



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The impact of part-time work on Public Service Motivation in the Netherlands.**

Kuijt, Emile

### **Citation**

Kuijt, E. (2022). *The impact of part-time work on Public Service Motivation in the Netherlands.*

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3281467>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



**Universiteit Leiden**

**The impact of part-time work on Public Service Motivation in the  
Netherlands.**

Emile Francois Kuijt.

s1549731

Master Thesis

MSc. Public Administration: International and European Governance

Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs

Leiden University

The Hague, the Netherlands

Jan 9th, 2022

Supervisor: Kohei Suzuki, PhD.

Wordcount: 16468

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Public Service Motivation	8
2.2 Measuring PSM	10
2.3 Institutional environments' impact on PSM values	13
2.4 Part-time work and the Dutch context	16
2.5 Part-time employment, motivation and PSM	19
2.6 The Core-Periphery model	21
<b>Chapter 3: Theory and Framework</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Research Design</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Methodology Data analysis</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Chapter 6: Methodology Interviews</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Chapter 7: Data Analysis</b>	<b>37</b>
7.1 Data results	37
7.2 Analysis	44
7.3 Analysis Data overall	46
<b>Chapter 8: Interview analysis</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Chapter 9: Discussion on Findings</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Chapter 10: Conclusion</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>68</b>

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

During the lockdowns in place to prevent the spread of the coronavirus, large numbers of people are forced to work from their own home, deprived of face-to-face interactions their working environment has completely changed. This can have a profound impact on the way they work and their mental health. According to Professor Nicholas Bloom, who has extensively studied working from home, this is likely to lead to a massive decrease in productivity, and the lack of social interaction will lead to spikes in depression (Molla, 2020). Working from home without social interaction leads us to consider the importance of our physical presence at the office on our motivation. Besides working from home, another major factor affects the amount of time people spend at the office. This factor is part-time work. The effects of working from home lead us to the question of whether less time spent at the office by working part-time can similarly impact motivation.

Motivation as a concept is at the core of human existence. It influences what we do and why. "Motivation can be defined as everything that drives and sustains human behavior" (Gard, 2001). In this sense, understanding the concept of motivation is key to understanding how and why people do what they do and how we can use this knowledge to be driven enough and sustain our behavior to achieve our goals. These goals could be individual or shared. Working to achieve shared goals is one of the purposes of public administration. According to one of the oldest definitions, public administration is "the management of men and materials in the accomplishment of the purposes of the state" (White, 1926, p. 5). In order to achieve shared goals or goals of the state, motivation is vital. Understanding what factors can influence motivation in public administration can help us move forward. An individual's bias to respond positively to motives found mainly or solely in public organization can be defined as PSM (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368). The beliefs and values an

individual possesses that make them have this positive response can be defined in four categories. These are, Attraction to policy making, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion (Perry, 1996, p. 16).

This thesis considers the issue of motivation in the Dutch civil service by looking at the relation between part-time work and PSM. The social relevancy of this thesis lies partially in its focus on PSM, a significant aspect affecting the performance of the entire public sector. The very high level of part-time work in the Netherlands makes it a furthermore very relevant question, as its effects can have a more significant impact than in many other countries. In 2018, 41,1% of Dutch municipal employees and 28,6% of central government employees worked part-time (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken Trends en Cijfers 2019, p. 10,12). For other countries, it can help understand what the impact may be of a growing spread and acceptance of part-time work. It gives us a greater understanding of the pros and cons of part-time work on a macro level. In a time when many people and organizations are reconsidering and rethinking the ways in which we work.

Concerning the role of motivation in public service, much research has been focused on the existence of different types of motivation between public sector and private sector employees Rainey (1982) found that public sector workers had a greater interest in helping others, compared to private sector workers. From this strand of research followed the concept of Public Service Motivation or PSM. Perry and Wise explain Public service motivation ( hereafter PSM) can be viewed as an individual's bias to react positively to motives found mainly, or solely in public organizations. Here motives would refer to the needs an individual feels urged to eliminate (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368). Most research on PSM looks at it as a cause for self-selection of individuals with high PSM levels into public service. Employee motives are seen as being brought to the work situation (Wright, 2001, p. 564). Perry and Vandenaabeele argue that PSM is not a stable trait an individuals is born with, instead it may change in strength, shape or relevance over time, as individuals are influenced by their institutional environment (Perry & Vandenaabeele, 2008). We should look at the public sector work environment as

a relevant institutional environment. Research that looks at the public sector work environment and the development of PSM, tends to look at development when entering an organization or the effects of organizational characteristics, job characteristics or value systems. Georgellis and Tabvuma, found that PSM levels spiked after employees transferred from private sector to public sector jobs and were sustained years later (2010). Ward similarly found that workers placed in a more public service oriented program showed increases in PSM that were sustained over time (2013).

One of the very few studies looking at the relation between part-time work and PSM is that of Grund and Thommes. They found that part-time work reduces the connection to political-social involvement, which they define as an aspect of PSM (2015). While this study offers a beginning to the study of the impact of part-time employment on PSM, more research, and more attention to part-time work as a mediating factor is needed. This study focuses only on Germany, and uses only quantitative data. National and cultural factors may affect the outcome, which makes that arguments from this study may not apply to the Netherlands, furthermore, the quantitative methods used, do not look into attitudes and cultural context of part-time work. If we want to better understand this phenomenon we need to look at different countries with different attitudes and systems.

This leads us to our research question:

### **What is the impact of Part-time work in the dutch public administration on Public Service**

#### **Motivation of these Part-time workers?**

This question can be further divided. One aspect of the Dutch part-time work would be the culture and social attitudes surrounding part time work, in the Netherlands, as well as legal aspects. The second part would be the part-time work itself as in the smaller number of hours worked, and/or spent in the workplace. This research will help us test ideas from the Grund and Thommes study concerning the negative impact of part-time work on PSM, to see whether they hold in the context of the Netherlands, while also expanding the theory by including the social and cultural context into the development of

the theory. This will help us form a broader picture on the topic, going beyond the effect of simply the smaller amount of hours spent working or in the workplace.

First we will look at existing theory on motivation, PSM, and part time work in the Netherlands, and abroad, to understand the relevance, and relations between the concepts, and develop our theoretical framework, to answer our research question.

## **Chapter 2: Literature review**

In order to theorize what the effects of part-time employment may be on Public Service motivation, and what gap in the theory this will fill, we must first look at what existing literature has written on the topic. For this we will look at how the main concepts used in our theory, performance in public administration, PSM, and Part-time employment, specifically in the dutch context, have been defined. Then we will look at what has been written previously on the relationship between part-time employment and PSM.

When we want to look at the relevance of motivation in the public sector it is important we first clearly look at the end goal of a public administration and its civil servants, and in order to do this, it is best we first go back to the definition of public administration. Public administration according to one of the oldest definitions is ‘the management of men and materials in the accomplishment of the purposes of the state.’ A more specified definition is given by Chandler who defines it as: “(...) the development and maintenance of policy by members of governments, public agencies and public sector employees and the practice of putting the authoritative decisions they have made into practice.” (Chandler, 2000, p. 1) What we get from this more specific definition is a concern with the process through which a policy is developed and executed.

Now in order to achieve these goals of public administration, civil servants and members of public administration need to work to achieve them. Several characteristics of civil servants’ behaviour have been discussed that would be the most relevant for achieving this. Thus providing an idea of the ideal type of performance for civil servants. Boyne divided these into several dimensions of performance that are relevant in public organizations. These categories are outputs, efficiency, responsiveness, effectiveness, and democratic outcome (Boyne, 2002 as cited in Andrews, Boyne & Walker, 2006, p. 14). Output, consisting of the quality and quantity of services, efficiency, concerning costs per output, and effectiveness, concerning goal achievement, (Boyne 2002 as cited in Andrews, Boyne & Walker,



2006, p. 14) could arguably all be considered as related to effectiveness/efficiency. Democratic outcomes and responsiveness refer to accountability and participation, and satisfaction measures (Boyne, 2002 as cited in Andrews, Boyne & Walker, 2006, p. 14). These could also be included in a definition of quality of governance as efficiency, as participation and satisfaction measures would contribute to delivering effective services that people will appreciate more. Furthermore when we consider throughput legitimacy, the more standard efficiency, effectiveness and output measures do matter, however, accountability and participation indeed seem to be very relevant for discussions of throughput legitimacy as previously defined in connection to transparency and participation.

If we thus combine these five categories of performance we get a type of performance that we would expect to contribute to the goal of good governance, as well as throughput legitimacy, and exemplify some of the characteristics of the ideal type of the Weberian bureaucracy. If we were to identify an ideal type of performance within public service it would be performance that contributes to outputs, efficiency, responsiveness, effectiveness, and democratic outcome for the organization. PSM may be part of what leads to this type of performance.

## **2.1 Public Service Motivation**

In order to develop our hypotheses on PSM in the Dutch public sector we must look at how to define Public Service Motivation. Now to look at the concept of Public Service Motivation we go back to its origins. Perry and Wise explain Public service motivation (PSM) can be viewed as an individual's bias to react positively to motives found mainly, or solely in public organizations. Here motives would refer to the needs an individual feels urged to eliminate (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 368). PSM, in this definition would then be the occurrence of motives that can be satisfied by employment in public service. The core idea being that individuals are driven not just by self-interest but also by their desire

to help others and contribute to society, and that public servants are particularly motivated by this ideal. They may let go of their own interests for the greater good (DiIulio, 1994; Perry & Wise, 1990).

