



Proud to Be a Public Servant? An Analysis of the Work-Related Determinants of Professional Pride among Dutch Public Servants

R. T. Borst & C. J. Lako

To cite this article: R. T. Borst & C. J. Lako (2017) Proud to Be a Public Servant? An Analysis of the Work-Related Determinants of Professional Pride among Dutch Public Servants, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40:10, 875-887, DOI: [10.1080/01900692.2017.1289390](https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1289390)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1289390>



Published with License by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC© 2017 R. T. Borst and C. J. Lako.



Published online: 09 Mar 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1733



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Proud to Be a Public Servant? An Analysis of the Work-Related Determinants of Professional Pride among Dutch Public Servants

R. T. Borst and C. J. Lako

Institute for Management Research, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

A proud public servant is defined as someone who works honorably, conscientiously, and with dedication. Although professional pride has several positive effects on the performances of public servants, it is not instantly apparent which instruments help to stimulate pride. This study combines the Job Demands-Resources model and the High Performance Work Practices taxonomy to analyze the determinants of pride. The analysis of a large dataset of Dutch public servants shows that their professional pride can barely be influenced by High-Performance Work Practices but is in particular determined by the work environment and personal experiences related to the work.

KEYWORDS

High-performance work practices; job demands-resources model; pride; public sector; survey

Introduction

Through history, academics and practitioners have been intrigued by the measurement of public servants' effectiveness and efficiency (Dunsire, 1973; Van Dooren, Bouckaert, & Halligan, 2015; Wilson, 1887). The classic narrow focus on solely the rational and technical competencies of public servants to reach high performances (Weber, 1919) changed throughout the years toward a broader focus that also considers the importance of stimulating organizational factors (Gulick & Urwick, 1937), and most recently also psychological factors such as job satisfaction, affective commitment and Public Service Motivation (PSM) for the performances of public servants (Leisink & Steijn, 2009; Pandey & Stazyk, 2008).

Besides these existing psychological factors, the new concept professional pride gained increasing attention within several governmental HRM departments across the world such as the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and the Netherlands (Lavigna, 2013; Cotton, 2012; Kernaghan, 2011; Jansen, Brink, & van den Kolk, 2010). A proud public servant is defined as someone who works honorably, conscientiously and with dedication and makes use of his or her education, knowledge, experience, and professional ethics to reach this state (Vermeeren en van Geest, 2012). An important reason for the current attention for professional pride is that the process of preserving the pride among public servants is

difficult since a large group of governmental critics, including politicians and some media, portray public servants (i.e., "nameless and faceless bureaucrats") as overpaid and underworked (Jansen et al., 2010; Lavigna, 2013).

Professional pride is an important dimension of work engagement. Several empirical studies in the private sector show that it has important effects on extra-role performance (Sulea et al., 2012) and in-role performance (Chughtai & Buckley, 2011). Although public servants pride has several positive effects, it is not instantly apparent which instruments help to stimulate pride.

Quantitative studies aimed at work engagement and inherently professional pride do analyze several determinants of pride, but they particularly use the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model from the psychological sciences (see for a meta-analysis Halbesleben, 2010). They are mostly focused on private sector samples. The JD-R model is aimed at the work environment and work experience of employees which are hard to influence by the organization. Recently, Albrecht, Bakker, Gruman, Macey, and Saks (2015) therefore opted to extend the analysis by testing the influence of actual human resource management (HRM) instruments on indicators of engagement such as professional pride. Typical HRM instruments are the high-performance work practices (HPWPS) such as employee benefits and training (Boselie, 2005).

Scholars argue that employee benefits including high wages, short working hours, and fringe benefits do not affect the attitudes and behavior of public servants due to their extrinsic nature (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Houston, 2000; Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2006). It is argued that public servants are especially motivated by the intrinsic rewards of work providing feelings of accomplishment (Houston, 2000). However, these scholars also show that employee benefits including job security and work-life balancing benefits do have a large significant effect on the motivation of public servants (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Houston, 2000). Whether these employee benefits and other HRM practices influence professional pride have barely been tested in the private sector, let alone in the public sector (Albrecht et al., 2015). In other words, HRM practices might be practical instruments through which HR directors can directly influence public servants' professional pride and even more important their performance.

This study uses a big quantitative dataset which can be used to develop a comprehensive model in which the JD-R model and the HRM taxonomy are combined to explain the determinants of public professional pride. The accompanying research question is: What exactly is the professional pride of public servants and what are its determinants? Before dealing with the second part of the question, the section "Professional pride: conceptual framework" describes what is known in the relevant literature about the significance of public professional pride. In the section "The determinants of professional pride", an overview of the JD-R model and the HRM taxonomy is given. It leads to the creation of hypotheses to be tested in the study. The "Methods" section presents the data material that are used to test the various hypotheses. The results of the outcomes of the analysis are presented in the "Results" section before subsequently concluding with a discussion in the section "Discussion and implications".

Theory

On the basis of scientific literature, a definition of the term professional pride is formulated (section "Professional pride: conceptual framework"). At the same time, an inventory is made of the determinants which might make public servants proud of their profession (section "The determinants of professional pride").

Professional pride: Conceptual framework

Jansen et al. (2010) noticed that increasingly more attention seems to be devoted to the professional pride of public servants. In the field of public psychology, pride is broadly defined as possessing a certain feeling of status or respect, for oneself but also for others (Kernaghan, 2001, p. 69). It is a certain emotion that actually gives rise to positive feelings. Jansen et al. (2010) even took it a step further when they defined pride as the process of self-consciously publicly supporting an achievement or quality of your own, or of someone to whom you feel closely allied, simply because you believe that its value deserves broader recognition. Viewed in this perspective, pride has a close connection to another complex concept, namely "honor," a trait with which it is often compared.

