

## **Factors Affecting Young People's Participation in Public Administration: Results of Survey**

Inara Kantane<sup>1</sup>, Biruta Sloka<sup>2</sup>, Romans Putans<sup>3</sup>, Tatjana Muravska<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Latvia, The College of Economics and Culture  
Riga, Latvia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia

*E-mails:* <sup>1</sup>*inara.kantane@lu.lv (corresponding author);* <sup>2</sup>*biruta.sloka.@lu.lv;* <sup>3</sup>*romans.putans.@lu.lv;*  
<sup>4</sup>*tatjana.muravska.@lu.lv*

*(Received Jun 2015; accepted Sep 2015)*

**Abstract.** Young people are an important part of society and security of country future. The aim of this paper is to analyse factors affecting young people's participation in public administration. Methods used in research: analysis of scientific literature, survey of young people. For evaluation of many aspects of research focus in survey it was used evaluation scale 1 – 10, there were asked 1001 young person. For survey data analysis used methods: descriptive statistics – indicators of central tendency or location and indicators of variability, cross tabulations, Mann-Whitney test, Kruskal-Wallis test, factor analysis. The results of analysis of survey data indicate that work in the field of private business, non-governmental organizations and public institutions are the most popular subject areas for young people to participate in public administration. The key factors that are important when working in public administration are interesting work, professional managers and wage, career opportunities. The opinions of young people about the plans for the future and significance of the factors “it is important that the work is interesting”, “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making”, “career opportunities” differ depending on the young people age and gender.

**Keywords:** Affecting factors, participation, public administration, survey, young people.

---

### **1. Introduction**

Young people are an important part of society. The involvement and participation of young people in the public administration is very topical issue and is referred as one

of the major expected results in Youth policy guidelines of 2009. – 2018 by Council of Europe and European Commission and Youth Partnership of Council of Europe and European Commission documents as well as in most of the world countries policy documents (Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Latvia, 2009). In Latvia share of young people in whole population is relatively small and that motivates to use any young person for society needs as efficient as possible but also respecting democratic development and personal interest of young people. The aim of this paper is to analyse factors affecting young people's participation in public administration in Latvia. The survey of young people was conducted by approaching personally for persons included in the sample and were asked to fill in web survey (n=1001). The evaluation scale 1 – 10 was applied for most of the questions. For survey data analysis used methods: descriptive statistics – indicators of central tendency or location and indicators of variability, cross tabulations, for hypothesis testing it was used Mann-Whitney test, Kruskal-Wallis test, multivariate analysis method – factor analysis was used to determine complex factors.

## **2. Theoretical Findings**

The academic research worldwide has paid attention of researchers on different aspects of young people entering and staying in public administration as they are one of the most important part in the sector – starting with motivation factors (Coley, Price, 2015) including payment for their done work (O'Halloran, 2012), career growth factors (Bach, Bordogna, 2011), stability factors, recruitment factors (Colley, 2011), qualification factors (Linn et al, 2004), specialisation factors (Patel, 2010), training factors (Price et al, 2011) and education factors (Kaestner et al, 2013) and even retirement factors (Colley, L, 2012); (Friend, 2004) and work organisation factors (Credet al, 2010) influencing work of young people in public administration and also making agreements of public – academic partnerships to realise the state policy (Hansen, et al, 2014). Balu, Margina and Ratezanu evaluate the degree of interest of master graduates in public administration towards a possible career in the public sector (Balu et al, 2014) and modernisation aspects (Maddock, 2002) and changes (White, 2000) as well as place (Hess, 2010). European Union funded programs often rise initiatives for finding better solutions in professional work (Nousianainen, Mäkinen, 2015) and applying new and innovative approaches (Henderson, 1995) and modern approaches (Rondeaux, 2006) and transforming also civil servants (Berg, 2006). Different approaches and theories have been developed, checked and evaluated for more efficient approaches in public administration (van Wart, Cayer, 2006), evaluated different changes (Caron, Giaugue, 2006) as well as historical trends in public administration (Dobuzinskis, 1997) and (Grant, 2006). Many countries have

developed their special policies on public administration and attention to young people (Circa, 2013) taking into account also their national specifics and public administration development (Rouban, 2008) in France and (Ongaro, 2008) in Italy and Parrado, 2008) in Spain and (Greoenvald. 2011) in the Netherlands and their involvement in public administration activities. The analysis of research findings in mentioned above scientific publications has confirmed and inspired for empirical research needs on thoughts of young people in public administration in Latvia on their plans in future.