In order to establish the relevance of PSM on performance, and thus quality of governance in general, we must look at theories on its effects on individual performance. The effects of PSM, and motivation in general are usually described in terms of performance of the employee within the organization. A more motivated worker performs better. Important for this is the presence of PSM-fit. A PSM fit would be the lack or presence of a possibility of an individual to actually fulfill their needs in terms of PSM in their job and organization (Steijn and Leijnsink, 2009, p. 14). As we previously mentioned, research has found that red tape has a negative impact on PSM. Red tape would be a hindrance to fulfillment of PSM values. Furthermore we can assume that the publicness of an organization matters. In a private sector company where PSM values are not relevant to the work of the organization we would assume they would not contribute to performance. On the positive effects of higher PSM much research has been done. Naff & Crum (1999) showed that employees with higher PSM are more likely to perform better, have higher satisfaction, and are less likely to seek a different job. Brewer & Selden (1998) showed that employees with higher PSM are more likely to be a whistleblower. Taylor & Taylor (2011) In their research showed that PSM had more influence on employees' effort than wages. Overall, multiple studies have found a positive relation between PSM and performance of public sector workers.

The ideal type of performance in the public sector we have previously identified was performance that contributes to outputs, efficiency, responsiveness, effectiveness, and democratic outcome. PSM increasing employees' efforts would likely benefit all of these categories, but specifically efficiency, effectiveness and outputs. If people are willing to work harder, output will be of higher quality, people may work faster and may focus more on achieving the goals. In terms of democratic outcomes and responsiveness, whistleblowing could be a good example of accountability and impartiality which was seen as part of responsiveness and democratic outcome. Overall, when looking at these theories we can establish that higher levels of PSM would make for a better performance, if there is a good PSM fit with the organization.

## 2.2 Measuring PSM

In order to be able to measure and understand levels of PSM, we must look at what constitutes PSM. As we have previously seen it is generally discussed in terms of attraction to work in public service, and beliefs, values and attitudes required and associated with it. James L Perry in his 1996 work sought to measure and categorize these beliefs, values and attitudes in a precise way. He identified 4 items that he would use to measure and categorize PSM. These being

1. Attraction to policy making
2. Commitment to the public interest/civic duty
3. Self-Sacrifice
4. Compassion

(Perry, 1996, p. 16)

While these values offer a good system of measurement, it would need to be adapted to our context. Values and attitudes associated with public service can differ from one context to another, as they may be influenced by national contexts or organizational contexts. Using these values established by Perry in this study would require a knowledge of the Dutch context of values and attitudes associated with public service. This is provided by Vandenabeele who in his study looked at these values identified by Perry, and compared them to the Dutch context, to understand if and how this theory can be applicable. In his study Vandenabeele finds that the 4 dimensions Attraction to policy making, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion as identified by Perry are present. However there are still differences. In commitment to the public interest there is more focus on the national interest. Compassion is more collective than individual, and self-sacrifice is not

as present as it is in the US (Vandenabeele, 2005, p. 266). This shows that the overall framework of PSM, containing the domains of Attraction to policy making, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion is applicable to the Dutch context, although minor changes do need to be made.

### **2.3 The origins of PSM**

In order to understand how part-time employment can affect PSM levels it is important to look at theories on the origins of PSM, and what causes it. This relates to the debate on intrinsic or external motivation, and where PSM can be placed.

Intrinsically motivated behavior is done because of the satisfaction that comes from fulfilling a task. It is interesting, enjoyable or has personal meaning. This motivation thus comes from within the individual and is autonomous (Houston, 2011, p. 762). This intrinsic motivation would thus be triggered by work content that is enjoyable, and fulfilling. The opposite of this intrinsic motivation would be extrinsic motivation. Here the reward lies not within the individual but outside of it. It is this outside force that contains the reward that causes the behavior (Houston, 2011, p. 762). This could be monetary rewards or punishment.

PSM may be somewhat difficult to place in this dichotomy. PSM was traditionally perceived as mostly altruistic, helping others. If this were the case then intrinsic motives such as work enjoyment and external motivation, such as punishment or monetary rewards cannot be considered PSM, However, Perry and Wise argue that it may be more complex and PSM can in fact also be grounded in personal utility maximization (Perry and Wise, 1990, p. 368) they discuss motivation in three categories.

The first category is identified as rational motivation. They find that a person drawn to public service to contribute to policy making may be satisfying his personal needs while also serving public interests. This could be through Personal identification with a program (Perry and Wise, 1999, p. 368). This could thus be a case of individual utility maximization. The second category of motivation they identified is the category of norm-based motivation. This would involve norms that determine the employees desire to work for the public sector. These are generally identified as a desire for serving the public interest, loyalty to duty and the government as a whole, and finally social equity (Perry and Wise 1999, p. 368, 369). Here the idea of what exactly is the public good appears not as relevant, instead the general idea of working for the government and public good is the norm. Finally there is the aspect of affective motives. Here they identify a genuine belief in the social importance of a program, as a source of commitment. And finally they discuss the concept of patriotism of benevolence. This is described as a combination of love of the people within a country, and the imperative to protect them in all the basic rights granted to them (Perry and Wise 1999, p. 368, 369). this seems the closest to the typical altruistic description of PSM.

Looking at these three categories we might try to consider the specific motivations previously discussed as mentioned by Perry, and see how they fit in these categories. These are Attraction to policy making, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice and Compassion. Compassion seems to fall mostly under affective, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty and self-sacrifice appear to be norm-based, while Attraction to policy making appears to fall under the rational category. One common motive from the discussion of extrinsic and intrinsic sides of motivation, as well as the categories identified by Perry and Wise, is the question of altruism. If an action is performed because of one's belief it will help the public good, is it fulfilled on altruistic reasons, or is it also intrinsic in the sense that fulfilling this desire of the individual is a motive of which the effects will be felt by the individual. The answer may be both. Affective, norm-based and rational motives may all be combined into PSM, creating a motivation concerned with both the effects outside of the individual, as well as the coherence to an individual's norms and desires it may fulfill. In this sense we can see PSM as something that may have consequences that are external to the

individual, but that is deeply shaped by norms, values and a belief that they would have a positive impact. Now in order to understand the relation with part-time work, we have to look at what impacts these values, norms, and beliefs, and shapes them in such a way that they relate to PSM.

#### **2.4 Institutional environments' impact on PSM values**

In order to develop our theory on part time work, we must see what can impact these norms and values, and what can do this while working in the public service already. Part-time employment mostly affects the interaction of the individual with its work environment. Therefore if the work environment can impact PSM development, PT work might affect it through this. When looking for the factors that impact norms and values, we might divide these between socio historical context, demographic factors, and specific organizational and environmental factors. According to Perry, the basis for PSM is rooted in education, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) argue that it can also be influenced by developments within an organization. Pandey & Stazyk (2008, p. 102) show that certain demographic factors including age, sex, and education can have an impact. All of these factors would impact our norms and values, and thus could steer us towards or away from PSM values.

Concerning the sociohistorical factors, Perry in his 2000 work discusses how socio historical context can shape people's motivations and values. Here he includes education and socialization, as well as life events as major factors. Observational learning and modeling is a process for transmission of values and patterns of behavior. These factors would influence individual characteristics such as competences and most notably the self-concept, which includes values and identity, that in the end influence behavior (Perry, 2000, p. 481). Then there is the motivational context, including institutions, such as beliefs and values, work environment and job characteristics and incentives. These would impact the self concept, values etc. and self-regulatory processes as individual characteristics (Perry, 2000, p. 481). These processes by which motivational context and

sociohistorical context influence the self-context may be identified as identification and integration in terms of extrinsic factors.

This relates to March and Olsen's discussion on institutions. They define institutions as "collections of interrelated rules and routines that define appropriate action in terms of relations between roles and situations" (1989, p. 21). Thus institutions determine appropriateness of behavior and thus also PSM. This implies that PSM is not a stable trait, but instead is context-dependent and may change even within a person over time, given changes in institutional environment. Indeed Perry and Vandenabeele argue that PSM is not a stable trait an individuals is born with, instead it may change in strength, shape or relevance over time, as individuals are influenced by their institutional environment (Perry & Vandenabeele, 2008). Relevant institutional environments could be education, national culture, religion or the organizational environment one works in. These would all impact what individuals would consider appropriate, and thus impact their PSM.

Many institutional environments and sociohistorical factors apart from the work environment seem to impact PSM values, such as education. Examples of this are found in research that finds that higher educated and older people have higher levels of PSM and compassion than those younger or lower educated (Steijn, Leijnsink, 2009, p. 21). Here the institution of higher education, and sociohistorical factors of age may have had an impact. These socio factors could lead to self-selection of high PSM individuals into public service, as their socio historical context has led to a motivational context that leads to high PSM. This presumes a development of PSM values before entering the workplace, or independently of the workplace.

Recent research has focused on how organizations affect levels of PSM. The conclusions of this research is that organizational membership, environments, culture ,tenure, and experiences can all impact PSM levels. Processes of organizational socialization can lead to employees adapting values to

their organizational culture. To date, a number of studies has found a positive effect of organizational reforms and cultures on individuals' PSM levels (Ward, 2014, p. 116). As we have previously discussed, institutions and institutional change could form the bases for changes in values and attitudes thus also changes in PSM. The workplace as an institution, as a factor of motivational context thus affects levels of PSM. This is also suggested by research by Georgellis and Tabvuma, who found that PSM levels spiked after employees transferred from private sector to public sector jobs and were sustained years later (2010). Ward similarly found that workers placed in a more public service oriented program showed increases in PSM that were sustained over time (2014). We can relate this to previous discussions by March and Olsen on the idea of logic of appropriateness, where individuals act based on what is perceived as being appropriate. It is likely that individuals in the public sector see that in that sector PSM related values such as compassion are more appropriate than values such as competitiveness. Thus through processes such as integration and identification these could develop PSM in the individual. Organizational culture, rules, reward structures and experiences could all contribute to this.