Honor is something that Jansen et al. (2010) defined as the placing of high demands upon an individual's own actions so that in the eyes of others they gain a certain worth. As is clearly apparent from the broad definitions, these two concepts display certain evident similarities. As a matter of fact, both terms have very much to do with people's intrinsic qualities. If a person is proud or feels honored, then that infuses him or her with a degree of intrinsic motivation. However, pride and honor are two very different concepts. Feelings of honor contribute to a striving toward certain behavior, while pride is much more a state of mind that leads to honor and inherently certain behavior. An employee who is proud of his or her profession is therefore someone who works honorable, conscientiously and with dedication and makes use of his or her education, knowledge, experience, and professional ethics to reach this state (Vermeeren en van Geest, 2012). Those who take pride in their profession are—so it is presumed—satisfied with their work because it is important and has significance, because it represents quality and is expertly executed in all good conscience (Jansen et al., 2010).

Kernaghan (2001) applies pride specifically to the public sector, and he distinguishes the various aspects that can endow public servants with feelings of pride. According to him, these aspects range from a narrow focus on pride in oneself and one's team through pride in one's organization and in the public service as a whole to a broad focus on pride in one's country. The current study focuses on the narrow definition of pride to which Kernaghan refers. The presence of pride among public servants in their profession and the organization for which they work is examined. In other words, the degree in which someone works honorable, conscientiously and with dedication for his or

her organization, is examined. In this study, the following proposition is therefore be used to test the construct pride empirically: I am proud of the fact that I work for <<sector>> (for instance, the central government or a municipality).

A question which remains prominent is what the relationship is between pride and other positive psychological concepts such as organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991), Public Service Motivation (Leisink & Steijn, 2009; Pandey & Stazyk, 2008), and job satisfaction (Cantarelli, Belardinelli, & Belle, 2016). Studies focusing on work engagement and inherently pride showed that commitment with the organization, job satisfaction, and public service motivation are job attitudes which work in tandem to produce organizational outcomes (Albrecht et al., 2015; Perry & Vandenabeele, 2015). Lavigna (2015) argues that public organizations should recruit and retain employees who have a high degree of PSM and then build on that gene to drive high levels of engagement and inherently pride. Bakker (2015) also concludes that PSM may strengthen work engagement because public servants with high levels of enduring PSM find their work important and meaningful. Public servants with PSM are therefore likely to invest their resources in public service work and keep them engaged. Ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) therefore conceptualize PSM as the key psychological resource which stimulates engagement and inherently pride. This, in turn, can lead to higher performances, commitment, and job satisfaction.

The determinants of professional pride

Public servants pride is important for employee outcomes and, to discover how professional pride can be stimulated, it is important to know what factors influence professional pride. In order to build a comprehensive model, the high-performance work practices (HPWPS) taxonomy from HRM (Posthuma, Campion, Masimova, & Campion, 2013) and the JD-R model from vocational psychology (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014) are combined as possible determinants of public servants pride. As mentioned in the introduction, while the JD-R model is focused on the work environment and work experience of employees, the HPWPS taxonomy is focused on concrete instruments. Albrecht et al. (2015) theorized that a combination might have a positive effect on work engagement and inherently pride. Bakker and Demerouti (2014) argue that the effects of these determinants might depend on the specific occupation under consideration. The specific circumstances of public servants will

therefore be taken into account by the application of these models.

HPWPS taxonomy

The HPWS approach is one of the most commonly used HRM approaches to increase job performance (Boselie, 2005). The HPWPs taxonomy makes a distinction between five key high-performance work practices (Albrecht et al., 2015; Boselie, 2005): (1) selective recruitment and selection, (2) employee benefits, (3) appraisal and performance management, (4) training and development, and (5) employee involvement and socialization. The approach builds on the notion that individual HPWPs can have a positive effect, but bundling these practices with each other will be even more successful (Boselie, 2005). Unfortunately due to the data, the first HPWP selective recruitment cannot be integrated into the model.

Employee benefits. In the two-factor theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), a differentiation is made between two kinds of factors, those that are intrinsic (e.g., the content of the job) and those that are extrinsic (such as employee benefits), that can have an influence on employee behavior. Theories such as the Cognitive Evaluation Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and the Attribution Theory (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973) show that extrinsic factors have a negative effect on intrinsic factors. One might therefore expect that employee benefits (extrinsic) have a negative effect on pride (intrinsic) as well. More recent theories such as the General Interest Theory (Eisenberger, Pierce, & Cameron, 1999) and the Self-Determination Theory (Gagné & Deci, 2005) show, however, that basic needs in the work circumstances need to be fulfilled before someone can even be motivated or proud. Still, it is argued that public servants are more motivated by the intrinsic rewards of work which provide feelings of accomplishment instead of extrinsic motivators (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Houston, 2000). One might therefore expect that extrinsic benefits have a small positive significant effect on pride.

