influence on turnover." Other factors not investigated in this paper that impact sector switches from the private sector to the private sector may exist. However, the empirical findings of this paper can provide valuable and usable knowledge for improving our understanding of employees' characteristics and motivation to work for the public sector. Taken together, the empirical results of this paper may provide some interesting implications for the literature on public policy and public management.

Most previous studies focus on turnovers from the public sector to the private sector. To the best of my knowledge, this is one of a few papers investigate employees' turnover from the private sector to the public sector. In terms of data, this paper has advantages over the previous studies. First, the data used in this paper contains information on 'actual turnover', not 'turnover intention.' Boouckenhooghe et al. (2013) explained that turnover intention is a worker's desire or willingness to leave an organization. However, 'actual turnover' is different from 'turnover intention' as Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011, p. 3) described: "Intention to turnover is defined as one's behavioral attitude to withdraw from the organization whereas turnover is considered to be the actual separation from the organization." Most of the previous studies on turnover and sector-switching used survey data sets with questions on turnover intention. Even if there is a positive correlation between turnover intention and actual turnover, it is still possible that employees who revealed turnover intention can end up securing the current job. Second, the data of this paper has relatively long periods and a larger number of employees. Related to that, previous empirical studies lack panel data analysis. A partial solution to the previous studies' problem is to track the same employees for more than one time period. In this paper, I track turnovers of the same workers over the periods: 2003-2006 and 2010-2013.

The public sector would be benefited from hiring employees with work experience in the private sector for many reasons. Put differently, bringing knowledge, skills, experience of the private sector into the public sector is getting more critical. First, despite the differences between the private sector and public sector (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Karl & Sutton, 1998; Markovits et al., 2010; Rainey & Bozeman, 2000), the boundary between the private and public sectors has been blurring (Billis, 2010; Dees & Anderson, 2017).[6] This phenonium is related to creating 'hybrid' organizations and the combination of multiple logics within organizations (Bromley & Meyer, 2017, p. 942). Second, the public sector is believed to be less efficient than the private sector. Leibenstein (1976) proposed four critical reasons why firms or governments may not be able to produce products or services at the least cost: incomplete labor contracts, unpriced inputs, incomplete production or cost functions, and individual motivation. Public sectors would suffer more from the four reasons because (1) public sector agencies would have fewer incentives to minimize costs and maximize profits, (2) the services produced and offered by public sector agencies are often hard to put prices, (3) public sector employees have a higher degree of job security. The public sector would be expected to be more efficient by bringing more workers with private sector experience.

Nevertheless, it is not easy for the public sector to attract qualified and skillful people from the private sector. Borjas (2002) showed that it was getting more difficult for the public sector to attract and retain high-skill workers. He also argued that the main reasons for the difficulty were the wage gap and wage structure: (1) the mean wage in the private sector was higher than the public sector, and (2) the wage structure of the public sector was more condensed (smaller variation in the wage distribution) than the private sector. It is, however, evident that there should be other factors besides the wage gap and structure to affect employees' decision to work for the public sector.

How can the public sector attract skillful and qualified workers from the private sector? Before answering the question, we may have to ask this question: "who are attracted to work in the public sector?" or "Who wants to switch from the private sector into the public sector?" The public sector needs to understand the characteristics of workers who prefer to work for the public sector over the private sector. The empirical findings of this paper would open a window into the extent and characteristics of sector switchers from the private sector into the public sector.

The study needs to be interpreted with caution because the economic and cultural situations such as a demographic structure, labor market structure, and relationship between the private and public sectors are different among countries. In other words, evidence from a single country, the United States, may not be representative. Another limitation, albeit one faced by most studies of turnover or sector switch, is that other factors can affect people's decision on sector switch that are not included in the models of this paper.

The findings in this paper raise issues for academic researchers, policymakers, and managers. First, this study provides empirical evidence that there are significant difference in characteristics between the sector-switchers from the private to the public sector and the stayers. I also show that the difference in characteristics between the sector-switchers from the private to the public sector and the sector-switchers of the opposite direction is clear. Until recent years, there have not been enough studies on turnover from the private sector to the public sector. Therefore, we do not have solid evidence on the individual characteristics of the sector-switchers. Moreover, we do not have much information on what attracts people to the public sector. We need more studies to find out how the public sector attracts (high-skilled) workers.

Second, bring (high-skilled) workers from the private sector to the public sector is one thing, and retaining them

6 "Sector-bending refers to a wide variety of approaches, activities, and relationships that are blurring the distinctions between nonprofit and for-profit organizations, either because they are behaving more similarly, operating in the same realms, or both." (Dees & Anderson, 2017, p. 51)

is another. Talented and ambitious workers will stay with their current organization only if they are offered development opportunities, motivation, and nurturing (Davis et al., 2007). However, the public sector is often vulnerable to brain drain, particularly in developing countries (Kim, 2008). Therefore, knowing the characteristics of the people more likely to work for the public sector (or switch jobs from the private to the public sector) would be the first step to developing retention strategies for key talent.

Third, In recent years, the literature on Human Resource Management (HRM) emphasis on how employee's performance contributes toe organization performance (Mudor, 2011). More research is needed to understand what the sector switchers bring into the public sector. In detail, we can measure individual and organizational performance changes caused by hiring workers from the private sector.