Another example could be red tape, which is described by Moynihan and Pandey as having a negative effect as it discourages individuals (2007, 47). This shows how PSM goals appear difficult to achieve because of red tape, thus lowering PSM levels. In Perry's process theory of PSM it is also described how an individual's values and identity, and thus motivation are linked to institutions such as the workplace (2000). Incentive systems and characteristics of the workplace thus affect motivation in general and PSM specifically. This allows us to understand higher levels of PSM in civil servants than private sector workers as not just self-selection of high PSM workers into the public service, but also as a result of socialization while on the job. We can understand the origins of PSM thus broadly as the major institutions that we take part in, including the workplace.

## **2.5 Part-time work and the Dutch context**



The Dutch context of part-time work is very important to take into account as the Netherlands appears to have a unique relationship with part-time employment. Professor Jelle Visser even coined it ‘‘the only part-time economy in the world.’’ (Visser, 2002, p. 23) in 2019 Part-time employment made up almost 50% of total employment (CBS Statline, 2019). The unique position that part-time employment has in the Netherlands, and the specific characteristics of part-time employment in the Netherlands could have a major impact on PSM in the Netherlands. In order to gain a deeper understanding we will look at the history of part-time work in the Netherlands, the legal and social frameworks surrounding PT work, and the demographics of PT work.

Part-time employment can be defined as being employed for less than the full-time working hours at the organization of employment. In the Dutch government this is defined as 36 hours, with a possibility to work up to 40 hours in a standard work week (excluding overtime) (Ministerie van Binnenlandse zaken, 2019). Much research has looked into differences in part-time employees compared to full-time employees.

Jelle Visser in his paper discusses several different explanations as to why the Netherlands became a part-time champion. One is that in the 1980s when it arose, a ‘‘social democratic welfare state’’ as well as a unified feminist movement were folded into the welfare state’s decision making processes, where they favoured part-time work for women during motherhood. Another explanation however, argues that it is instead a spontaneous occurrence, brought on by married women entering the labour force at a late stage, thus shaping government policies. Lacking child-care facilities and support made women choose part-time employment to overcome this. This combined with labour market adversity in the 1980s led to the adoption and spread of policy measures favouring part-time employment (Visser, 2002, p. 26). Thus we can see that the rise of part-time employment in the Netherlands was a complex, and to some extent perhaps even accidental occurrence. As this process went along an institutional, legal, and social context surrounding part-time (PT) employment developed.

There is a difference between those who voluntarily work part-time and those who do not have any other option. We will mostly focus on those who chose to work part-time. As we focus on the Netherlands, we should take into account the Dutch context, and in this context it seems clear that most part-time workers made their own choice. Compared to other countries, the Netherlands has the largest amount of part-time work in the world, and part-time of jobs of high quality. Every Dutchman has the right to do their job part-time, and wage discrimination against them is legally prohibited (Wielers and Raven, 2013, p. 106). This explains part of the reasoning behind people's decisions. Now when we look at demographics, some other parts of their reasoning becomes clear.

While PT employment was in the 1980s mostly an issue of married women with children, nowadays it is spread beyond this demographic. 81% of women with children work part time, as opposed to 14,9% of men with children. Overall 73.3% of all Dutch working women worked part-time in 2019. At the same time 27.8% of men worked part-time. In 2019 49.1% of all employees worked part-time. In 2019 men in couples that have children were statistically more likely to work full time than men without children and/or partners, Whereas for women it was the other way around (CBS Statline, 2019). So we see that men with children still function as a traditional breadwinner, who only focus on paid work by working full-time. However the mothers are able to combine paid work with care for their children by working part-time.

This is largely facilitated by changes in the institutional context. In 2000 a new law extended the ability to work part-time to all employees regardless of the presence or absence of family obligations, which has led to a normalisation of part-time work among the general population (Ibanez, 2010, p.179). Since 2000, all employees have the right to do their job part-time, an employer has to honor an employee's request to work part-time, Only if there are very serious concerns for the results on the functioning or safety of the organisation may it be denied (Wielers and raven, 2013, p. 106). These developments have lead to a situation where part-time is available to almost everyone, regardless of their job or gender, and is relatively uncomplicated to request. This creates a situation where high quality jobs are available part-time. Part-time jobs are therefore also mainly chosen by employees, instead of forced upon them. The number of workers involuntarily working part-time is low, and the

gap between real and preferred working hours is very narrow compared to other countries (Yerkes, 2009, p. 540).

Alongside a legal situation where part-time has become normalised and accessible, there is also a situation of social acceptance of part-time work. Certain concerns on the effects of PT employment on performance appear to be less prevalent than in other countries as illustrated by Ibanez. In his interviews he found that Dutch interviewees did not think a large number of employees working part-time could negatively affect the quality of education. Instead students would have benefits from teachers that are less stressed. Among British respondents this view was not shared by the majority, and was very rare amongst representatives of employers (Ibanez, 2010, p.183). Similarly Keuzenkamp finds that Dutch employers do not see the large share of PT workers as problematic, and see the choice for part-time work as a private decision. Employers cite demand for part-time jobs as the most important reason to offer them, but also mention benefits such as flexibility required by peaks and lows in demand. Employers are not active in increasing or decreasing working hours, only 13% of employers from the research admitted they had a policy of seeking to increase working hours of part timers (Keuzenkamp, 2009, p. 6, 10,11). This shows a social environment where part-time work is accepted, explicitly also by employers. The demand for part-time employment together with other benefits makes that they offer PT positions. They do not perceive negative effects on performance, and do not pressure employees into working full time.

Despite the positive general perception of part-time work, there are also some negative associations, mainly, its effect on career perspectives. The major drawback is that part-time jobs offer less career opportunities than full-time job (Wielers and Raven, 2013, p.106). This appears to be clear to employees, as they are more likely than management to estimate that part timers have worse chances of getting promoted than full timers (Portegijs et al., 2008, p. 59). This is also clear from the data. In the Netherlands as in other European countries part timers are less represented amongst the higher

positions. Dutch labour conditions may be better for part timers, but the chances of a promotion and consequences for career development are just as negative (Portegijs et al., 2008, p. 57, 61).

Whereas part-time work is sometimes presented as a compromise in the choice between career and children, it seems that it in fact still can have negative effects on career opportunities. Similarly, opportunities to work part-time may be less prevalent in certain sectors (Rasmussen, Lind and Visser 2004, p. 644). Another possible downside for PT work could be differentiation in wages.

However, when controlling for sector, experience and occupation the gap between part-time and fulltime has narrowed to only 7 per cent in the private sector and 0 per cent in the public sector (Rasmussen Lind and Visser, 2004, p. 644). Thus it seems that wage differences ,specifically in the public sector, could be neglected. Overall the downsides appear to be lack of career growth opportunities, some limits to in which sector one can work part-time, and sometimes a wage difference. However as we have seen before these issues do not appear to be a large obstacle as many choose part-time, perhaps because they value other factors such as raising their children or enjoying spare time over wages or career development.

## **2.6 Part-time employment, motivation and PSM**

Scholars have found part-time employment to have an impact on performance. However, the answer appears inconsistent. A major issue in research on this topic is the question of whether differences in performance or satisfaction are due to differences between the demographics of part-timers and full-timers or as actual results of the part-time work. When corrected for demographic differences the two groups often appear to be quite similar in performance related measures.

Part time workers have been more, less or equally committed in previous studies (Taylor, 2007, p. 942). Taylor finds that full-time employees have higher levels of job satisfaction (2007, p. 945).

While another study finds that part-timers are more committed and satisfied, but are less invested in the relation with their employer (Sinclair, Martin and Michel, 1999, p. 247). Similarly Thorsteinson

found little difference between PT and FT workers, except for the fact that Full-time workers were more involved with their job (2003).

Another aspect of the social context of part-time work is its perceived effect on the support for the work obligation norm. The work obligation norm refers to the extent to which work, paid or unpaid, is perceived as a social obligation to society. In the Netherlands and in other European countries, Those who work part-time support the work obligation norm less compared to fulltimers. And as a result, the Netherlands score very low on support for the work obligation norm (Wielers and raven, 2013, p. 112). This would point to PT workers in the public sector lacking a feeling of obligation, and thus being less involved or productive.

On the other side there are the arguments in favor of PT work, as it would increase productivity. Some authors point out how PT workers could outperform their colleagues, tired from long working hours, and part-time jobs may allow people to use the circadian rhythm better, and perform better as they are less stressed (Garnero, Kampelmann, Rycx, 2014, p. 3). Going back to our indicators of performance in the public sector, outputs, efficiency, responsiveness, effectiveness, and democratic outcome we also get a mixed picture. While higher productivity may lead to more output and efficiency, lack of involvement or lack of a relationship with the employer may lead to less democratic outcome, outputs, or responsiveness. Overall the picture remains unclear.

As we have seen in previous theory, sociohistorical context, such as institutional environment can affect the development of PSM. During employment the workplace and other institutions can affect the development of values. If we were to look at part-time employment through this perspective we could see it as a factor that affects the level of exposure to the workplace as an institution that can shape values and norms, through socialization and the logic of appropriateness.