In the literature, a few primary working conditions and many different fringe benefits can be distinguished. The most common primary working conditions distinguished in earlier studies in public administration are good wages, satisfaction about the number of hours worked (part-time/fulltime) and tenure (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Caillier, 2013). Besides primary working conditions, several fringe benefits that emerged from the literature can be classified as working time arrangements (e.g., flexible work hours and teleworking), leave arrangements (e.g., paid parental leave,

childcare), financial arrangements (e.g., pension plan, collective healthcare), education and training arrangements (training facilitation through time and money), and arrangements for career support (e.g., job rotation and project work, support by a career coach). The following hypothesis can be stated:

- H1. Primary and secondary working conditions have a significant positive effect on public servants pride.

Appraisal and performance management. Several scholars suggest that performance management is an important determinant of employee engagement and inherent professional pride (Albrecht et al., 2015; Gruman & Saks, 2011; Mone & London, 2010). According to Lavigna (2013), to be fully engaged, public servants need to understand what their roles, responsibilities, and expectations are; receive consistent feedback on their performance; and be encouraged and supported as they strive to develop their capabilities. However, there are constraints on incentive structures in the public sector. This possibly makes performance management more a negative reinforcing instrument (“a competitive, adversarial and punitive ethos”) than a motivating HRM instrument (Diefenbach, 2009). Public servants have more pride when the public relies upon their professionalism and discretion, rather than upon measurable superficial activities (Jansen et al., 2010). Another argument is that performance management is frequently hard to apply because public servants have to deal with unique problems (Jansen et al., 2010). However, Borst, Lako, and de Vries (2012) argue that public servants might see performance measurement as a very useful instrument to reverse the negative image of the public sector. Public servants favoring performance measurement might be proud to show the results of their work. The following hypothesis can be stated:

- H2. The perception of the applicability of performance measurement has a positive significant effect on public servants pride.

Training and development. What has emerged from research is that “career development opportunities” are viewed by public servants as important for the cultivation of pride (Vermeeren & van Geest, 2012).

One well-known career development opportunity is, for instance, the possibility to attend a work-related training. Evidence shows that employees can develop their personal resources through training and

development which, in turn, influences work engagement and inherently pride (Albrecht et al., 2015; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010). However, Borst, Lako, and De Vries (2013) concluded that attending a work-related training actually had relatively little effect on positive job attitudes such as work satisfaction and Public Service Motivation of Dutch public servants (Borst et al., 2013). One may therefore question whether receiving work-related training really may be viewed as an important determinant of public servants pride. However, on the basis of the scarce empirical studies performed within the public sector, one can expect that a positive correlation exists between career development opportunities and pride (Vermeeren & van Geest, 2012; Borst et al., 2013). The discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

- H3. The attendance of a work-related training has a significant positive effect on the pride of public servants.

Employee involvement and socialization. In particular, new hires, when they enter an organization, are typically excited about their new job and organization but also have feelings of uncertainty and anxiety (Albrecht et al., 2015). To keep newcomers proud, it is necessary to let them feel worthwhile, useful, valuable and not taken for granted (Albrecht et al., 2015). To be involved by colleagues in the execution of tasks and gain more influence in the organization probably might make public servants proud (Albrecht et al., 2015; Gunter & Furnham, 1996; Vermeeren & van Geest, 2012). The following hypothesis can be stated:

- H4. Being involved by colleagues in the execution of tasks has a significant positive effect on the pride of public servants.

Factors from the JD-R model

According to the JD-R theory, all working environments or job characteristics can be modeled using two different categories, namely job demands and job resources. Job demands are defined as those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (i.e., cognitive or emotional) effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that either/or (1) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and

psychological costs; (2) are functional in achieving work goals; (3) stimulate personal growth, learning and development (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Recently, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2007) extended the early JD-R model by including personal resources. Personal resources are defined as the psychological characteristics or aspects of the self that are generally associated with resilience and refer to the ability to control and impact one's environment successfully (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). Since this study is especially interested in how to stimulate pride, it is only focus on job and personal resources.

Job resources. Several studies revealed that social support, supervisory coaching, and feelings of job security¹ may instigate a motivational process leading to work engagement and inherently pride (e.g., Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). First, supportive colleagues, for example, satisfy the basic need of relatedness (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). A good relation with colleagues is also functional in achieving work goals which gives feelings of purpose and meaningfulness (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Secondly, supervisory coaching also helps with attaining feelings of purpose, optimism, and self-esteem (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Finally, in an insecure job situation, an employee perceives a discrepancy between the level of job security he or she desires and the level that his or her employer offers. Accordingly, this discrepancy or person—job misfit is likely to contribute to lower work engagement and inherently pride (Mauno, Kinnunen, Mäkikangas, & Nätti, 2005). Job security might in other words contribute to a sense of pride.

Summarized, through the achievement of work goals or the satisfaction of basic needs by the above-mentioned job resources, an intrinsic positive work-related state of mind (i.e., professional pride) is stimulated (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This, in turn, can lead to higher performances and other positive job attitudes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

H5: The job resources social support, supervisory coaching, and feelings of job security have a significant positive effect on the pride of public servants.

Personal resources. Three personal resources which have not been studied within the JD-R model but might be specifically interesting within the public sector are public service motivation (PSM), optimism about the image of public servants, and occupational expertise. First, occupational expertise refers to the personal qualities and capabilities that are needed to reach given attainments (Van der Heijden, 2000). Occupational

expertise might be especially important in the increasing demanding work environment of public servants nowadays (Cantarelli et al., 2016). It might be expected that public servants remain proud within an era of doing more with less means if they have enough occupation specific expertise to keep doing their job.