To resolve these, one would require very detailed data on turnovers, individual characteristics, performances, etc. More research along these lines is needed. As is always the case in social studies, more work remains to be done.

Submitted: May 13, 2021 KST, Accepted: June 27, 2021 KST

REFERENCES

Ahituv, A., & Lerman, R. I. (2011). Job turnover, wage rates, and marital stability: How are they related? *Review of Economics of the Household*, *9*(2), 221–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-010-9101-6

Akerlof, G. A., Rose, A. K., Yellen, J. L., Ball, L., & Hall, R. E. (1988). Job switching and job satisfaction in the US labor market. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, *1988*(2), 495–594. https://doi.org/10.2307/2534536

Allison, G. T. (1983). Private and public management: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant particulars. *Golombewski/Gibson*, 1–19.

Anderson, P. M., Meyer, B. D., Pencavel, J., & Roberts, M. J. (1994). The extent and consequences of job turnover. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity. Microeconomics*, *1994*, 177–248. https://doi.org/10.2307/2534731

Aydogdu, S., & Asikgil, B. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, *1*(3), 43.

Bellante, D., & Link, A. N. (1981). Are public sector workers more risk averse than private sector workers? *ILR Review*, *34*(3), 408–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979398103400307

Billis, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Hybrid organizations and the third sector: Challenges for practice, theory and policy*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Blank, R. M. (1985). An analysis of workers' choice between employment in the public and private sectors. *ILR Review*, *38*(2), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979398503800204

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.

Boouckenhooghe, D., Raja, U., & Butt, A. N. (2013). Combined Effects of Positive and Negative Affectivity and Job Satisfaction on Job Performance and Turnover Intentions'. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *147*(2), 105–123.

Borjas, G. J. (2002). *The wage structure and the sorting of workers into the public sector* (No. w9313). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w9313

Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: what's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, *39*(1), 97–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00284

Bozeman, B., & Ponomariov, B. (2009). Sector Switching from a Business to a Government Job: Fast-Track Career or Fast Track to Nowhere? *Public Administration Review*, *69*(1), 77–91. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.01942.x

Bromley, P., & Meyer, J. W. (2017). "They are all organizations": The cultural roots of blurring between the nonprofit, business, and government sectors. *Administration & Society*, *49*(7), 939–966. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714548268

Buelens, M., & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review*, *67*(1), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00697.x

Carpenter, J., Doverspike, D., & Miguel, R. F. (2012). Public service motivation as a predictor of attraction to the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*(2), 509–523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.08.004

Chavadi, C. A., Sirothiya, M., & Vishwanatha, M. R. (2021). Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intentions and Job Mismatch Among Millennial Employees in Bengaluru. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 2278533721994712. https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533721994712

Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, *19*(4), 304–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.04.001

Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover-A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4282625

Davis, T., Cutt, M., & Flynn, N. (2007). *Talent assessment: A new strategy for talent management*. Gower Publishing, Ltd.

De Graaf, G., & van der Wal, Z. (2008). On Value Differences Experienced by Sector Switchers. *Administration & Society*, *40*(1), 79–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707311785

Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2017). Sector-bending: Blurring the lines between nonprofit and for-profit. In *In search of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 51–72). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203788813-6

Doeringer, P. B., & Piore, M. J. (1985). *Internal labor markets and manpower analysis*. Me Sharpe.

Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2009). The value of value congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 654–677. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014891

Ertas, N. (2015). Turnover intentions and work motivations of millennial employees in federal service. *Public Personnel Management*, *44*(3), 401–423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015588193

Even, W. E., & Macpherson, D. A. (1996). Employer size and labor turnover: The role of pensions. *ILR Review*, *49*(4), 707–728. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979399604900408

Ewen, R. B. (1967). Weighting components of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *51*(1), 68–73. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024243

Fang, H. Y. (2007). An Empirical Study of the Relationship of the Personality Traits and Organizational Commitment with Turnover Intention [J]. *Chinese Journal of Management*, *3*.

Fry, F. L. (1973). A behavioral analysis of economic variables affecting turnover. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, *2*, 247–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-5720(73)90005-3

Galletta, M., Portoghese, I., Penna, M. P., Battistelli, A., & Saiani, L. (2011). Turnover intention among Italian nurses: The moderating roles of supervisor support and organizational support. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, *13*(2), 184–191. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2018.2011.00596.x

Greenhalgh, L., Lawrence, A. T., & Sutton, R. I. (1988). Determinants of work force reduction strategies in declining organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *13*(2), 241–254. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306878

Grossman, P. J., Mavros, P., & Wassmer, R. W. (1999). Public sector technical inefficiency in large US cities. *Journal of Urban Economics*, *46*(2), 278–299. https://doi.org/10.1006/juec.1998.2122

Hall, D., & Lobina, E. (2005). The relative efficiency of public and private sector water. *PSIRU Reports*.

Healy, M. C., Lehman, M., & McDaniel, M. A. (1995). Age and voluntary turnover: A quantitative review. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(2), 335–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01760.x

Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(1), 116–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02016.x

Hobfoll, S. E. (2012). Conservation of resources and disaster in cultural context: The caravans and passageways for resources. *Psychiatry*, *75*(3), 227–232. https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2012.75.3.227

Hobfoll, S. E., & Lilly, R. S. (1993). Resource conservation as a strategy for community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *21*(2), 128–148. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(199304)21:2

Idson, T. (1993). *Employer size and labor turnover*.