## 2.7 The Core-Periphery model

Grund and Thommes studied the effects of contract types on PSM, using the core-periphery employment model. This model describes how organizations create a flexible periphery of employees around a central stable core, to increase flexibility. The flexibility is temporal, such as part-time or temporary work, as opposed to the core of full-time or long-term workers. Part-time workers being located at the periphery would affect the social aspects of work. Interaction with others and their social approval can impact work motivation (Grund and Thommes, 2017). This core-periphery employment model comes from the literature on workforce employment strategies and the dual labor market. It discusses human resources strategies that divide up a firm's labor pool between a stable core and a flexible periphery. The core consists of permanent, highly skilled employees with possibilities for training and internal career development, thus flexible in terms of function. (Deery, Jago 5) The periphery consists of Fixed-Term contract employees and other types of nonstandard employees. They, instead, have less job security and function in a way as a buffer of labour that allows for numerical flexibility, and also gives job security to the core employees. (Pfeiffer 2009) (Kalleberg 2001). Studies have found that social comparison can lead to feelings of deprivation and inequity amongst workers in the periphery. such feelings can result in reduced organizational commitment and lower job satisfaction. (De Witte, Naswall 2003)

Organizational commitment has been seen as the most relevant predictor for overall motivation and has been proven to significantly correlate with PSM. (Grund and Thommes, 2017 p. 5) This core-periphery model offers a way to differentiate employees based on contract types and temporal flexibility. Furthermore, it shows that the periphery in this model is likely to score lower on factors correlating to PSM. In considering the periphery based on temporal flexibility, part-time employees can also be considered part of the periphery. At the same time, these employees are often relatively permanent and thus could also be considered part of the core. (Kalleberg 2001, p. 483) Thommes discuss how part-time workers being located at the periphery would affect the social aspects of work.

Interaction with others and their social approval can impact work motivation. (Grund and Thommes, 2015, p.5,6) Using this theory, we can understand how part-time work can affect the development of motivation as well as values. part-timers have less opportunities to interact with colleagues, but these interactions are furthermore of lesser quality. Fulltimers are less likely to share knowledge with part-timers. They are furthermore unlikely to consider PT workers as regular group members. PT workers have fewer opportunities to learn at work. (Grund and Thommes, 2015, p. 9) Furthermore, this study analyses data on part-time workers and PSM and finds that PT workers have lower scores on political/social involvement, which they use as a proxy for PSM (Grund and Thommes, 2017). This suggests that indeed socialization as a source of PSM can have a significant impact. This study provides a good theoretical framework, however its data analysis lacks the depth of more qualitative methods, making it more difficult to establish causation with the theory. Furthermore, the theory does not consider national context as the authors admit. This study was done in Germany, in a different cultural context and a situation with a different outlook and system for part-time employment. Indeed as they mention in their study, the relation between employment and PSM is subject to national and cultural differences, as well as the prevalence of different contract types in this context (Grund and Thommes, 2015, p. 23).

Similarly, to this study, Jacobsen discusses how part-time employment may affect organizational commitment. One aspect of this is normative commitment. This involves commitment where an individual is attached to an organization through (internalized) values, creating an obligation to stay within the organization. (Jacobsen 2000) PSM values could be these values in the case for a public sector organization, the values that make one feel a need to be in public service. He also hypothesized that a "lack of integration hypothesis" or "imperfect socialization hypothesis" would be a reason for part-time employees' lack of normative commitment. However, his study found no significant difference in normative commitment amongst part-time employees. In the other two commitment types measured in the study, continuance and affective, they scored higher and lower than full-time peers (Jacobsen 2000, p. 187,194). While the results of the study are not significant, the theory developed in it can be useful. This study shares Grund and Thommes idea of imperfect socialization

impacting the development of values. The imperfect socialization hypothesis it discusses is very useful in combination with the core-periphery model. However, the study applies it to normative commitment outside of the public sector, and while it can be argued to be very similar to PSM, it does not focus on public service.

The core-periphery model helps us classify part-time employees as people on the periphery, be it from a functional perspective or social perspective, that can impact their socialization. This imperfect socialization, in turn, leads to lower commitment and PSM.



### **Chapter 3: Theory and Framework**

Having looked at the literature, we should now develop our own theory on the relation between Dutch part-time culture and PSM. PSM is generally defined as an individual's bias to react positively to motives found mainly or solely in public organizations. The 4 dimensions identified by Perry, being Attraction to policy making, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion are generally applicable to the case of the Netherlands. PSM would be relevant as it leads to better performance of public service overall and individual performance if there is a good PSM fit between the individual and the organization. This makes PSM relevant for the overall functioning of public service and quality of governance.

In the existing literature, we have found that the source of PSM values is mostly seen as a result of sociohistorical factors, demographic factors, and the influence of the institutions we take part in. It can be influenced by organizations and socialization while on the job. Socialization and the creation of networks with colleagues for information, support, friendship, and guidance, can increase adherence to organizational values.

The values of a public sector organization would be the same as those of PSM, as attraction to the values of public sector work forms the core of PSM. Higher levels of PSM values measured in public sector employment would thus not only be a result of selection of high PSM individuals into the public sector but also of higher exposure and socialization in an environment that promotes the development of PSM values. This relates to the core-periphery model and imperfect socialization hypothesis, where we assume that part-time employees have fewer opportunities to interact with this environment than their full-time peers and a lower quality of interactions, as they are on the periphery. Employees on the periphery score lower on organizational commitment, which is significantly correlated with PSM. The development and use of the networks described in organizational socialization theory would occur less. As a result, we would expect them to score lower on PSM-related values than similar employees who work full time.

We add onto this the aspect of Part-time work in the Netherlands. National culture was an aspect lacking from the discussion of Grund and Thommes, Jacobsen and others . We have seen that the work obligation norm, which is similar to some aspects of PSM, is not widely supported in the Netherlands, and less supported by part-time workers, thus showing that in the Netherlands, PT workers score lower on these PSM related values. This could be because of the impact of socialization and the core-periphery theory. Concerning Dutch part-time work culture, two aspects need to be considered, its wide spread, social, cultural attitudes and the legal situation. PT work is widely accepted in the Netherlands by employers, colleagues, and family members. Furthermore, they generally do not see any negative side effects, part-time workers feel supported, and are not pressured to increase their working hours. This leads us to consider that part-time work is so socially accepted that it could make that PT workers are, in fact, not at the periphery in the core-periphery employment model. Part-Time workers would still spend less time in the organization and thus have less time in which adoption of values and socialization could take place. However, the quality of interaction would not be affected because of the Dutch part-time culture, which does not see PT work, and thus PT workers as less or negative.

This brings us to our conceptual framework. We assume that PSM is affected by sociohistorical and demographic factors, but also, most importantly, after entering the workplace, by socialization, the social networks this can create, the interactions that come from this, and exposure to the values of the workplace. The networks from socialization theory can still exist after the phase of initial or formal socialization. The amount of time spent with colleagues can influence how strong these networks are. Based on the core-periphery employment model, part-time work limits an individual's interaction possibilities and exposure to the work environment, thus harming the development of PSM values, or organizational commitment, correlated to PSM. However, we argue that national cultural and social attitudes to part-time work in the Netherlands are such that the part-time workers are not at the periphery socially, as they are not seen as different or less in any way. Thus while they may have

fewer opportunities for socialization, the quality of interaction is not lower. This brings us to our Hypotheses.

**H1: Part-time employees score lower, but not extremely much lower, on PSM-related values than similar full-time employees, because of less interaction possibilities leading to PSM development.**

**H2. Dutch acceptance of Part-time work makes that Part-time employees are not on the periphery socially, quantity of interactions is lower, but not quality, and thus they may score only somewhat lower.**

We expect that PSM would be lower amongst PT workers, regardless of other factors such as demographics, but not as much as in a society where part-time work is less accepted. In doing this we apply the core-periphery model from Grund and Thommes, and imperfect ‘socialization hypothesis’ from Jacobsen, in the Dutch context, while adding theory on the impact of social-cultural attitudes to part-time work in that context.

## **Chapter 4: Research Design**

In order to test these hypotheses, we will look at part-time employees and full-time employees in the Dutch public administration and score them on their PSM values. This would provide us with knowledge on whether significantly different scores exist between the two groups. Relevant demographic factors that have been proven to impact PSM should be corrected for. The second part of our theory is the role of social, cultural attitudes to part-time work and the role of the workplace in developing PSM. We should look at socialization in the workplace and test the core-periphery model for part-time employees. For this, we should see whether PT workers are less involved in the workplace in terms of socialization, which could lead to developing less PSM.

The focus will be on municipalities as parts of the Dutch public administration. This is because of several reasons. Dutch municipalities have the largest share of the total public administration employees. In 2018, 50.22% of the employees in the Dutch public administration were municipal employees. Furthermore, in 2018, 41,1% of municipal employees worked part-time, the highest of any layer of government, with, for example, only 28,6% of central government employees working part-time (Trends en Cijfers 2019, 10,12 2019). This makes our theory would affect municipalities the most, as they have both the most employees and the highest share of PT workers.

Furthermore, because of the large size of this layer of government, the availability of data, and abilities to conduct research are much larger than when a smaller organization had been chosen. Finally, all municipalities have the same tasks. This makes results from one municipality more generalizable to the others, compared to ministries, where each one has an entirely different function and tasks that can affect issues such as motivation and socialization. Organizational culture can still differ, but this is the case for any organization or department.

Our research design will consist of a data analysis using a one-way ANOVA test and a qualitative study based on interviews in a case study. The interviews and data analysis methods provide a useful analysis when taken together. The data analysis can help us understand the general pattern. We can see if there are differences in scores on PSM values between the part-time and full-time workers, regardless of demographic factors and differences in scores related to socialization. However, this lacks understanding of the meaning behind the phenomena we may see in the data analysis. For this, and for an understanding on a micro level, the case study is useful as it offers direct personal accounts on the meaning of the relation between part-time work and PSM, instead of simply statistical significance.