### 3. Empirical Research Results

The questionnaire of the survey of young people in public administration in Latvia was designed and carried out by Romans Putans by scientific supervision of Tatjana Muravska, the empirical research data analysis was supported by other authors of the paper. The population of empirical research was settled: young people in public administration in Latvia and for selection of units included in the sample were selected 10% of the population: every tenth person was approached personally by e – mail and invitation to participate in the survey.

About 46.4% of young people (respondents) agreed with statement “I am planning to engage in private business”, about 29.9% of young people agreed with statement “I would like to work in the public or municipal institution”, less young people agreed with other statements about plans for the future. The main statistical indicators of youth people evaluations on the statement about plans for the future are included in the table 1. Data of table 1 shows that the average evaluations for statement “I am planning to engage in private business” is higher – arithmetic mean 6.57, median 7, mode 8, however, the evaluations were quite different – standard deviation 2.737, range 9 (in 1 – 10 evaluation scale, where 1 – completely disagree, 10 – completely agree).

Table 1. Main statistical indicators of young people evaluations on the statements about plans for the future (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, n=1001)

The plans for the future	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum
I would like to work in the public or	5.63	0.073	6	5	2.737	9	1	10

municipal institution								
I am planning to engage in private business	6.57	0.07 3	7	8	2.713	9	1	10
I would like to work in the public social sector (doctor, teacher, policeman, etc.)	3.70	0.06 8	3	1	2.545	9	1	10
I would like to work in the academic environment, including scientific work in the field of public administration	4.52	0.07 2	4	1	2.693	9	1	10
I will participate in public administration, with the involvement of non-governmental organisations	5.77	0.07 2	6	5	2.704	9	1	10
I will offer an opinion on the Internet and newspapers, journals	5.77	0.07 1	6	7	2.648	9	1	10
I will stand in election	3.74	0.07 3	3	1	2.725	9	1	10

Males evaluated factor “I am planning to engage in private business” higher than females (arithmetic mean 6.97 and 6.18), the evaluations differed statistically significant as it were proved by the results of Mann-Whitney test ( $z = -6.103$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Females higher than males evaluated factors “I will participate in public administration, with the involvement of non-governmental organisations” (arithmetic mean 6.01 and 5.51) and “I would like to work in the public social sector (doctor, teacher,

policeman, etc.)” (arithmetic mean 4.19 and 3.20), the evaluations differed statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test results respectively  $z = -3.147$ ,  $p=0.002$ ;  $z = -8.122$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

The respondents who age was 30 years or greater evaluated factor “I would like to work in the public or municipal institution” higher, but respondents who age was 27-30 years evaluated factor lower (arithmetic mean 6.19 and 5.35), the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z = -3.523$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). The factor “I am planning to engage in private business” higher evaluated respondents who age was 21-26 years, but respondents who age was 20 or less years evaluated factor lower (arithmetic mean 6.67 and 6.39), the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z = -3.468$ ,  $p=0.001$ ). The respondents who age was 30 years or greater evaluated factor “I would like to work in the public social sector (doctor, teacher, policeman, etc.)” higher, but respondents who age was 27-30 years evaluated factor lower (arithmetic mean 3.45 and 4.02), the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z = -2.884$ ,  $p=0.004$ ). The respondents who age was 30 years or greater higher evaluated also factor “I would like to work in the academic environment, including scientific work in the field of public administration”, respondents who age was 20 years or less evaluated factor lower (arithmetic mean 5.28 and 4.03), the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z = -5.450$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). The factor “I will participate in public administration, with the involvement of non-governmental organisations” higher evaluated respondents who age was 20 or less years, respondents who age was 27-30 years evaluated factor lower (arithmetic mean 6.32 and 5.52), the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z = -3.678$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). The average values of young people evaluations on the statements about plans for the future by age groups are included in the table 2.