Jeon, S. H., & Robertson, P. J. (2013). Should I stay or should I go: The impact of public duty motivation on turnover intentions. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, *28*.

Jovanovic, B. (1979). Job matching and the theory of turnover. *Journal of Political Economy*, *87*(5, Part 1), 972–990. https://doi.org/10.1086/260808

Ju, B., & Li, J. (2019). Exploring the impact of training, job tenure, and education-job and skills-job matches on employee turnover intention. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *43*(3/4), 214–231. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-05-2018-0045

Kamarck, E. (2007). *The End of Government as We Know it: Making Public Policy Work*. Lynne Reinner.

Karl, K. A., & Sutton, C. L. (1998). Job values in today's workforce: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*, *27*(4), 515–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609802700406

Kim, P. S. (2008). How to attract and retain the best in government. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *74*(4), 637–652. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852308098472

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person - organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, *49*(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person–environment fit. In *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol 3: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization.* (pp. 3–50). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-001

Leibenstein, H. (1976). *Beyond economic man*. Harvard University Press.

Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review*, *62*(4), 395–404. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00193

Liu, B., Liu, J., & Hu, J. (2010). Person-organization fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *38*(5), 615–625. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2010.38.5.615

Llorens, J. J., Wenger, J. B., & Kellough, J. E. (2007). Choosing public sector employment: The impact of wages on the representation of women and minorities in state bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *18*(3), 397–413. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum020

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *4*(4), 309–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0

Markovits, Y., Davis, A. J., Fay, D., & van Dick, R. (2010). The link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Differences between public and private sector employees. *International Public Management Journal*, *13*(2), 177–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967491003756682

Mayer, G. (2014). *Selected characteristics of private and public sector workers* (pp. 7–7500). Congressional Research Service.

Millard, B., & Machin, A. (2007). Characteristics of public sector workers. *Economic & Labour Market Review*, *1*(5), 46–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.elmr.1410075

Miller, R. A. (1984). Job matching and occupational choice. *Journal of Political Economy*, *92*(6), 1086–1120. https://doi.org/10.1086/261276

Mortensen, D. T., & Pissarides, C. A. (1999). New developments in models of search in the labor market. *Handbook of Labor Economics*, *3*, 2567–2627.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Morrow, P. C. (1980). A multidisciplinary model of voluntary employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *17*(3), 263–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90022-6

Mudor, H. (2011). Conceptual framework on the relationship between human resource management practices, job satisfaction, and turnover. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, *2*(2), 41–49. https://doi.org/10.22610/jebs.v2i2.220

Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1990). Economic, psychological, and sociological determinants of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, *19*(3), 321–335. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-5720(90)90034-5

Munnell, A. H., & Fraenkel, R. C. (2013). Public sector workers and job security. *State and Local Pension Plans Issue in Brief*.

Mussagulova, A., Van der Wal, Z., & Chen, C.-A. (2019). What is wrong with job security? *Public Administration and Development*, *39*(3), 121–132. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1863

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). Re-examining the relationship between age and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *74*(3), 283–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.004

Nutt, P. C. (1999). Public-private differences and the assessment of alternatives for decision making. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *9*(2), 305–350. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024412

Ostroff, C., & Schulte, M. (2007). In C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on Organizational Fit* (pp. 3–69). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203810026

Pack, J. R. (1987). Privatization of public - sector services in theory and practice. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *6*(4), 523–540. https://doi.org/10.2307/3323506

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *6*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, *50*(3), 367–373. https://doi.org/10.2307/976618

Pfeifer, C. (2011). Risk aversion and sorting into public sector employment. *German Economic Review*, *12*(1), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0475.2010.00505.x

Poole, M., Mansfield, R., & Gould-Williams, J. (2006). Public and private sector managers over 20 years: A test of the 'convergence thesis.' *Public Administration*, *84*(4), 1051–1076. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00626.x

Rainey, H. G., & Bozeman, B. (2000). Comparing public and private organizations: Empirical research and the power of the a priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *10*(2), 447–470. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024276

Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public service motivation: A systematic literature review and outlook. *Public Administration Review*, *76*(3), 414–426. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12505

Rosenfeld, R. A. (1992). Job mobility and career processes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *18*(1), 39–61. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.18.080192.000351

Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty - first century. *Handbook of Psychology*, 55–76. https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei1204

Schaffer, R. H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *67*(14), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093658

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*(3), 437–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x

Schneider, B. (2001). Fits about fit. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(1), 141–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00051

Schneider, B., Smith, D. B., & Goldstein, H. W. (2000). *Attraction–selection–attrition: Toward a person–environment psychology of organizations*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Sheshinski, E., & López-Calva, L. F. (2003). Privatization and its benefits: Theory and evidence. *CESifo Economic Studies*, *49*(3), 429–459. https://doi.org/10.1093/cesifo/49.3.429

Su, X., & Bozeman, B. (2009). Dynamics of Sector Switching: Hazard Models Predicting Changes from Private Sector Jobs to Public and Nonprofit Sector Jobs. *Public Administration Review*, *69*(6), 1106–1114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02068.x