Secondly, Haque (2001) argues that the pride of public servants partly depends on their appreciation or recognition from the general public. As shown before, the prevailing image of public servants tends to be a negative one. Public servants are often portrayed as lazy and inhuman individuals (Waterman, Rouse, & Wright, 2004). Their critics also accuse them of being nameless and faceless bureaucrats (Lavigna, 2013). All these prejudices converge in the activity known as “bureaucrat bashing” (Goodsell, 2000). Despite the critics, Haque (2001) also showed that the pride of public employees also partly depends on their own view of the public service in terms of its social status and public respect. Psychological research shows that people invariably have a different idea of how they are perceived by others than is the case in reality (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Gioia en Thomas, 1996). In other words, there is often a discrepancy between how people believe that others see them and the public's actual perception (Haque, 2001). Optimistic public servants might therefore not have the idea that they have a negative image and remain proud of their job.

Finally, PSM refers to the predisposition of individuals to serve the public interest (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). It is a deep personality trait of individuals who are willing to engage in sacrificial behavior for the good of citizens without reciprocal benefits for themselves (Perry & Vandenabeele, 2015). Many employees enter public service because they are already committed to the mission of government (Lavigna, 2013). PSM is therefore a relatively stable, higher-level individual difference variable that is only subject to slow change (Bakker, 2015). It is seen as a “key psychological resource” (Bakker, 2015) that might drive high levels of engagement and inherently pride (Lavigna, 2015).

H6: The personal resources occupational expertise, optimism about image, and PSM have a significant positive effect on the pride of public servants.

Methods

Participants

The data used for testing the hypotheses are derived from a survey carried out in 2010 by the Dutch

Table 1. Sample statistics.

	Population	Sample	Response	Response (%)
Total public sector	855.454	80.000	26.876	34
Government	288.865	28.500	10.596	37
Central government	116.280	10.000	3.841	38
Local government	148.933	9.000	3.354	37
Provinces	11.098	4.000	1.383	35
Legal authorities	3.393	1.500	562	37
Water Boards	9.161	4.000	1.456	36
Education and science	438.911	38.500	12.414	32
Primary education	162.131	9.000	2.953	33
Secondary education	88.574	8.000	2.990	37
Secondary vocational education	47.446	5.000	1.553	31
Higher professional education	35.345	5.000	1.612	32
Universities	45.181	5.000	1.469	29
Public research institutes	2.152	1.500	409	27
University Medical Centers	58.082	5.000	1.482	29
Security	127.678	13.000	3.866	30
Defense	67.879	7.000	1.980	28
Police	59.799	6.000	1.886	31

Source: MWM2 (2010, p. 22).

Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations in the so-called Personnel and Mobility Monitor (MWM2, 2010). All government sectors are involved in the sample of 80,000 employees, of whom 26,876 completed the questionnaire. This resulted in a response rate of 34%, varying by sector between 27% and 38%. The characteristics of the Dutch public sector and the sample with the corresponding response rates are presented in Table 1.

The questionnaire received by the sample consists of several clusters of questions each with a specific theme. In these clusters, respondents answered questions about their personal background, the content of their jobs, mobility and employability within the organization, job satisfaction, working conditions, public service motivation, performance-related interviews with managers, and the degree of integrity of their colleagues. A number of items from the questionnaire were used for this study.

Measures

Most studies focusing on the effects of HR practices use objective and subjective measures (Langevin Heavy et al., 2013). A combination of these forms of measures is also used in this study to test these practices. Studies analyzing the JD-R model mostly use subjective measures since the factors within this model are also focused on the experience of employees themselves. Therefore, subjective measures are used as well to analyze the job resources and personal resources (see Appendix A for the items of the multi-item scales). The independent variable *Professional pride* was

measured with one item (e.g., “I am proud to work for <<my organization>>”) dichotomized into a binary response scale (Proud-Not Proud).

In case of the HPWPs, *Primary and secondary working conditions* were measured with various measures. Income was measured with one item (What is your monthly income?) on a 13-point scale (between less than €2,000 and more than €7,000 gross per month). Objective job security was measured with one item (What kind of contract do you have?) on a dichotomous response scale (fixed-term contract/permanent contract). Desired number of working hours was measured with one item (Are you satisfied with the amount of hours you work?) on a dichotomous response scale (yes/no). The secondary benefits are measured with one item (Do you use the following fringe benefit?) on dichotomous response scales (I use them/I do not use them). *Applicability performance measurement* was measured with six items (e.g., “My performance agreements are well measurable” and “My performance agreements are realistic”) on a 5-point Likert scale (totally disagree-totally agree). The reliability analysis shows a good scale reliability ($\alpha = 0.75$). *Work-related training* was measured with one item (Did you follow a work-related training last year?) on a dichotomous response scale (yes/no). *Employee involvement* was measured with one item (In my job, colleagues ask me for advice when the work becomes complicated) on a 5-point Likert scale (totally disagree-totally agree).

In case of the JD-R model, *Social support* was measured with eight items (e.g. “My colleagues take no responsibility for the results of their work” and “my colleagues cut corners in their work”) on a 5-point Likert scale (totally disagree-totally agree). The reliability analysis shows good scale reliability ($\alpha = 0.93$). *Supervisory coaching* was measured with one item (how satisfied are you with the conversations with your supervisor?) on a 5-point Likert scale (totally dissatisfied-totally satisfied). *Feelings of job security* were measured with six items (e.g., “I am confident that I can continue to work with my employer for a long time” and “I doubt whether I can keep my current job”). The reliability analysis shows good scale reliability ($\alpha = 0.80$). *Occupational expertise* was measured with one item (“I am confident that I can effectively perform a variety of tasks”). *Optimism about image* was measured with one item (“Most citizens appreciate our work”). *PSM* was measured with 10 items on a 5-point Likert scale (Totally disagree-Totally agree). The scale includes the dimensions of attraction to public policy (APP), compassion (COM), and commitment to the public interest (CPI). A second-order three-

dimensional construct was developed which showed a good scale reliability ($\alpha = 0.74$).