## **Chapter 5: Methodology Data analysis**

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test will be performed for the data analysis. This will analyze the variance in responses to the different statements on PSM values and socialization in the work environment. The data used is from a dataset gathered by the Dutch Ministry of Internal affairs. The website where the data are available The data analysis will focus on differences in scores on PSM-related issues and socialization between similar part-time and full-time employees who work in the public administration of dutch municipalities. Using data gathered by the Dutch government on its employees in a survey on PSM values can help find statistically significant differences in the scores of part-time and full-time employees. In the dataset used, respondents are given statements concerning PSM and are asked to state to what extent they agree with them. The statements are:

“Ik zet me belangeloos in voor de samenleving.”

**“I am selflessly committed to society.”**

“Ik vind het belangrijk om een wezenlijke bijdrage aan de publieke zaak te leveren.”

**“I find it important to make a significant contribution to the public good.”**

“Ik vind het belangrijker om een wezenlijke bijdrage aan de samenleving te leveren dan om persoonlijk succes te hebben”

**“I think it is more important to make a significant contribution to society than to have personal success.”**

“Het algemeen belang dienen is een belangrijke drijfveer in mijn dagelijks leven (op het werk of daarbuiten)”

**“Serving the common good is a major driving force in my daily life (at work or outside)”**

‘Door mijn werk lever ik een bijdrage aan de publieke zaak’

**‘Through my work I contribute to the public good.’**

Respondents are given five options:

- Completely Disagree
- Disagree
- Do not agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Completely Agree

These statements indicate PSM values, and more specifically, relate to the 4 categories of PSM values as identified by Perry, and that we found are applicable in the Dutch context. These were Attraction to policymaking, Commitment to the public interest/civic duty, Self-Sacrifice, and Compassion. Perry in his 1996 work defines ways to measure PSM and defines statements that can help define PSM dimensions. Several of these clearly relate to the above statements.

"I unselfishly contribute to my community" is used to measure commitment to the public interest. (Perry 1996) It clearly relates to our statement "I am selflessly committed to society." However, the "selflessly" can also relate to self-sacrifice. Thus, we can also see it as an issue of self-sacrifice to a lesser extent.

The second statement is, "I find it important to make a significant contribution to the public good". This statement also appears to relate to the dimension commitment to the public interest/civic duty quite straightforwardly.

The third statement "I think it is more important to make a significant contribution to society than to have personal success." Is clearly related to self-sacrifice and is similar to "Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements." Used by perry as a measure of self-sacrifice. (Perry 1996)

"Serving the common good is a major driving force in my daily life (at work or outside)" This statement seems to relate to commitment to the public interest the most out of the 4 categories.

Compassion does not appear to be clearly reflected in the terms mentioned by Perry. However, Perry mentioned compassion in relation to the love for the people within a country and the belief one must protect them (Perry 7, 1996). Serving the common good, contributing to the public good, and contributing to the community, could be interpreted as protecting the country's people, doing what is best for them. Therefore compassion is not explicitly emphasized in the questions. However, we can see how they relate to it in the broader perspective of PSM.

The last statement: "Through my work, I contribute to the public good."

While it does not directly measure the level of PSM, it does give an indication. Instead of motivation, it can reflect the impact the work has, no matter if motivation was high or low. But it can also reflect motivation in the sense that they choose not to actively contribute through their work. This statement does not clearly relate to any of the four categories. However, it does provide insight on PSM and civil servants' perspectives on the impact of their work. This statement will be considered but will not play a large role in our analysis.

Finally, there are two statements concerning socialization. These statements are:

‘‘Ik voel me als een deel van de familie in deze organisatie’’

**"I feel like a part of the family in this organization"**

‘‘ik voel me thuis in deze organisatie’’

**"I feel at home in this organization"**

These statements will be used to look at differences in socialization. The first statement specifically reflects a more social connection with colleagues, while the second one is more general. Looking at these statements offers a perspective on the difference in socialization and feelings of closeness that would reflect this. We would expect part-timers to score lower than full-timers on these statements, just like on the PSM statements.



The answers given to all these statements will be valued from 0, completely disagree, to 4, completely agree. The value of the answers given will then be used to determine the mean. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test will be performed, with a chosen standard significance level of  $P=0.05$ . This will analyze the variance in responses to the different statements on PSM values and socialization in the work environment. The Null hypothesis is that there are no differences in scores between populations that work part-time and full-time. The dependent variable being the answers to the PSM and socialization survey, the independent value would be the part-time or full-time employment. The definition for part-time and full-time is based on the Dutch government's definition of full-time as at least 36 hours per week. Anything less than 36 hours will be considered part-time. Control variables will be demographic factors that previously have been consistently described in literature as relating to higher or lower PSM scores. These are age, education, and sex. We will only focus on employees who have received university education to eliminate the possibility of education being a factor. As women tend to make up the vast majority of part-time workers in the Netherlands, we will also look at a comparison between PT and FT women, because otherwise differences in scores between men and women could be perceived as differences between PT and FT. To account for age, we will also look at scores for part-time and full-timers per age group: under 35, 35-44, 45-54, and 55+. Differences between part-time and full-time workers will be analyzed, using the means, standard deviation, and the P values, giving the statistical significance of the difference between the means. The advantage of this approach is the large amount of data available in the database, concerning over 600 civil servants. Furthermore, the specific statements connect with specific categories of PSM values, allowing us to understand not just PSM overall but the prevalence of these specific categories of values within PSM in these groups. Furthermore, the socialization statements provide data relating to the relationship between employee and work environment that can help us test the relevance of the core-periphery model previously discussed.

This approach's disadvantage is that the data can be divided based on age, education, and sex. However, we cannot look at these data on an individual level to see how one individual with specific age sex education scores on the different statement. Furthermore, the most recently available data may be either 2014 or 2016. Thus not all data are from the same year or the exact same group of people.

As the dataset is large, and the population all falls into the same categories, we do not expect there to be a large difference in scores because of this. However, what both of these issues contribute to is that the analysis remains more on a macro-level, seeing overall trends in groups, instead of the specifics. The addition of the analysis of the interviews will largely overcome this issue.

## **Chapter 6: Methodology Interviews**

For the interviews, several employees from a Dutch municipality that work within the same department are interviewed. As they work in the same department, they closely interact with each other, and socialization within this department is thus most likely. The interviewed employees are both part-time and full-time workers, men and women, with longer and shorter tenures at the organization and in public service. As previously discussed, certain demographic factors appear to impact PSM values. In order to minimize their impact, the selected employees all received a similar level of education and features both older and younger employees so as not to overrepresent one age group. Then there is the choice of the specific municipality chosen. We want to interview people from the same department as different working cultures and different atmospheres can have a profound impact on socialization and motivation. Our selection of interviewees should include men and women, of different ages, both parttime and fulltime, all working within the same department. This because as we previously saw age and sex can play a role in the development of PSM levels. To find this diversity of people, it must be a somewhat large department. The municipality of Maastricht was selected as we previously had contact with employees from that municipality's economic department, and it thus was convenient, and met the criteria. Maastricht has over 100,000 inhabitants, thus considered one of the larger municipalities, and the economic department has around 30 employees. We were given basic demographic information about these people, and contact information, and were thus able to select sample of 6 people of the same education level, but different ages, sex, and including part-time, full-time, and people who had experienced both.

The department chosen as a case study may not be entirely representative of Dutch municipalities as a whole in terms of motivation, socialization, work ethic, and other relevant factors. As it is a larger municipality a different working culture may exist compared to smaller municipalities, and Maastricht as a city has slight cultural differences compared to other Dutch municipalities, as some of the interviewees also admit. A recent employee research was provided by the municipality, that scores

and compares the Maastricht economic department to the municipality as a whole and a benchmark of Dutch municipalities, that found the department to not be an outlier in any specific fields. Still it can be difficult to confirm that the specific sample selected from the department will be representative overall.

Multiple independent interviewees function as primary sources, giving information on their own experiences and motives, and observations on the team as a whole. This helps understand the dynamics and contextualize the answers of other interviewees. Interviewees may have an incentive to present themselves better than they are, mainly with higher PSM and less motivated by monetary rewards, for example. Asking interviewees about motivations in the team as a whole can help us understand whether the given answers by other interviewees were likely to be true. In order to guarantee the independence of observations, interviewees are interviewed separately and were asked not to communicate about the contents of the interviews with colleagues. The fact that employees currently all work from home makes it less likely the interviewees communicated with each other about the contents.

Concerning the way the interviews are conducted, several decisions have been made. Interviews are done over the phone, as the current situation does not allow for in-person meetings. Interviews are conducted in Dutch, and the transcripts are translated into English, as interviewees are more comfortable speaking in their native language, and it is also the language of the workplace.

Interviewees have signed consent forms allowing their interviews to be used for the purposes of this research, and their answers will be made anonymous as no names are provided. Full interviews are included at the end of this document as an appendix.

The interviews are semi-structured. First, there is the background information, such as age and tenure at the organization. Before the interviews, this information was already known but is asked again for confirmation. Second, the same statements from the dataset will be given to the respondents.

Interviewees are asked to respond to the same statements as from the questionnaire. Finally, there are the open questions relating to three different topics, the origin of their own PSM scores, socialization in the department, and Part-time work and its relation to the two factors. The contents of the

interviews will be divided into three categories, based on their topic, these being "Work as a source of PSM values" "Socialization in the workplace" and "attitudes to part time work(ers)". Their statements on these topics will then be analyzed.