Tai, T. W. C., Bame, S. I., & Robinson, C. D. (1998). Review of nursing turnover research, 1977–1996. *Social Science & Medicine*, *47*(12), 1905–1924. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(98)00333-5

Werbel, J. D., & DeMarie, S. M. (2005). Aligning strategic human resource management and person–environment fit. *Human Resource Management Review*, *15*(4), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2005.10.001

Wilson, G., Roscigno, V. J., & Huffman, M. L. (2013). Public sector transformation, racial inequality and downward occupational mobility. *Social Forces*, *91*(3), 975–1006. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sos178

Wright, B. E., & Christensen, R. K. (2010). Public service motivation; A test of the job attraction–selection–attrition model. *International Public Management Journal*, *13*(2), 155–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967491003752012

Wynen, J., Op de Beeck, S., & Hondeghem, A. (2013). Interorganizational mobility within the US federal government: Examining the effect of individual and organizational factors. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(6), 869–881. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12113

Appendix

Table A. Marginal Effect of the Results of Logit Regression [2003-2006: Model 7 of Table 1]

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)					
		dy/dx	Delta-method Std.Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	0.0168417	0.0093163	1.81	0.071	-0.0014178	0.0351012
	Age: 30s	0.0213104	0.0087531	2.43	0.015	0.0041547	0.0384661
	Age: 40s	0.0193007	0.0087265	2.21	0.027	0.0021971	0.0364044
	Age: 50s	0.0208564	0.0088412	2.36	0.018	0.0035279	0.0381849
Gender	Male	-0.0038298	0.0021422	-1.79	0.074	-0.0080284	0.0003689
Marriage	Married	0.0012683	0.0021632	0.59	0.558	-0.0029715	0.0055082
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.0076324	0.003482	2.19	0.028	0.0008077	0.014457
	Asian	-0.0006325	0.0029549	-0.21	0.83	-0.006424	0.0051589
	Hispanic	0.0035759	0.003627	0.99	0.324	-0.003533	0.0106848
	Others	0.0107656	0.0042204	2.55	0.011	0.0024937	0.0190376
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.0047969	0.0046475	-1.03	0.302	-0.0139059	0.004312
	Degree: Master	-0.0009265	0.0047157	-0.2	0.844	-0.0101691	0.0083162
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	0.0014611	0.0022502	0.65	0.516	-0.0029492	0.0058714
	Not related	0.0049746	0.0028848	1.72	0.085	-0.0006796	0.0106287
Government funded project	Participated	0.0155269	0.0021594	7.19	0	0.0112945	0.0197593
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-0.0168929	0.0030626	-5.52	0	-0.0228956	-0.0108903
Supervisor	Supervisor	0.0041538	0.002054	2.02	0.043	0.000128	0.0081795
General training	Participated	0.0020348	0.0020602	0.99	0.323	-0.0020031	0.0060726
Professional meeting	Participated	0.0011955	0.0020051	0.6	0.551	-0.0027344	0.0051254
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	-0.003393	0.0048025	-0.71	0.48	-0.0128057	0.0060198
	11~24	0.0019061	0.0047693	0.4	0.689	-0.0074415	0.0112537
	25~99	0.0043792	0.0036246	1.21	0.227	-0.0027248	0.0114832
	100~499	0.0048445	0.0032568	1.49	0.137	-0.0015387	0.0112277
	500~999	0.0068252	0.0039742	1.72	0.086	-0.000964	0.0146144
	1000~4999	0.011324	0.0029511	3.84	0	0.00554	0.0171081
	5000~24999	0.0026482	0.003187	0.83	0.406	-0.0035982	0.0088945
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	-0.0045998	0.0035385	-1.3	0.194	-0.0115351	0.0023355
	South	0.0084471	0.0027909	3.03	0.002	0.0029771	0.0139171
	West	0.0062252	0.0029959	2.08	0.038	0.0003533	0.012097
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-0.0015024	0.0068249	-0.22	0.826	-0.014879	0.0118743
	Physics and related sciences	0.001469	0.005013	0.29	0.769	-0.0083562	0.0112942
	Social and related sciences	0.0099777	0.007556	1.32	0.187	-0.0048317	0.0247871
	Engineering	-0.0004002	0.0026351	-0.15	0.879	-0.0055649	0.0047645
	S and E-	-0.0010149	0.00314	-0.32	0.747	-0.0071692	0.0051394