Besides these variables, the control variables *age* (in years), *gender*, *tenure* (in years), and *educational level* (high/low) are included in the analysis. In addition to the frequently used controls, this study controls for *sector* since the literature shows that bureaucrat bashing is the highest within politically appointed organizations (Haque, 2001). It might therefore be the case that public servants within the public educational sector have a higher professional pride than public servants within politically appointed organizations. In addition, teachers might see their work as a real calling (PSM) to educate children and are prouder on their profession than public servants in politically appointed organizations.

Results

In this section, the results of the study are presented. First, descriptive statistics and correlations are reported (Descriptive statistics and correlations). Then, binary logistic regression is applied by using SPSS Statistics 23 (Hypothesis testing).

Descriptive statistics and correlations

In Table 2, means, standard deviations (S.D.), and correlations are reported.

The descriptive statistics show that 55% of the sample is male. The average age is 47.7 years old, and on average, respondents have worked for 10 years in their public organization. In addition, 68% of the sample is highly educated and 43% works in one of the governmental organizations (central government, local government, provinces, legal authorities, and water boards). Interestingly, 69.9% is proud to work in the public sector, and 7.5% is not proud. In addition, 22.6% says not to know whether they are proud or not. In this study, this is interpreted as negative since an employer want to have proud employees due to the positive effect on performances.

The correlations indicate several significant correlations between our central variables. Interestingly, the high-performance work practices show significant but relatively low correlations with pride. The job resources and personal resources show relatively high correlations with pride. In particular, optimism about image and PSM shows relatively high correlations with pride (respectively $r = .28$ and $r = .18$).² The social factors social support and supervisory coaching show high correlations as well (respectively $r = .14$ and $r = .15$). In addition, while subjective job security has a high

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations ($N = 24,328-26,871$).

	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 Gender (1 = male)	0.55	0.498																	
2 Age	47.65	10.39	.17**																
3 Educational level	0.68	1.149	-.31**	-.02**															
4 Tenure	10.03	9.535	.06**	.44**	-.02**														
5 Sector	0.43	0.494	.14**	.04**	-.07**	-.16**													
6 Objective job security	0.94	0.240	.03**	.28**	-.02**	.16**	.12**												
7 Wages	5.33	3.261	.37**	.27**	.13**	-.01	.18**	.14**											
8 Satisfaction hours	0.94	0.238	.02**	.00	-.02*	-.01	.05	.04**	.04**										
9 Applicability performance measurement	3.77	1.159	-.08**	-.11**	.02**	-.06**	-.05**	-.05**	-.02**	.04**									
10 Training	0.60	0.489	.00	-.07**	.01	-.03**	.04**	.01	.04**	.00	.04**								
11 Involvement	3.78	0.742	.12**	.05**	.02**	-.01*	.05**	.09**	.22**	.03**	.05**	.05**							
12 Social support	3.66	0.924	-.04**	.03**	.05**	-.01	-.05**	-.01	.10**	.05**	.13**	.13**	.02**						
13 Supervisory coaching	3.38	1.167	-.02**	-.03**	-.01	-.05**	.04**	.00	.02**	.09**	.13**	.13**	.06**	.23**					
14 Subjective job security	3.62	1.156	-.04**	-.32**	.06**	-.15**	-.09**	.01*	.12**	.06**	.17**	.15**	.10**	.13**	.12**				
15 Occupational expertise	4.05	0.697	-.04**	-.06**	.03**	-.07**	-.01	-.01	.09**	.01	.13**	.13**	.04**	.24**	.06**	.23**			
16 Optimism about image	3.27	0.959	-.04**	.08**	.02**	.08**	-.08**	-.02**	.00	.04**	.12**	.12**	.03**	.01	.14**	.09**	.12**	.07**	
17 PSM	3.60	0.816	-.03**	.11**	.05**	.02**	-.03	.03**	.13**	-.01	.13**	.13**	.06**	.17**	.23**	.11**	.27**	.13**	
18 Pride	0.70	0.459	-.03**	-.05**	.00	-.03**	-.11**	-.03**	.01	.06**	.13**	.13**	.06**	.15**	.15**	.13**	.10**	.28**	.18**

Note: The 11 used fringe benefits are not integrated into the model due to the lack of oversight, they are integrated in the logistic analysis which is used for hypothesis testing.

** ≤ 0.01 * ≤ 0.05 .

Table 3. Multiple logistic regression.