Table 2. Average values of young people evaluations on the statements about plans for the future by age (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, 2012, n=1001)

The plans for the future	Age							
	≤ 20		21-26		27-30		≥ 30	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
I would like to work in the public or municipal institution	5.67	6	5.66	6	5.35	5	6.19	7
I am planning to	6.39	7	6.67	7	6.59	8	6.51	7

engage in private business								
I would like to work in the public social sector (doctor, teacher, policeman, etc.)	3.92	3	3.70	3	3.45	3	4.02	3
I would like to work in the academic environment, including scientific work in the field of public administration	4.03	4	4.44	4	4.55	5	5.28	5
I will participate in public administration, with the involvement of non-governmental organizations	6.32	7	5.65	6	5.52	5	5.90	5
I will offer an opinion on the Internet and newspapers, journals	5.87	6	5.61	6	5.80	6	5.92	6
I will stand in election	4.24	4	3.80	3	3.62	3	3.28	2

Data of table 3 shows that main factors which didn't motivate participation in public administration were "a bad view of the public administration" – arithmetic mean 6.74, median 7, mode 8, "a bad experience at work or in collaboration with public administration" – arithmetic mean 5.69, median 6, mode 5 (in 1 – 10 evaluation scale, where 1 – completely disagree, 10 – completely agree).

Table 3. Main statistical indicators of young people evaluations on the statements which didn't motivate participation in public administration (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, 2012, n=1001)

Statements which didn't motivate participation in public administration	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum
---	------	--------------------	--------	------	----------------	-------	---------	---------

tion								
It is not the interests of the public administration sector in general	4.11	0.069	4	1	2.580	9	1	10
There is no inner belief that something can change	5.16	0.074	5	3	2.784	9	1	10
A bad view of the public administration	6.74	0.068	7	8	2.525	9	1	10
A bad experience at work or in collaboration with public administration	5.69	0.070	6	5	2.619	9	1	10
The job does not prestige in the public administration	4.73	0.066	5	5	2.481	9	1	10

The interesting work was very significant factor when working in public administration – arithmetic mean 9.26, median 10, mode 10 (in 1 – 10 evaluation scale, where 1 – not significant; 10 – very significant). About 37.3% of young people evaluated these factors as very significant, about 48.5% as significant. High young people also evaluated such factors as “leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates”, “wage”, “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making” and “career opportunities”.

The evaluations of all mention factors were homogeneous – the variability of evaluations was not large. The main statistical indicators of youth people evaluations on the factors, which are important when working in public administration, are included in the table 4.

Table 4. Main statistical indicators of young people evaluations on the factors, which are important when working in public administration (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, 2012, n=1001)

Important factors when working in public administration	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
It is important that the work is interesting	9.26	0.032	10	10	1.202	1	10
The leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates	8.76	0.038	9	10	1.436	1	10
Wage	8.72	0.036	9	10	1.340	1	10
Professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making	8.59	0.045	9	10	1.674	1	10
Career opportunities	8.58	0.041	9	10	1.542	1	10
Prestige	7.27	0.055	8	8	2.046	1	10
The job is easy, and does not require a special effort	4.85	0.059	5	5	2.196	1	10

The opinions of young people about the significance of factors “it is important that the work is interesting”, “the leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates”, “wage”, “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making”, “career opportunities”, “prestige” differed depending on the young people gender.

Females evaluated factors higher than males, the evaluations differed statistically significant as it were proved by the results of Mann-Whitney test (respectively  $z = -6.777, p=0.000$ ;  $z = -4.979, p=0.000$ ;  $z = -4.795, p=0.000$ ;  $z = -3.828, p=0.000$ ;  $z = -2.845, p=0.004$ ;  $z = -3.758, p=0.000$ ).

The young people evaluations about the significance of factors “it is important



that the work is interesting”, “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making”, “career opportunities”, “wage”, “job is easy, and does not require a special effort” differed depending on the young people age, it were proved by the results of Kruskal-Wallis test (respectively  $\chi^2= 13.580$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ;  $\chi^2= 71.135$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ;  $\chi^2= 24.249$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ;  $\chi^2= 28.183$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ;  $\chi^2= 10.433$ ,  $p = 0.015$ ).

The factor “it is important that the work is interesting” higher evaluated respondents who age was 27-30 years, but respondents who age was 30 years or greater evaluated factor lower, the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z= -2.109$ ,  $p=0.035$ ).

The factor “career opportunities” higher evaluated respondents who age was 20 years or less, but respondents who age was 30 years or greater evaluated factor lower, the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z= -4.507$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

The factor “wage” higher evaluated respondents who age was 27-30 years, but respondents who age was 20 years or less evaluated factor lower, the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z= -2.874$ ,  $p=0.004$ ).