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2003-2006)					
		dy/dx	Delta-method Std.Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Related Fields						
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.0025973	0.0029631	-0.88	0.381	-0.0084049	0.0032103
Satisfaction on principal job	Security	-0.002108	0.001208	-1.74	0.081	-0.0044757	0.0002598
	PSM	-0.0004314	0.001279	-0.34	0.736	-0.0029382	0.0020755
	Salary	0.0009454	0.001633	0.58	0.563	-0.0022553	0.0041461
	Benefit	-0.001442	0.0014426	-1	0.317	-0.0042693	0.0013854
	Location	0.0011254	0.0012483	0.9	0.367	-0.0013212	0.003572
	Opportunity for advancement	-0.0010317	0.0014128	-0.73	0.465	-0.0038008	0.0017374
	Intellectual challenge	-0.0003741	0.0015322	-0.24	0.807	-0.0033772	0.0026289
	Level of responsibility	-0.0009967	0.0016919	-0.59	0.556	-0.0043128	0.0023194
	Degree of independence	-0.00078	0.0014135	-0.55	0.581	-0.0035503	0.0019903
Importance of job factors	Security	0.0011903	0.0019902	0.6	0.55	-0.0027104	0.0050911
	PSM	0.0047721	0.0016155	2.95	0.003	0.0016058	0.0079384
	Salary	-0.0038629	0.0020246	-1.91	0.056	-0.007831	0.0001051
	Benefit	0.0014182	0.0020576	0.69	0.491	-0.0026146	0.005451
	Location	0.0025291	0.0015952	1.59	0.113	-0.0005975	0.0056556
	Opportunity for advancement	-0.0006757	0.001679	-0.4	0.687	-0.0039664	0.0026151
	Intellectual challenge	0.0000441	0.0021446	0.02	0.984	-0.0041592	0.0042474
	Level of responsibility	0.0018455	0.0019671	0.94	0.348	-0.00201	0.005701
	Degree of independence	-0.0041398	0.0018702	-2.21	0.027	-0.0078053	-0.0004743

Note: Average marginal effects of all covariates are estimated using Stata 14. The code used is *margins, dydx(*)*

Table B. Marginal Effect of the Results of Logit Regression [2010-2013: Model 7 of Table 2]

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)					
		dy/dx	Delta-method Std.Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	0.0163331	0.0076451	2.14	0.033	0.0013491	0.0313172
	Age: 30s	0.0133819	0.0070679	1.89	0.058	-0.0004708	0.0272346
	Age: 40s	0.0099378	0.0071483	1.39	0.164	-0.0040726	0.0239482
	Age: 50s	0.0114418	0.006919	1.65	0.098	-0.0021191	0.0250027
Gender	Male	0.0010284	0.002633	0.39	0.696	-0.0041322	0.006189
Marriage	Married	-0.0022343	0.0023966	-0.93	0.351	-0.0069316	0.002463
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.0075113	0.0034233	2.19	0.028	0.0008017	0.014221
	Asian	-0.0019076	0.0033724	-0.57	0.572	-0.0085173	0.0047022
	Hispanic	-0.000646	0.0038319	-0.17	0.866	-0.0081564	0.0068644
	Others	-0.0056422	0.0079875	-0.71	0.48	-0.0212974	0.0100129
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.0080353	0.0040771	-1.97	0.049	-0.0160262	-0.0000444
	Degree: Master	-0.005953	0.0039839	-1.49	0.135	-0.0137614	0.0018553
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	-0.0002598	0.0027321	-0.1	0.924	-0.0056145	0.005095
	Not related	0.0044571	0.0036307	1.23	0.22	-0.002659	0.0115732
Government funded project	Participated	0.0158767	0.0025778	6.16	0	0.0108244	0.020929
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-0.0048572	0.0027116	-1.79	0.073	-0.0101719	0.0004575
Supervisor	Supervisor	-0.0008266	0.0024989	-0.33	0.741	-0.0057244	0.0040712
General training	Participated	-0.000311	0.0023469	-0.13	0.895	-0.0049109	0.0042889
Professional meeting	Participated	0.0039202	0.0023854	1.64	0.1	-0.0007551	0.0085954
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	0.0031285	0.005611	0.56	0.577	-0.0078689	0.014126
	11~24	0.0054536	0.0054595	1	0.318	-0.0052469	0.0161542
	25~99	0.0051618	0.004093	1.26	0.207	-0.0028603	0.0131839
	100~499	0.0046725	0.0037028	1.26	0.207	-0.0025849	0.0119299
	500~999	0.0025116	0.0049262	0.51	0.61	-0.0071437	0.0121668
	1000~4999	0.0069127	0.003748	1.84	0.065	-0.0004333	0.0142586
	5000~24999	0.0022171	0.0038008	0.58	0.56	-0.0052323	0.0096665
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	-0.004901	0.0040364	-1.21	0.225	-0.0128121	0.0030102
	South	0.0040811	0.0030126	1.35	0.176	-0.0018236	0.0099857
	West	0.0021182	0.0032669	0.65	0.517	-0.0042849	0.0085213
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-0.0113943	0.0083521	-1.36	0.172	-0.0277642	0.0049755
	Physics and related sciences	0.0051296	0.0046732	1.1	0.272	-0.0040298	0.0142889
	Social and related sciences	0.0037094	0.0091986	0.4	0.687	-0.0143196	0.0217383
	Engineering	-0.0026912	0.0038584	-0.7	0.485	-0.0102536	0.0048712
	S and E-	-0.0007842	0.0041108	-0.19	0.849	-0.0088413	0.0072729