## Chapter 7: Data Analysis

### Data results

#### Statement 1: "I am selflessly committed to society."

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016.Public Service Motivation.) 2014

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.436	436	0.812	0,010	P = 0.896
Parttime	2,446	161	0.668		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.529	155	0.783	0,09	P = 0.318
Parttime	2.439	114	0.655		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	2.568	105	0.570	0.09	P = 0.483
	Parttime	2.474	19	0.263		
45-54	Fulltime	2.588	119	0.685	0.2	P = 0.089
	Parttime	2.389	36	0.245		
35-44	Fulltime	2.405	121	0.71	0.15	P = 0.194
	Parttime	2.561	57	0.822		
Under 35	Fulltime	2.423	97	0.718	0.04	P = 0.834
	Parttime	2.467	15	0.981		

**Statement 2: “I find it important to make a significant contribution to the public good.”**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016.Public Service Motivation.) 2016

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.389	532	0.453	0.131	P = 0.0009
Parttime	3.258	159	0.37		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.392	194	0.405	0,152	P = 0.0005
Parttime	3.239	142	0.368		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	3.607	112	0.241	0.19	P = 0.0002
	Parttime	3.419	31	0.252		
45-54	Fulltime	3.337	169	0.463	0.04	P = 0.5719
	Parttime	3.378	45	0.240		
35-44	Fulltime	3.428	145	0.358	0.31	P < 0.0001
	Parttime	3.175	63	0.437		
Under 35	Fulltime	3.456	92	0.251	0.46	P < 0.0001
	Parttime	3	15	0.000001		

**Statement 3: ‘I think it is more important to make a significant contribution to society than to have personal success.’**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016.Public Service Motivation.) 2014

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
<b>Fulltime</b>	2.383	436	0.793	0.27	P = 0.0003
<b>Parttime</b>	2.656	131	0.612		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
<b>Fulltime</b>	2.458	155	0.730	0,156	P = 0.0704
<b>Parttime</b>	2.614	114	0.646		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
<b>Ages 55+</b>	<b>Fulltime</b>	2.471	85	0.443	0.16	P = 0.1291
	<b>Parttime</b>	2.632	19	0.246		
<b>45-54</b>	<b>Fulltime</b>	2.717	123	0.826	0.04	P = 0.0612
	<b>Parttime</b>	2.438	32	0.254		
<b>35-44</b>	<b>Fulltime</b>	2.333	110	0.644	0.31	P = 0.0009
	<b>Parttime</b>	2.653	49	0.231		
<b>Under 35</b>	<b>Fulltime</b>	2.340	94	0.765	0.46	P = 0.0001
	<b>Parttime</b>	3.25	12	0.568		



**Statement 4: “Serving the common good is a major driving force in my daily life (at work or outside)”**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016.Public Service Motivation.) 2016

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.221	530	0.637	0.137	P = 0.0139
Parttime	3.084	155	0.494		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.242	194	0.526	0,207	P = 0.0002
Parttime	3.036	140	0.452		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	3.426	115	0.443	0,003	P = 0.9711
	Parttime	3.423	26	0.246		
45-54	Fulltime	3.258	163	0.826	0.17	P = 0.0355
	Parttime	3.083	48	0.254		
35-44	Fulltime	3.154	145	0.644	0.15	P = 0.1558
	Parttime	3.016	61	0.231		
Under 35	Fulltime	3.221	95	0.765	0.22	P = 0.2484
	Parttime	3	10	0.568		

**Statement 5: ‘Through my work I contribute to the public good.’**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016.Public Service Motivation.) 2014

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.254	435	0.425	0.059	P = 0.1318
Parttime	3.195	123	0.158		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	3.208	154	0.309	0,019	P = 0.5576
Parttime	3.189	106	0.154		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	3.23	87	0.443	0,23	P = 0.0111
	Parttime	3	13	0.246		
45-54	Fulltime	3.303	123	0.826	0.1	P = 0.0804
	Parttime	3.205	39	0.254		
35-44	Fulltime	3.169	118	0.644	0.16	P = 0.1379
	Parttime	3.094	53	0.231		
Under 35	Fulltime	3.206	97	0.765	0.21	P = 0.0394
	Parttime	3	10	0.568		

**Statement 6: 'I feel like a part of the family in this organization.'**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016. Betrokkenheid bij de organisatie.) 2016

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.117	532	0.905	0.211	P = 0.0131
Parttime	1.905	158	1.042		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.015	197	0.821	0,120	P = 0.2348
Parttime	1.895	143	1.038		

Age groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	2.259	116	1.080	0,32	P = 0.1192
	Parttime	1.933	30	0.685		
45-54	Fulltime	2.129	170	0.883	0.21	P = 0.8714
	Parttime	2.152	46	0.687		
35-44	Fulltime	2.042	144	0.796	0.16	P = 0.0019
	Parttime	1.617	60	1.054		
Under 35	Fulltime	2.220	91	0.462	0.21	P = 0.1839
	Parttime	3	10	0,000001		

**Statement 7: 'I feel at home in this organization.'**

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016. Betrokkenheid bij de organisatie.) 2016

Men+Women	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.803	532	0.633	0.072	P = 0.1985
Parttime	2.731	156	0.539		

Women only	Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Fulltime	2.891	193	0.472	0,198	P = 0.0010
Parttime	2.693	140	0.617		

Age Groups		Mean score	Number of observations	Standard deviation	Difference	Significance level
Ages 55+	Fulltime	3.037	108	0.372	0.28	P = 0.0002
	Parttime	2.75	28	0.194		
45-54	Fulltime	2.823	169	0.516	0.02	P = 0.8613
	Parttime	2.806	38	0.161		
35-44	Fulltime	2.764	144	0.629	0.01	P = 0.9171
	Parttime	2.755	53	0.189		
Under 35	Fulltime	2.979	95	0.212	0.1	P = 0.1756
	Parttime	3.077	13	0.410		

## 7.1 Analysis

### **Statement 1: “I am selflessly committed to society.”**

In the selection where all respondents have the same level of education but are not further separated, the Part-Timers score higher, but not significantly. When we look at only the women, we see that full-time women score higher, but it is not statistically significant either. When we divide the population of men and women into the age categories, we find that in the two oldest groups, the Fulltimers score higher. In the younger categories, the part-timers, however, none of these findings are statistically significant at our chosen significance level of  $P=0.05$ .

### **Statement 2: “I find it important to make a significant contribution to the public good.”**

In the analysis of men+women of all ages and similar education levels, we see a statistically significant difference, with Full Timers scoring higher. When looking at women only, this holds. When looking at the age groups, 3 of them offer the same picture, while in 45-54 part-timers score slightly higher, but not in a statistically significant way. Thus it seems clear that overall part-timers score significantly lower on this statement.

### **Statement 3: “I think it is more important to make a significant contribution to society than to have personal success.”**

In the first analysis, we find that part-timers score significantly higher than full-timers, with a p-value of  $P = 0.0003$ . When we look at only women, we see that part-timers score higher. However, with a p-value of 0.0704 it is not as statistically significant. Looking at the age groups, we find that part-time workers score significantly higher than part-timers in the two youngest groups. In the group 45-54 full-timers score higher, however not significantly, while in the group 55+ part-timers score higher, but not significantly either.

**Statement 4: “Serving the common good is a major driving force in my daily life (at work or outside)”**

In the analysis of men+women of all ages of similar education levels, we see a statistically significant difference, with full-time employees scoring higher. The same occurs in the group of only women. However, when looking at the age groups, Fulltimers scoring higher is only statistically significant in the group 45-54. The oldest group 55+, however, has the highest scores, with part-timers scoring much higher than their younger peers.

**Statement 5: “Through my work I contribute to the public good.”**

On this question FT employees consistently score higher, but not in a statistically significant way. The same holds when looking at women only. In the age groups, the difference is statistically significant in the oldest and youngest groups, but not in those in between. The low numbers of part-timers in these age groups may have an impact.

**Statement 6: ‘I feel like a part of the family in this organization.’**

On this question, full-timers scored significantly higher. However, for women who scored lower overall, the difference was not statistically significant. This suggests that the difference was likely more due to the overrepresentation of women in the part-time group. In all age groups except 35-44 the difference is not statistically significant. That group is also overrepresented in the part-timers overall and scores much lower than all other groups.

**Statement 7: ‘I feel at home in this organization.’**

For this question, FT employees score higher. However, we only see a statistically significant difference when looking at women only, and in the 55+ age group. Full-Time women scored higher than their male peers, while part-time women scored lower than their male peers.

The two middle-age groups have the largest share of part-time workers, while they also have the lowest scores overall on this question. In all age groups except under 35, part-timers score lower.

### 7.3 Analysis Data overall

Our theory assumes that part-time employees spend less time at work and thus develop less PSM at work because socialization on the job leads to the development of PSM values. However, the Dutch part-time culture would make that the quality of these interactions would not be lower, as part-timers are not on the periphery. We would expect lower scores on PSM and socialization for part-timers. We have found that part-timers indeed score lower on most PSM and socialization statements. However, this is not always statistically significant, casting doubt on our theory. As we assume in our theory, this could be because they have less time to develop social networks and PSM. However, the quality of their interactions is not affected. Thus the negative effect is lower and not necessarily enough to be statistically significant.

On statement 3, part-timers scored significantly higher, also in the age groups. In contrast, on statement one, they did not score significantly lower or higher in a not statistically significant manner. These two statements both relate to the theme of self-sacrifice. ‘‘Selflessly’’, and ‘‘I think it is more important to (...) than to have personal success’’ reflect self-sacrifice. Here part-timers tend to score higher. Statements 1 and 3, are also the ones with the lowest mean scores overall. This fits with the existing theory describing how self-sacrifice is not very strong in the Netherlands.