	Model 1 (control)			Model 2 (HPWPS)			Model 3 (JD-R)		
	β	Wald sig.	Odd's	β	Wald sig.	Odd's	β	Wald sig.	Odd's
Gender	-.092	.002	.913	-.154	.000	.857	-.067	.057	.935
Age	-.004	.016	.996	-.004	.013	.996	-.013	.000	.987
Educational level	-.073	.023	.929	-.148	.000	.863	-.234	.000	.792
Tenure	-.008	.000	.992	-.006	.000	.994	-.006	.003	.994
Sector	-.535	.000	.586	-.569	.000	.566	-.407	.000	.666
Objective job security				-.074	.282	.929	-.028	.702	.972
Wages				.036	.000	1.037	.027	.001	1.028
Satisfaction hours				.469	.000	1.598	.310	.000	1.363
Flexible work hours				.051	.158	1.052	.068	.075	1.070
Teleworking				-.026	.507	.975	-.090	.029	.913
Sabbatical leave				.026	.674	1.026	.071	.277	1.074
Paid parental leave				.125	.057	1.134	.121	.083	1.128
Collective health insurance				-.033	.314	.968	-.033	.394	.968
Work after retirement age				.186	.049	1.204	.151	.136	1.163
Facilitate training through time				-.068	.225	.935	-.150	.011	.861
Facilitate training through money				.050	.370	1.051	.022	.706	1.023
Support by a career coach				.060	.385	1.062	.114	.123	1.120
Childcare				.049	.566	1.050	.061	.502	1.063
Function rotation and project work				-.151	.094	.860	-.048	.616	.953
Applicability performance measurement				.414	.000	1.512	.183	.000	1.201
Training				.189	.000	1.208	.113	.000	1.120
Involvement				.131	.000	1.140	.066	.003	1.068
Social support							.160	.000	1.174
Supervisory coaching							.220	.000	1.245
Subjective job security							.148	.000	1.159
Occupational expertise							.105	.000	1.110
Optimism about image							.579	.000	1.785
PSM							1.148	.000	3.152
	N = 24.328			N = 23.167			N = 23.167		
	Nagelkerke R² = .023			Nagelkerke R² = .057			Nagelkerke R² = .196		
	$\chi^2 = 384.398$ sig. = .000			$\chi^2 = 960.129$ sig. = .000			$\chi^2 = 3457.600$		
							sig. = .000		

positive significant correlation with pride ($r = .13$), objective job security (Permanent/fixed-term contract) has a small negative significant correlation ($r = -.03$). This provides some indication that pride is determined by work experience and the work environment and can hardly be influenced by concrete HRM instrument

Hypothesis testing

To test whether these individual correlations also have a significant effect when they are controlled for the other variables, a multiple logistic regression analyses are conducted. In Table 3, the results of the logistic regression are presented for all the independent variables. In model 1, merely, the control variables are included. In model 2, the high-performance work practices are added and in model 3, the job- and personal resources are added as well. Through this method, the additional value of HRM in the explanation of pride can be distinguished (by comparing the fit measures).

As Table 3 shows, pride can indeed hardly be influenced by HRM instruments. The additional explained variance of pride by HRM instruments above the control variables is only 3.4%. Job- and personal resources from the JD-R model do explain a relatively large amount in the variance of pride (13.9%). Interestingly,

sector has a significant effect with pride in all three models. The results show that a much smaller amount of public servants within governmental organizations are proud than public servants from public education and security.

Hypotheses 1–4 express the theoretical expectations that the relationships between HRM instruments and pride are positive. Hypothesis 1 expected that primary and secondary working conditions have a positive effect on professional pride. Merely, the primary working conditions wages and satisfaction with amount of hours worked have a positive significant effect on pride. The results show that fringe benefits have no significant effect on pride. Hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected. Hypotheses 2–4 are confirmed by the data. As expected, the applicability of performance measurement, the attendance of work related training, and the involvement in the organization have a positive significant effect on pride.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 express the theoretical expectations that the relationships between Job- and personal resources and pride are also positive. The results indeed confirm that these resources have a positive significant effect on pride. In particular, the personal resources PSM and optimism about the image of public servants have a positive significant effect on the pride of public servants.

Discussion and implications

The results of the present study show that factors from the Job Demands-Resources model are the most important determinants of public professional pride. Three factors from the work environment (i.e., job resources) including social support, supervisory coaching, and perceived job security all have a positive relation with the professional pride of public servants. Since only these three factors from the work environment are studied (contributing to only a small part of the explanation of pride), it might be interesting to further study the processes in this environment affecting pride. Recent public administration research into the importance of ethical leadership for several outcomes in the public sector might, for example, be interesting to combine with this psychological research into the pride of public servants. In particular, this study shows that supervisory coaching has positive effects on pride.

Next to the work environment, personal experiences related to the work seem to be the most important factors affecting professional pride. The predispositions of public servants to engage in sacrificial behavior for the good of citizens without reciprocal benefits for themselves (PSM) are very important for being proud to be a public servant. In addition, a much larger amount of public servants within public education and security are proud than public servants from governmental organizations. These results show that public servants who see their job as a real calling (e.g., teachers who educate children and police officers who protect citizens against crimes) are particularly proud.

A practical implication is therefore to focus on the public service motivation of public servants to enhance their pride. Recent research shows that PSM can be stimulated by focusing on PSM already in the personnel selection process, and to use management practices that are supportive of PSM, such as participative leadership and treating employees fairly (Ritz, Brewer, & Neumann, 2016).

Public servants who are optimistic about their image among citizens also seem to be proud at their profession. In other words, public servants who do not experience bureaucrat bashing are proud. This result together with the findings that within politically appointed government organizations a relatively low amount of public servants is proud, underpin the notion that bureaucrat bashing is especially aimed at public servants within government organizations (Haque, 2001).

To keep public servants proud on their profession, the focus should therefore be, among others, on diminishing the bureaucrat bashing by citizens. In 2012, the president of the United States also said in his speech for public service recognition week that citizens should praise the professional pride and passion of federal, state and local public servants (American Society of Public Administration, 2012). It is indeed important to improve the image and inherently the professional pride of public servants since pride is positively related to the performances and inherent good service provision to citizens (Bouckaert, 2001; Lavigna, 2013; Vigoda-Gadot, Eldor, & Schohat 2013).