		Dependent variable: Sector switching (2010-2013)					
		dy/dx	Delta-method Std.Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Related Fields						
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.0005631	0.0034707	-0.16	0.871	-0.0073656	0.0062394
Satisfaction on principal job	Security	-0.0040058	0.0013302	-3.01	0.003	-0.0066129	-0.0013987
	PSM	0.0052229	0.0017412	3	0.003	0.0018102	0.0086356
	Salary	0.0008449	0.0017828	0.47	0.636	-0.0026494	0.0043392
	Benefit	-0.0007648	0.0014874	-0.51	0.607	-0.0036801	0.0021506
	Location	0.0005553	0.0013476	0.41	0.68	-0.0020861	0.0031966
	Opportunity for advancement	-0.0033395	0.0014384	-2.32	0.02	-0.0061587	-0.0005203
	Intellectual challenge	-0.0009687	0.0018076	-0.54	0.592	-0.0045116	0.0025741
	Level of responsibility	-0.0000874	0.0019962	-0.04	0.965	-0.0039998	0.003825
	Degree of independence	0.0000082	0.0014755	0.01	0.996	-0.0028837	0.0029001
Importance of job factors	Security	0.0019582	0.0023811	0.82	0.411	-0.0027086	0.0066251
	PSM	0.0035401	0.0017102	2.07	0.038	0.0001883	0.006892
	Salary	-0.0028506	0.0023816	-1.2	0.231	-0.0075186	0.0018173
	Benefit	0.0010279	0.0024661	0.42	0.677	-0.0038056	0.0058615
	Location	0.0008798	0.0019059	0.46	0.644	-0.0028557	0.0046153
	Opportunity for advancement	0.0000658	0.0020865	0.03	0.975	-0.0040236	0.0041553
	Intellectual challenge	-0.0013418	0.0023012	-0.58	0.56	-0.0058521	0.0031686
	Level of responsibility	-0.002808	0.0021856	-1.28	0.199	-0.0070917	0.0014756
	Degree of independence	-0.0014352	0.0021561	-0.67	0.506	-0.005661	0.0027907

Note: Average marginal effects of all covariates are estimated using Stata 14. The code used is *margins, dydx(*)*

Table C. Logit Regression Results: Switching from the public sector to the private sector (2003-2006)

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	0.803**	0.857**	0.788**	0.749**	0.705*	0.790**	0.689*
		(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.39)
	Age: 30s	0.348	0.384	0.358	0.304	0.294	0.326	0.296
		(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.32)
	Age: 40s	-0.065	-0.054	-0.085	-0.077	-0.079	-0.089	-0.118
		(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.31)
	Age: 50s	-0.155	-0.128	-0.153	-0.154	-0.141	-0.154	-0.161
		(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)
Gender	Male	0.009	0.026	0.019	-0.033	-0.045	-0.022	-0.038
		(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Marriage	Married	-0.081	-0.075	-0.088	-0.082	-0.081	-0.065	-0.077
		(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.069	0.077	0.065	0.186	0.13	0.16	0.1
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.21)
	Asian	-0.035	-0.028	-0.022	0.053	0.009	0.042	0.014
		(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
	Hispanic	0.178	0.19	0.197	0.283	0.237	0.274	0.248
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.23)
	Others	-0.248	-0.232	-0.21	-0.255	-0.277	-0.255	-0.249
		(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.404*	-0.412*	-0.311	-0.376*	-0.383*	-0.351	-0.268
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
	Degree: Master	-0.571**	-0.570**	-0.490**	-0.549**	-0.554**	-0.538**	-0.470**
		(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	0.007	0.001	0.017	-0.006	-0.01	-0.025	-0.009
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
	Not related	-0.057	-0.058	-0.022	-0.048	-0.076	-0.081	-0.059
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Government funded project	Participated	0.226	0.233	0.21	0.249	0.253	0.236	0.218
		(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-0.391*	-0.394*	-0.271	-0.505**	-0.514**	-0.441**	-0.346
		(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.22)
Supervisor	Supervisor	-0.026	-0.02	-0.064	-0.042	-0.054	-0.025	-0.077
		(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.14)
General training	Participated	-0.444***	-0.428***	-0.441***	-0.464***	-0.452***	-0.437***	-0.437***

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)
Professional meeting	Participated	0.311**	0.303**	0.300**	0.302**	0.293**	0.300**	0.295**
		(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	-0.092	-0.16	-0.101	-0.097	-0.036	-0.114	-0.005
		(0.72)	(0.74)	(0.73)	(0.74)	(0.74)	(0.75)	(0.73)
	11~24	0.29	0.235	0.246	0.272	0.257	0.258	0.267
		(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.50)
	25~99	-0.312	-0.333	-0.293	-0.382	-0.34	-0.377	-0.301
		(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
	100~499	-0.008	-0.035	-0.014	-0.022	-0.02	-0.043	-0.02
		(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
	500~999	-0.329	-0.352	-0.366	-0.326	-0.337	-0.362	-0.389
		(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)
	1000~4999	-0.006	0.01	-0.008	-0.007	0.001	0	-0.01
		(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.19)
	5000~24999	-0.620**	-0.620**	-0.639**	-0.620**	-0.609**	-0.645***	-0.651***
		(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	0.143	0.131	0.127	0.134	0.144	0.118	0.122
		(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
	South	0.138	0.137	0.113	0.106	0.102	0.118	0.092
		(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)
	West	0.111	0.086	0.114	0.067	0.079	0.066	0.096
		(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-1.168***	-1.149***	-1.112***	-1.208***	-1.183***	-1.202***	-1.152***
		(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)
	Physics and related sciences	-0.830**	-0.753*	-0.720*	-0.789**	-0.779**	-0.745*	-0.696*
		(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)
	Social and related sciences	-0.258	-0.251	-0.221	-0.266	-0.264	-0.269	-0.236
		(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.40)
	Engineering	-0.329	-0.272	-0.232	-0.338	-0.35	-0.303	-0.274
		(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.24)
	S and E-Related Fields	0.247	0.305	0.32	0.247	0.254	0.289	0.31
		(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.17	-0.115	-0.095	-0.166	-0.165	-0.126	-0.109
		(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)
Satisfaction on principal job	General	-0.267***						