Relevant for our discussion here is the question of how respondents interpret these statements. Self-sacrifice could involve sacrificing your time for the public good, or sacrificing your career for your children.

Suppose we interpret personal success from question 3 as career progress. In that case, it makes sense that part-timers score lower, as they likely already sacrifice possible career progress for raising a family by choosing part-time. Thus they tend to value this type of ‘personal success’ lower in general and are more willing to sacrifice. This may also be reflected in the two age groups where the difference in scores on question 3 was statistically significant; the groups under 35 and 35-44 are also those most likely to be raising young children. In these same age groups, PT workers also scored higher than FT workers on statement 1, although not statistically significant, compared to the 2 oldest groups, where the FT workers scored higher, but not statistically significant either.

Let us consider this when looking at the fact that part-time employees score lower on statement 2 ‘I find it important to make a significant contribution to the public good.’ This is similar to statement 3, on which they scored high. If we assume that part-time employees often sacrifice career progress for family life, they may be more willing to sacrifice, but it does not mean they value contributing to the public good higher. Furthermore, Working towards personal success, if interpreted as career progress and valuing contributing to the public good, can go hand in hand when working in the public sector. Viewed this way, it is not strange that full-time employees score significantly higher here.

Our other dominant category of PSM values present in these statements is Commitment to the public interest, which is reflected in statements 1, 2, and 4.

On statements 2 and 4, part-timers score significantly lower. Statement 1, however, offers a more mixed result. However, as we discussed, its added perspective of self-sacrifice may play a role in this. Overall we could say that part-timers show less adherence to Commitment to the public interest. Looking at our two socialization-related questions, we see a mixed image. While the two statements offer statistically significant lower scores for part-timers, these do not hold across the different groups. We expected that less time spent in the workplace would lead to less development of these social networks, and thus the feeling of connection represented by these statements, while the dutch part-time work culture, the wide spread and social acceptance, would make that besides the quantity of interactions, their quality would not decrease. The statement concerning family expresses a more



amicable relationship between the employee and a coworker, while the statement on feeling at home could also extend the organization as a whole and its goals.

The responses to these statements could be interpreted to align with our theory. Parttime employees do score lower on these questions in almost every group. However, this difference is often insignificant and more related to the overrepresentation of women who score lower overall. Suppose Dutch part-time culture mitigates the negative effects of spending less time on the development of friendship networks and social networks. In that case, part-time workers scoring lower, but not consistently significantly lower, makes sense.

Overall, what we see from the ANOVA test is somewhat in line with our expectations. H1 assumed that, Part-time employees score lower, but not extremely much lower, on PSM-related values than similar full-time employees because of fewer interaction possibilities leading to PSM development. Part-timers score lower on Commitment to the public interest. Self-sacrifice, however, may be higher amongst part-timers. The fact that they are more willing to sacrifice possible career progress by working part-time can exemplify that. Part-timers on most issues score lower, often not in a statistically significant way, which can be in line with H1. the higher scores on self-sacrifice are more difficult to explain.

On socialization, part-timers score lower. However, the results are not always statistically significant across groups. H2 held that Dutch acceptance of Part-time work makes that Part-time employees are not on the periphery socially, quantity of interactions is lower, but not quality, and they thus score only somewhat lower on socialization.

The statistical evidence does not offer clear support. Based on our theory, the fact that part-timers score lower but not always statistically significant could be expected. However, it also means that there is no clear evidence to support the idea that less time spent at work impacts socialization and the development of PSM values. A country where part-time culture is different and part-timers are at the periphery could provide more evidence on this.

## **Chapter 8: Interview analysis**

Content of the interviews is referenced in this analysis. The full transcripts however, can be found in the appendix.

<b>Interviewees</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Part-time or Full-time</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Job level</b>
Interviewee 1	Male	35	Full-time	Economic department	Medium
Interviewee 2	Female	52	Part-time	Economic department	Senior
Interviewee 3	Female	35	Full-time	Economic department	Medium
Interviewee 4	Male	30	Full-time	Economic department	Medium
Interviewee 5	Female	29	Part-time	Economic department	Junior
Interviewee 6	Female	50	Part-time, until recently full-time	Economic department	Senior

First, the interviewees were given the PSM and Socialization statements previously discussed and given the same options from completely agree to completely disagree. Analyzing the scores of the interviewees on the statements, we do not see any clear evidence in support of our theory or in line with the data analysis. The person who has the lowest average score is a PT worker, however, the next lowest one is full-time. The small sample size of course may play a role as well. Now let us look at the interviewees' statements.

### **Work as a source of PSM values**

Interviewees were given the 5 PSM-related statements. They were asked to identify whether or not their answers reflected their norms and values. All respondents agreed that their higher scores on the statements reflected their norms and values at least to a large extent. Interviewee 6, who at first

seemed to somewhat disagree stated that in her case it did reflect norms and values. After this, the interviewees were asked about the origin of these norms and values. The main factors mentioned here were personality, education, upbringing, and work. Interviewee 3 and 4 first respond by referencing their work in the government.

**“I think working for the government, where I ended up somewhat coincidentally after an internship, has had the biggest impact.” (Interviewee 3)**

The other interviewees’ first responses concern personality, education, and upbringing.

When asked specifically about the role of the workplace, all respondents agreed it had had an impact or strengthened those values. Interviewees 1 and 2 said the work interaction with direct colleagues was the most important here, while the other 4 respondents instead focused on work content, the organization as a whole, and its goals. When asked about the influence of interactions with colleagues, these interviewees generally admitted it did play a role, but a lesser one. This pattern is reflected in the following 2 statements:

**“Mostly direct colleagues, that is the most determinative, and then I mean the department. It determines, well, not who you are, but how you deal with things. Because you also receive feedback.” (interviewee 1)**

**“Colleagues and their ideals always play a role, but there are also those who are simply the opposite. But I think, if you are together eight hours a day, 5 days a week, that has an influence that cannot be otherwise.” (Interviewee 6)**

Concerning the PSM statements, all interviewees expected their colleagues to score similarly. The only reason mentioned as to why they might not, would be a “more commercial” attitude as mentioned by interviewee 6, similar to interviewee 2 mentioning that “maybe some colleagues would say that they work mainly for the entrepreneurs and business people.”

Overall what we see in these answers is in line with our expectations. Civil servants find that workplace socialization plays a role in the development of the values reflected in the PSM survey, albeit perhaps not the primary influence for most. The employees that found social interaction was the

work aspect that had the biggest impact for them, had worked in the organization respectively 10, and 20 years, suggesting that social bonds built up over longer times may be relevant. However, at the same time, interviewee 6 had the longest tenure at the organization and stressed the importance of work content instead.

### **Socialization**

Respondents were given the two socialization statements and asked how they would answer them for their department and why. Overall, we saw that respondents said they did feel at home in the organization. However, 'a part of the family' was interpreted as a close and amicable relationship with colleagues, which was not as present for the younger colleagues, 3,4, and 5, who described the relationship with colleagues mostly as work-oriented. The two lowest scores on the statement were also from respondents 4 and 5.

**“Well, I think that is more for me. As a colleague, there is always a certain distance, we are very friendly, but it is not as if I share a lot of private matters or at least not regularly. And because of that I answered a 2.” (Interviewee 4)**

The older colleagues saw valuable social connections and friendly interaction. All respondents mentioned the importance of sharing information, motivating each other, and sharing ideas. Overall, most respondents see socialization present in the group as motivation and helping each other, information sharing. Friendship and close personal relations are less prevalent. The first can lead to the other, as interviewee 6 describes.

**“I think getting together, motivating each other, collaborating, creating enthusiasm, that shows it.(...)”**  
Interviewee 2

**“it is very important if in your team you have a number of people who challenge you to look differently, or with whom you can brainstorm, people from whom you can learn something and grow - I think that is important in a team.”**

**“And you find that this is also the case in a team in which you work?” Interviewer**

**“Yes I think so(...)” Interviewee 3**

This brings us to the question of whom socialization happens with and the effect part-time work may have on it. Divisions within the overall group appear to be present, although part-time full-time is not mentioned as relevant. Instead, work content and age are mentioned, specifically in reference to information exchange. People go to those who work on the topic and more experienced and older colleagues. Concerning part-timers, the practicalities may be a reason why colleagues are less likely to go up to them, as they may not be present at the moment, or an appointment would need to be made.

**“And for information, you usually end up going to people your age or older to be honest, I notice that too.” (Interviewee 5)**

**“No, that is more of a practical difference, that they are often not there, or not when you need them and then you have to plan that. So then I schedule an appointment. In terms of motivation, it is of course up to who is there in the moment, and then part-timers are also less often there.” (Interviewee 6)**

Concerning the friendship part of socialization, Part-time work could be a hindrance to the bonding process, as noted by interviewee 4. However, other interviewees do not perceive any difference in these terms. Respondee 2 describes how many part-timers take part in social gatherings outside of work hours.

**“Yes, in the end I think, if you work three days, you just have a little less contact, you are just a little less present. I think that it does matter, that that creates more or less bonding, also depends on the person, but I notice as a full-timer that there is a difference. As a full-timer I notice a lot more.” (Interviewee 4)**

**“That does not really matter, that Im less part of the group because I work part-time.” (Interviewee 5)**

**“Mostly the people that work part-time, they come back on their day off for drinks together, or a trip.” (Interviewee 2)**

Overall we did not see a large difference in answers to the socialization statements between part-and-full-timers. Socialization is present mainly in the form of sharing ideas and motivation, more than friendship. For the former, co-workers tend to look for people working on the same topic or older than them. For friendship, this can grow out of working together. Part-time work may make for less socialization as there are practical difficulties as they are simply less present, the people do not seek them for sharing ideas. They spend less time at work and thus may bond less. However, this is refuted by some co-workers who state that they did not feel less part of the group, and that they participated as much as anyone else in social gatherings.