Beyond the findings that respond expressly to the research objective, a number of limitations should be acknowledged. First, several factors in the study, including pride itself, are measured with a single item. Despite the advantages of using validated multiple item scales, this is the cost of using secondary data. Therefore, only four multi-item scales could be used. Secondly, due to the nature of the data, several factors of the HRM and JD-R framework cannot be included either. Thirdly, the study uses a sample of one country and might not be representative for public sectors of other countries. Despite the limitations of the use of secondary data, the benefits are equally important. The results are in fact based on a representative sample of the complete public sector in the Netherlands. Due to these data, relatively certain conclusions can be drawn about the professional pride of Dutch public servants.

Conclusion

The present study is concerned with investigating the effects of the JD-R model and the HRM taxonomy on public professional pride. The main conclusion is that the professional pride of Dutch public servants can barely be influenced by HRM instruments but is in particular determined by the work environment and personal experiences related to the work (JD-R). This conclusion connotes that pride is a state of mind which can hardly be influenced by extrinsic stimulators. Fringe benefits, for example, do not have any effect on the professional pride of public servants. In addition, applicability of performance measurement and training do have a positive effect on public professional pride but these factors are of relatively lower importance than the work environment such as good relations with supervisors and colleagues, and personal resources including public service motivation and optimism about image. To increase professional pride

and inherently the performance of public servants, practitioners should therefore focus on the stimulation of job resources and personal resources of public servants.

Notes

1. As Mauno et al. (2005) show, there is a difference between the effects of objective job security (permanent contract/fixed-term contract) versus subjective job security (perceived job security) on work engagement and inherently pride. The objective version is more an instrument and is therefore characterized as part of the HPWP taxonomy, while the subjective version is more likely to say something about the experience of the work situation by the employee and is therefore characterized as part of the JD-R model.
2. These correlations show that pride barely correlates with PSM. The correlation is therefore not alarming to doubt the discriminate validity of pride. This confirms the theoretical assumption that PSM is a different concept from pride (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012)

References

- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2, 7–35. doi:10.1108/JOEPP-08-2014-0042
- American Society of Public Administration. (2012). *Obama praises "Pride and Passion of public servants"*. Washington, D.C.: ASPA.
- Bakker, A. B. (2015). A job demands-resources approach to public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 723–732. doi:10.1111/puar.12388
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309–328. doi:10.1108/02683940710733115
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13, 209–223. doi:10.1111/puar.12388
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands-resources theory. In P. Y. Chen, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Wellbeing: A complete reference guide, volume III, work and wellbeing* (pp. 37–64). New York, NY: Wiley Blackwell.
- Borst, R. T., Lako, C. J., & de Vries, M. S. (2012). Is performance measurement applicable in the public sector? A comparative study of attitudes among Dutch officials. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37, 922–931. doi:10.1080/01900692.2014.944988
- Borst, R. T., Lako, C. J., & de Vries, M. S. (2013). Courses for civil servants: Who attend and what are the effects? In G. Bouckaert, & M. S. de Vries (Eds.), *Training for Leadership* (pp. 273–292). Brussels, Belgium: Bruylant publishers.
- Boselie, P. (2005). *Strategic Human Resource Management: A balanced approach*. Berkshire, United Kingdom: Mcgraw-Hill Education.
- Bouckaert, G. (2001). Pride and performance in public service: Some patterns of analysis. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67, 15–27. doi:10.1177/0020852301671002
- Buelens, M., & van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 65–74. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00697.x
- Caillier, J. G. (2013). Satisfaction with work-life benefits and organizational commitment/job involvement: Is there a connection? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 33, 340–364. doi:10.1177/0734371X12443266
- Cantarelli, P., Belardinelli, P., & Belle, N. (2016). A meta-analysis of job satisfaction correlates in the public administration literature. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36, 115–144. doi:10.1177/0734371X15578534
- Chughtai, A. A., & Buckley, F. (2011). Work engagement: Antecedents, the mediating role of learning goal orientation and job performance. *Career Development International*, 16, 684–705. doi:10.1108/13620431111187290
- Cotton, A. J. (2012). *Measuring employee engagement in the Australian public service*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Public Service Commission Staff Research Insights.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Diefenbach, T. (2009). New public management in public sector organisations: The dark sides of managerialistic 'Enlightenment'. *Public Administration*, 87, 892–909. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01766.x
- Dunsire, A. (1973). *Administration: The word and the science*. London, UK: Martin Robertson.
- Eisenberger, R., Pierce, W. D., & Cameron, J. (1999). Effects of reward on intrinsic motivation – Negative, neutral and positive: Comment on deci, koestner, and ryan (1999). *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 677–691. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.677
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331–362. doi:10.1002/job.322
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. (2000). Organizational identity, image and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 63–82. doi:10.5465/AMR.2000.2791603
- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 370–403. doi:10.2307/2393936
- Goodsell, C. T. (2000). Bureaucrat bashing. In J. M. Shafritz (Ed.), *Defining Public Administration* (pp. 128–131). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 123–136. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004
- Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration*. Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.

- Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1996). Biographical and climate predictors of job satisfaction and pride in organization. *The Journal of Psychology*, 130, 193–208. doi:10.1080/00223980.1996.9915001
- Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 102–117). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Haque, M. S. (2001). Pride and performance in the public service: Three Asian cases. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67, 99–115. doi:10.1177/0020852301671007
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-Service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10, 713–728. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024288
- Jansen, T., Brink, G. J. M., & van den Kolk, J. (2010). *Professional Pride: A powerful force*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Boom.
- Kernaghan, K. (2001). An honour to be coveted. Pride, recognition and public service. *Canadian Public Administration*, 44, 67–83. doi:10.1111/j.1754-7121.2001.tb02044.x
- Kernaghan, K. (2011). Getting engaged: Public-service merit and motivation revisited. *Canadian Public Administration*, 51, 1–21. doi:10.1111/j.1754-7121.2011.00158.x
- Langevin Heavy, A., Beijer, S., Federman, J., Hermans, M., Klein, F., McClean, E., & Martinson, B. (2013). Measurement of human resource practices: Issues regarding scale, scope, source and substantive content. In J. Paauwe, D. E. Guest, & P. M. Wright (Eds.), *HRM & performance: Achievements and challenges* (pp. 129–148). West Sussex, United Kingdom: Job Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Lavigna, R. J. (2013). *Engaging government employees: Motivate and inspire your people to achieve superior performance*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- Lavigna, R. J. (2015). Public Service Motivation and employee engagement. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 732–733. doi:10.1111/puar.12429
- Leisink, P., & Steijn, B. (2009). Public service motivation and job performance of public sector employees in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75, 35–52. doi:10.1177/0020852308099505
- Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the 'Overjustification' hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 129–137. doi:10.1037/h0035519
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21, 41–67. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20034
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (2006). A comparison of the values and commitment of private sector, public sector, and parapublic sector employees. *Public Administration Review*, 6, 605–618. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00620.x
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., Mälikangas, A., & Nätti, J. (2005). Psychological consequences of fixed-term employment and perceived job insecurity among health care staff. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 209–237. doi:10.1080/13594320500146649
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2010). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- MWM2. (2010). *Quickscan Personeels- en Mobiliteitsonderzoek 2010*. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties Directoraat-generaal Bestuur en Koninkrijksrelaties Directie Arbeidszaken Publieke Sector.
- Pandey, S. K., & Stazyk, E. C. (2008). Antecedents and correlates of public service motivation. In J. L. Perry, & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 101–117). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). *Motivation in public management. The call of public service*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., & Vandenabeele, W. (2015). Public Service Motivation research: Achievements, challenges, and future directions. *Public Administration Review*, 75, 692–699. doi:10.1111/puar.12430
- Posthuma, R. A., Campion, M. C., Masimova, M., & Campion, M. A. (2013). A high performance work practices taxonomy: Integrating the literature and directing future research. *Journal of Management*, 39, 1184–1220. doi:10.1177/0149206313478184
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public service motivation: A systematic literature review and outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76, 414–426. doi:10.1111/puar.12505
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–315. doi:10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. F. Bauer, & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health: A transdisciplinary approach* (pp. 43–68). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W. B., Zaborila Dumitru, C., & Sava, F. A. (2012). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behavior. *Career Development International*, 17, 188–207. doi:10.1108/13620431211241054
- Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Staying engaged during the week: The effect of off-job activities on next day work engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 445–455. doi:10.1037/a0029213
- Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2000). The development and psychometric evaluation of a multidimensional measurement instrument of professional expertise. *High Ability Studies*, 11, 9–39. doi:10.1080/713669175

- van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2015). *Performance management in the public sector* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vermeeren, B., & van Geest, D. (2012). Researchnote: Professional pride and pressures of rules in the public sector. *Tijdschrift Voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 28, 215–328. (No doi).
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., Eldor, L., & Schohat, L. M. (2013). Engage them to public service: Conceptualization and empirical examination of employee engagement in public Administration. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43, 518–538. doi:[10.1177/0275074012450943](https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012450943)
- Waterman, R. W., Rouse, A. A., & Wright, R. L. (2004). *Bureaucrats, politics and the environment*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Weber, M. (1919). *The vocational lectures: "Science as a vocation"; "Politics as a vocation"* (English translation 2004). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2, 197–222. doi:[10.2307/2139277](https://doi.org/10.2307/2139277)
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 121–141. doi:[10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121](https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121)

Appendix A

Target variable:	Indicators used:
Performance measurement	My results are well measureable My performance measures are realistic It motivates me to create performances measures The possibility of performance related pay gives me extra motivation The creation of developmental appointments gives me extra motivation I know who I can turn to with questions about personnel business
Subjective job security	I am confident that I can continue to work for a long time for my employer I doubt it if I can keep my current job (reversed) I think I will lose my job in the near future (reversed) If it is necessary, I would certainly be able to find a new job I am convinced that if necessary I can find work with another employer If I would have been unemployed, It would be hard for to find a job (reversed)
Social support (all reversed)	My colleagues do not take responsibility for the results of their work My colleagues are not honest about the results of their work My colleagues cut corners in their job My colleagues distort the truth to their manager(s) My colleagues try to hide mistakes that they make My colleagues often do unproductive things in the boss's time My colleagues unjustly call in sick My colleagues often need longer to a task than is necessary
Public Service Motivation	To me, politics is a dirty word (reversed) I don't care much for politicians (reversed) I unselfishly contribute to my community Providing meaningful public service is very important to me Making a difference to society means more to me than personal achievements The general interest is a key driver in my daily life It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress I seldom think about the welfare of people whom I don't know personally (reversed) Considering the welfare of others is very important to me If we do not show more solidarity, our society will fall apart