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2003-2006)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.09)						
	Security		-0.218**	-0.191**			-0.199**	-0.180*
			(0.09)	(0.09)			(0.09)	(0.10)
	PSM		-0.169*	-0.228**			-0.085	-0.142
			(0.09)	(0.11)			(0.10)	(0.12)
	Salary			-0.277***				-0.275***
				(0.10)				(0.11)
	Benefit			0.059				0.089
				(0.11)				(0.12)
	Location			-0.151*				-0.138*
				(0.08)				(0.08)
	Opportunity for advancement			0.089				0.092
				(0.09)				(0.09)
	Intellectual challenge			0.16				0.167
				(0.11)				(0.11)
	Level of responsibility			0.071				0.06
				(0.13)				(0.13)
	Degree of independence			-0.071				-0.066
				(0.10)				(0.10)
	Security				-0.441***	-0.459***	-0.404***	-0.425***
					(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.13)
	PSM				-0.231**	-0.272**	-0.206**	-0.240**
					(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)
	Salary					0.044		0.039
						(0.14)		(0.14)
	Benefit					-0.1		-0.092
						(0.15)		(0.15)
Importance of job factors	Location					0.024		0.062
						(0.11)		(0.11)
	Opportunity for advancement					0.152		0.128
						(0.11)		(0.11)
	Intellectual challenge					-0.089		-0.104
						(0.15)		(0.15)
	Level of responsibility					0.15		0.144
						(0.14)		(0.14)
	Degree of independence					-0.037		-0.032
						(0.12)		(0.13)

	Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2003-2006)						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Constant	3.274	3.678	2.794	6.093**	5.990**	6.064**	5.124**
	(2.42)	(2.43)	(2.54)	(2.43)	(2.47)	(2.45)	(2.59)
Observations	4136	4136	4136	4136	4136	4136	4136
Pseudo R2	0.047	0.0485	0.0555	0.0534	0.0553	0.0566	0.0648

The data for regression estimations presented in this table are drawn from the NSCG database sponsored by the National Science Foundation and conducted by the Census Bureau. Regression specifications are estimated in STATA 14 using the logit algorithm. The dependent variable is a dummy variable '*Sector switching*.' Robust standard errors are estimated.

Table D. Logit Regression Results: Switching from the public sector to the private sector (2010-2013)

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Age (Ref: Age 60s and over)	Age: 20s	1.323**	1.327**	1.465***	1.241**	1.120**	1.327**	1.327**
		(0.51)	(0.54)	(0.55)	(0.52)	(0.52)	(0.54)	(0.56)
	Age: 30s	0.344	0.304	0.345	0.34	0.232	0.336	0.239
		(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.49)
	Age: 40s	0.188	0.154	0.156	0.222	0.139	0.194	0.106
		(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.48)
	Age: 50s	-0.595	-0.632	-0.65	-0.568	-0.681	-0.6	-0.731
		(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.53)	(0.52)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.53)
Gender	Male	0.675**	0.617**	0.663**	0.579**	0.746***	0.578**	0.787***
		(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Marriage	Married	-0.005	0.021	0.034	-0.013	-0.067	0.047	0.002
		(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Race (Ref: White)	Black	0.368	0.352	0.323	0.463	0.357	0.41	0.26
		(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.39)
	Asian	-0.136	-0.101	-0.038	-0.055	-0.079	-0.073	-0.009
		(0.44)	(0.47)	(0.45)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.44)
	Hispanic	0.076	0.082	0.084	0.121	0.012	0.113	0.03
		(0.38)	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.38)	(0.40)	(0.37)	(0.40)
	Others	-1.191	-1.309	-1.234	-1.165	-1.403	-1.278	-1.264
		(1.08)	(1.12)	(1.13)	(1.08)	(1.15)	(1.11)	(1.15)
Education (Ref: Doctoral or Professional)	Degree: Bachelor	-0.705	-0.589	-0.617	-0.699	-0.721*	-0.593	-0.629
		(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.46)	(0.48)
	Degree: Master	-0.486	-0.432	-0.479	-0.472	-0.557	-0.447	-0.562
		(0.44)	(0.45)	(0.46)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.46)	(0.47)
Job mismatch (Ref: Closely related)	Somewhat related	0.359	0.305	0.262	0.385	0.516*	0.291	0.378
		(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.28)
	Not related	0.316	0.363	0.263	0.401	0.457	0.358	0.333
		(0.45)	(0.43)	(0.41)	(0.45)	(0.46)	(0.43)	(0.42)
Government funded project	Participated	0.056	0.013	0.018	0.051	0.071	0.008	0.025
		(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.34)
Salary	ln (Annual Salary)	-0.542	-0.392	-0.376	-0.742*	-0.873**	-0.467	-0.554
		(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.47)	(0.40)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.50)
Supervisor	Supervisor	0.504**	0.448*	0.475*	0.467*	0.452*	0.433*	0.423
		(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.27)
General training	Participated	0.259	0.326	0.387	0.243	0.248	0.32	0.434