The factor “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making” higher evaluated respondents in the age group 30 years or more, but respondents who were in age group 20 years or less have evaluated factor lower, the differences of the respondent evaluations were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z= -5.731$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

The factor “the job is easy, and does not require a special effort” higher evaluated respondents who age was 30 years or greater, but respondents who age was 21-26 years evaluated factor lower, the differences were statistically significant (Mann-Whitney test  $z= -2.687$ ,  $p=0.007$ ). The average values of young people evaluations on the factors, which are important when working in public administration by age groups, are included in the table 5.

Table 5. Average values of young people evaluations on the factors, which are important when working in public administration by age (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, 2012, n=1001)

Important factors when working in public administration	Age							
	≤ 20		21-26		27-30		≥ 30	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
It is important that the work is interesting	9.19	10	9.30	10	9.43	10	8.82	10
Career opportunities	8.76	9	8.71	9	8.59	9	8.02	8.5

The leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates	8.64	9	8.67	9	8.85	9	8.88	9
Wage	8.57	9	8.59	9	8.92	9	8.75	9
Professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making	7.99	8	8.41	9	8.91	9	8.96	9
Prestige	7.12	7	7.30	8	7.22	8	7.50	8
The job is easy, and does not require a special effort	5.04	5	4.74	5	4.75	5	5.10	5

Factor analysis was used for identifying the key factors that are important when working in public administration. As a result of the factor analysis the initial seven factors, through three iterations (by using the Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalisation) are grouped in two complex factors. The evaluation scale 1 – 10 was used, where 1 – not significant; 10 – very significant (see table 6).

Table 6. Complex factors on young people evaluations on statement “In your opinion, which factors are important when working in public administration”, complex factors matrix after rotation. (Source: Survey of young people, survey conducted by Romans Putans, 2012, n=1001)

Initial factors	Complex factors	
	F1	F2
It is important that the work is interesting	0.774	0.134
Professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making	0.746	-0.060
The leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates	0.700	0.157
Wage	0.072	0.753
Career opportunities	0.440	0.619
The job is easy, and does not require a special effort	-0.271	0.608
Prestige	0.277	0.606
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

The interpretation of the complex factors with regard to the indicators with which the initial indicators have relatively high burdens:

1) Complex factor F1: Interesting work and professional managers. The factor has relatively high burdens on the following indicators: “it is important that the work is interesting”, “professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making”, “the leaders support the initiative of my work and congratulates”.

2) Complex factor F2: Wage, career opportunities. The factor has relatively high burdens on the following indicators: “wage”, “career opportunities”, “the job is easy, and does not require a special effort”, “prestige”.

The results of empirical research have confirmed that management in the public administration need to take into account thoughts of young people to keep them in public administration and support their development for public administration.

## **4. Conclusions**

The work in the field of private business, non-governmental organizations and public institutions are the most popular subject areas for young people to participate in public administration. About 29.9% of young people would like to work in the public or municipal institution, about 46.4% planning to engage in private business. The opinions of young people about the plans for the future differ statistically significant depending on the young people age and gender. The young people who age are 30 years or greater would like to work in the public or municipal institutions more than people who age are less.

The interesting work is very significant factor when working in public administration. The significant factors are leaders support the initiative of work and congratulates, wage, professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making and career opportunities. The opinions of young people about the significance of factors interesting work, professional leaders and working environment, and rational decision making, career opportunities differ statistically significant depending on the young people age and gender.

The key factors that are important when working in public administration are interesting work, professional managers and wage, career opportunities.

The main factors which don't motivate participation in public administration are bad view of the public administration, bad experience at work or in collaboration with public administration.