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)
Professional meeting	Participated	0.097	0.089	0.08	0.108	0.098	0.095	0.08
		(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.25)
Size of employer (Ref: over 25,000)	1~10	0.18	0.169	0.004	0.054	-0.081	0.058	-0.185
		(1.09)	(1.10)	(1.07)	(1.13)	(1.20)	(1.14)	(1.20)
	11~24	-0.218	-0.249	-0.562	-0.202	0.113	-0.342	-0.342
		(1.22)	(1.18)	(1.14)	(1.21)	(1.19)	(1.18)	(1.12)
	25~99	0.431	0.318	0.279	0.338	0.454	0.251	0.367
		(0.51)	(0.55)	(0.54)	(0.52)	(0.52)	(0.56)	(0.55)
	100~499	-0.491	-0.52	-0.594	-0.539	-0.491	-0.548	-0.589
		(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.51)	(0.48)	(0.51)
	500~999	-0.537	-0.488	-0.568	-0.552	-0.562	-0.508	-0.624
		(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.66)	(0.67)	(0.65)	(0.68)
	1000~4999	-0.427	-0.53	-0.618	-0.454	-0.423	-0.57	-0.579
		(0.38)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.41)	(0.40)
	5000~24999	0.07	0.077	0.052	0.103	0.054	0.077	-0.022
		(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)
Location of employer (Ref: Northeast)	Midewst	0.064	0.051	0.029	0.104	0.123	0.057	0.064
		(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.47)	(0.48)
	South	0.176	0.236	0.253	0.189	0.141	0.228	0.213
		(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.39)
	West	0.236	0.193	0.234	0.195	0.153	0.173	0.144
		(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.42)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.41)	(0.42)
Job category (Ref: Computer and math science)	Life and related sciences	-0.459	-0.47	-0.426	-0.539	-0.387	-0.519	-0.339
		(0.65)	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.65)	(0.66)	(0.67)	(0.69)
	Physics and related sciences	-0.717	-0.755	-0.806	-0.739	-0.617	-0.779	-0.676
		(0.74)	(0.75)	(0.75)	(0.74)	(0.73)	(0.75)	(0.72)
	Social and related sciences	0.183	0.18	0.152	0.154	0.245	0.158	0.238
		(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.64)	(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.63)
	Engineering	0.046	0.095	0.123	0.06	0.211	0.108	0.277
		(0.54)	(0.55)	(0.54)	(0.54)	(0.52)	(0.54)	(0.52)
	S and E-Related Fields	0.586	0.575	0.617	0.532	0.686	0.559	0.748
		(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.47)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.47)
	Non-S and E Fields	-0.178	-0.215	-0.132	-0.253	-0.136	-0.248	-0.055
		(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.49)	(0.47)
Satisfaction on principal job	General	-0.397**						

		Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2010-2013)						
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
		(0.16)						
	Security		-0.575***	-0.449***			-0.548***	-0.451***
			(0.15)	(0.16)			(0.15)	(0.17)
	PSM		-0.208	-0.105			-0.183	-0.048
			(0.15)	(0.16)			(0.15)	(0.17)
	Salary			0.18				0.22
				(0.21)				(0.21)
	Benefit			-0.18				-0.191
				(0.16)				(0.17)
	Location			-0.051				-0.081
				(0.14)				(0.14)
	Opportunity for advancement			-0.403**				-0.381**
				(0.18)				(0.18)
	Intellectual challenge			-0.152				-0.176
				(0.18)				(0.18)
	Level of responsibility			0.178				0.184
				(0.20)				(0.20)
	Degree of independence			0.085				0.078
				(0.18)				(0.19)
	Security				-0.494**	-0.564**	-0.345	-0.366
					(0.24)	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.27)
	PSM				-0.134	-0.271	-0.066	-0.25
					(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.22)
	Salary					0.759**		0.626**
						(0.31)		(0.31)
	Benefit					-0.565*		-0.529*
						(0.31)		(0.32)
Importance of job factors	Location					0.349*		0.390*
						(0.20)		(0.21)
	Opportunity for advancement					0.092		0.133
						(0.22)		(0.22)
	Intellectual challenge					0.955***		0.991***
						(0.30)		(0.30)
	Level of responsibility					0.036		0.084
						(0.24)		(0.25)
	Degree of independence					-0.385		-0.465
						(0.26)		(0.29)

	Dependent variable: Sector switching from Public to Private (2010-2013)						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Mode 5	Model 6	Model 7
Constant	3.154	2.801	2.615	6.48	4.107	5.004	2.171
	(4.73)	(4.80)	(5.32)	(4.76)	(4.87)	(4.89)	(5.52)
Observations	2471	2471	2471	2471	2471	2471	2471
Pseudo R2	0.0866	0.1069	0.1198	0.086	0.1202	0.1102	0.1568

The data for regression estimations presented in this table are drawn from the NSCG database sponsored by the National Science Foundation and conducted by the Census Bureau. Regression specifications are estimated in STATA 14 using the logit algorithm. The dependent variable is a dummy variable '*Sector switching*.' Robust standard errors are estimated.