## **Funding**

This work was supported by the National Research Program 5.2. “Economic Transformation, Smart Growth, Governance and Legal Framework for the State and Society for Sustainable Development - a New Approach to the Creation of a Sustainable

Learning Community (EKOSOC-LV)”

## References

- Bach, S., Bordogna, L. 2011. Varieties of New Public Management or Alternative Models? The Reform of Public Service Employment Relations in Industrialized Democracies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22(11): 2281-2294.
- Balu, P. E; Margina, O., Ratezanu, I. V. 2014. Evaluation of graduate perception of career development prospects in the public sector. *Quality - Access to Success* 15(1): 473-479.
- Berg.A.M. 2006. Transforming Public Services – Transforming the Public Servant? *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 19(6): 556-568.
- Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Latvia, Youth Policy Guidelines 2009-2018, Order of Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Latvia Nr. 246, April 20, 2009 (Jaunatnes politikas pamatnostādnes 2009.-2018.gadam; LR Ministru kabineta 2009.gada 20.aprīļa rīkojums Nr.246); <http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/LoadAtt/file720.doc>.
- Cierco, T. 2013. Public Administration Reform in Macedonia. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 46: 481-491.
- Colley, L., 2011. The Passing of Youth: How Removal of Traditional Youth Recruitment Policies Contributed to the Ageing of Public Service Workforces. *Labour History* 101(1): 177-193.
- Colley, L., 2012. How Did Public Services Fare? A Review of Australian State Public Service Labour Markets during the Global Financial Crisis. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 54(5): 612-636.
- Colley, L, Price, R. 2015. Future Public Service Capacity: Employment of Young People into Australian Public Service during the GFC. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 74(3): 324-335.

- Creed, P.A., Patton, W., Hood, M. 2010. Career Development and Personal Functioning Differences between Work-bound and Non-work Bound Students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 76 (1): 37-41.
- Caron, D.J., Giaugue, D. 2006. Civil Servant Identity at the Crossroads: New Challenges for Public Administrators. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 19(6): 543-555.
- Dobuzinskis, L. 1997. Historical and Epistemological Trends in Public Administration. *Journal of Management History* 3(4): 298-316.
- Friend., Z. 2004. The Retirement Epidemic: Recruiting Young People into Public Service. *Public Management* 96(9): 22-25.
- Gant, G.F. 2006. The Concept of Development Administration. *Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management* 15: 257-285.
- Groenvald, S. 2011. Diversity and Employee Turnover in the Dutch Public Sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 24(6): 594-612.
- Hansen, E.B., Seybolt, D.C., Sundeen, S.J. 2014. Building a Successful Public – Academic Partnership to Support State Policy Making. *Psychiatric Services* 65(6): 710-712.
- Henderson, K.M. 1995. Reinventing Comparative Public Administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 8(4): 17-25.
- Hess, D.A.M. 2010. Operationalising Place-based Innovation in Public Administration. *Journal of Place Management and Development* 3(1): 8-21.
- Hoekstra, H.A. 2011. A Career Roles Model of Career Development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 78 (2): 159-173.
- Linn, P.L., Ferguson, J., Egart, K. 2004. Career Exploration via Cooperative Education and Lifespan Occupational Choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 65 (3): 430-447.
- Kaestner, r., Sasso, A.L., Yarnoff, B. 2013. Youth Employment and Subsistence Use. *Social Science Research* 42: 169-185.

- Maddock, S. 2002. Making Modernisation Work. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 15(1): 13-43.
- Nousianainen, M., Mäkinen, K. 2015. Multilevel Governance and Participation: Interpreting Democracy in EU Programmes. *European Politics and Society* 16(2): 208-223.
- O'Halloran, P.L. 2012. Performance Pay and Employee Turnover. *Journal of Economic Studies* 39(6): 653-674.
- Ongaro, E. 2008. Public Management Reform in Italy: Explaining the Implementation Gap. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 21(2): 174-204.
- Parrado, S. 2008. Failed Policies but Institutional Innovation through “Layering” and “Diffusion” in Spanish Central Administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 21(2): 230-252.
- Patel, V.B. 2010. Career Choices after Specialization. *Techniques in Regional Anesthesia and Pain Management* 14 (4): 145-148.
- Price, R., McDonald, P., Bailey, J., Pini, B. 2011. A Majority Experience: Young People’s Encounters with the Labour Market. *Young People at Work*: 1-17.
- Rondeaux, G. 2006. Modernizing Public Administration: the Impact on Organisational Identities. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 19(6): 569-584.
- Rouban, L. 2008. Reform without Doctrine: Public Management in France. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 21(2): 133-149.
- Van Wart, M., Cayer, J.N. 2006. Comparative Public Administration: The Search for Theories. *Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management* 15: 171-192.
- White, L. 2000. Changing the “Whole System” in the Public Sector. *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 13(2): 162-177.