### **Attitudes to part-timers**

Under attitudes to part-timers and their motivation, we have arranged statements expressing attitudes to part time-work those who work part-time, as well as concerning their motivation or effects of part time-work on motivation. Based on our theory, we expect that the high level of acceptance of part-time work and Dutch part-time culture leads to a situation in which part-timers are respected, and we do not expect interviewees to have negative attitudes towards part-timers, or the idea that they are less motivated, or work less hard because they work part-time. This was reflected in the respondents' answers.

Respondents 1,3,4, and 5 mention, either from their own experience as a part-time worker or as an observation, that differences in motivation between full-timers and part-timers do not appear to exist. Interviewee 2 illustrates the motivation of part-timers with an example.

**“Mostly the people that work part-time, they come back on their day off(...) we have evenings with citizens, and brainstorm sessions, and there are times when you have this once or twice a week, and everyone participates. “**

When discussing the relevance of part-time for motivation, interviewee 5 focused only on time constraints, and different priorities that might affect performance.

**“I now have children and I have to be able to pick them up at 5, after work I will not come again unless there is something very bad, that is different than before.”**

Interviewee 1 expressed the view that everyone wants to contribute to society in their own way, and part-time work there is not relevant. Similarly, interviewee 3 states:

**“If he has a full 100 percent effort on the days that they are there, I don’t think that is a lesser colleague because he or she is part-time. It really depends on how that person is in it, or if they just sit there to fill those hours and quickly go back home to the children, yes that is of course a different approach than if someone is just there 20 or 24 hours full commitment to their work.”**

Overall, based on the information from the interviews, we would not accept H1. H1 assumed that, Part-time employees score lower, but not extremely much lower, on PSM-related values than similar full-time employees because of fewer interaction possibilities leading to PSM development. interviewees do not perceive part-time work as less, or part-time workers as less motivated, or any other negative connotations. Concerning The PSM statements given to the interviewees, all of them were asked whether they thought their colleagues would score the same. Most did. When interviewees mentioned some might score lower, part-time was not mentioned as a relevant factor, neither did the part-time interviewees consistently rate lower on the PSM statements. Overall, these statements show that part-time workers are respected and perceived as motivated. No one assumes they have less motivation because they work part-time. Practical matters, such as time constraints, and different priorities, are mentioned.

Concerning Hypothesis 2, and socialization, the interviews provide us with information that is mostly in line with our expectations. Workplace socialization plays a role in the development of PSM values in their eyes, albeit not the main factor. Interviewees found that part-time or full-time did not play a large role in determining socialization with colleagues, and they found they were very much a part of

the group. Only their absence from the office would make colleagues less able to be in contact with them. Attitudes to part-timers were positive and respectful. They were perceived as mostly similarly motivated. The only factors that may impact this were time constraints and priorities. This is in line with H2, which held that Dutch acceptance of Part-time work makes that Part-time employees are not on the periphery socially, quantity of interactions is lower, but not quality, and they may score only slightly lower on socialization. Based on these interviews we would accept H2.



## **Chapter 9: Discussion of Findings**

Let us briefly combine the outcomes from both methods and apply our theory to them.

We found in our data that part-timers scored mostly lower, however not always in a statistically significant matter. Our interviews found no clues of lower scores in PT workers, but the small sample may play a role there. The lower scores could be because, as we assumed in our theory, the quantity of interaction is less, but not the quality. Based on this, we could accept H1, as it expects somewhat lower scores for part-time employees on PSM. The different PSM values where part-time employees did not score lower, or higher, self-sacrifice, remain an issue. As we discussed, part-time employees could be more prone to self-sacrifice, as part-time work means they sacrifice possible career progress for family or other reasons.

Concerning H2, In the interviews, we found that, indeed, part-timers are not viewed negatively or as unmotivated. The part-timers did not feel like outsiders. Only the lack of time spent at the workplace might lead to less interaction. This confirms H2, which holds that Dutch acceptance of Part-time work makes that Part-time employees are not on the periphery socially, quantity of interactions is lower, but not quality, and thus they may score only slightly lower on socialization. In the interviews, the civil servants found that interaction in the work environment could play a major role in the development of PSM values for themselves, albeit not the most important aspect or necessarily the most important work-related factor in this.

Overall, the interview findings do not clash with what we may expect based on the data analysis and our hypotheses, despite the individual scores on the statements not offering any clues. We might have expected the part-time employees to feel less at home in the organization based on the low socialization scores for part-timers in the data analysis, but this was not very explicit.

## **Chapter 10: Conclusion**

This study found that Dutch part-timers mostly score lower on PSM values and socialization.

However, the cases where they scored lower in a statistically significant manner were fewer and often did not hold when dividing the group up based on age. Furthermore, part-time employees scored higher on self-sacrifice-related topics. In our hypotheses, we expected that the Dutch attitude to part-time work might negate some of the effects of the lack of socialization due to less time in the workplace and being at the periphery. From this perspective, an only slightly lower score on PSM and socialization could make sense. In the interviews, we found confirmation for the hypothesis that Dutch PT workers are not at the periphery and are part of the group. We also found that the civil servants all agreed that the interaction with colleagues is one of the factors impacting PSM values. By using the core-periphery employment model and imperfect socialization hypothesis in the Dutch context we gained new insights into the role national culture and attitudes can have on PSM. The findings of this study are not as conclusive as they likely would have been in a country with no part-time culture, where differences would have to be significant. The fact that the data here are somewhat more inconclusive actually can support our theory. These findings contribute to the understanding that not all public sector employees show the same level of PSM and that the socialization processes and working conditions can cause these differences. It also contributes to the idea that organizational and national cultures can play an important role in these developments.

The results of this study offer us a deeper understanding of the complexities of the concept of PSM. The development of PSM in the workplace is an understudied yet relevant topic. Our findings relate and add onto existing literature on the topic. Just like Jacobsen (2000) we assumed part-time employees might score lower on organizational commitment on the basis of identification with the values of that organization. Jacobsen found that in fact there was no conclusive evidence to point at this, and in our case there was also no clear evidence of significantly lower scores overall.

Our findings complement the work of Grund and Thommes (2015, 2017). In Germany they found a big difference in PSM levels between part-timers and full-timers. In the Netherlands, however, the difference did not appear as significant. This is as we argue, because of its high levels of social acceptance of part-time work. The difference in findings with the German study warrants more attention for the socio-cultural context of part-time work, comparing cases with different attitudes to part-time workers, and the consequent effects on socialization and the development of PSM in the workplace.

This study adds onto the work by Vandenabeele. Multiple of his works have centered on how PSM can change in different national contexts. He looked into the specificities and applicability of PSM in the Netherlands, and how Dutch (working) culture impacts it. The Dutch part-time working culture was absent from these discussions. The findings from this study can show that part-time work, and the social attitudes towards it can be relevant in discussions on PSM in the Netherlands and in other national contexts, especially those with higher amounts of part-time work.

### **Limitations**

This study does present several important limitations. One of the limitations of this study is that the case study selected may lack representativeness for municipal employees as a whole. While we have attempted to find a case-study that could be representative, even if it is representative of all municipal employees, we may not have had the same results when looking at central government or provincial civil servants.

The study used existing datasets on PSM in the Dutch government. This dataset did not include questions that captured every aspect of PSM as discussed by Perry. The aspect of Compassion is not clearly reflected in any of the survey questions. Moreover the survey on PSM only included 5 statements, which may be too limited to capture the concept perfectly.

The 5 statements were analyzed separately. They could have been aggregated together to an index. Because of limitations this was not possible. Other insights however, such as that the self-sacrifice

metric was higher in part-time employees would not have been gained, if an index of the 5 statements was used instead.

Another limitation of this study is the lack of previous work on the topic. The articles by Grund and Thommes, (2015, 2017) and to an extent Jacobsen (2000) clearly relate PSM and contract-types.

Other literature focuses on the relationship between part-time employment and organizational commitment and other factors seen as highly correlated or predictive for PSM.

### **Relevance, and avenues for future research**

Despite its limitations, this study can offer up avenues for future research concerning physical presence and socialization in the workplace for PSM. In our study, absence from the workplace in terms of part-time work has been an important factor to consider. Considering the Covid-19 epidemic and the necessity of working from home, many of the theories applied and developed here could also be applied to employees that are physically absent from the workplace and are working from home.

An employee who telecommutes could be less involved in socialization than co-workers who are physically present at the office, leading to similar effects on motivation as part-time work.

Our findings concerning the relatively high levels of self-sacrifice amongst part-time workers might warrant more research into the relationship between part-time work, sacrificing one's career, and self-sacrifice for the public cause. This specific value of PSM may actually be improved by working part-time or be one that is already present in people who would want to work part-time. This can also help develop an understanding of the benefits of having part-time workers as civil servants. While this study and previous studies emphasize the downsides, in terms of lower motivation, the presence of higher levels of self-sacrifice can have beneficial properties.

This study shows the relevance of socialization and cultural attitudes to part-time work. Based on this study, new policies aimed at developing higher levels of PSM in employees can take these factors into account. Developing a culture of acceptance and normalization of part-time work within an organization could benefit from higher socialization levels of part-timers and, thus, higher PSM values, which all will contribute to the organization's performance as a whole.

Finally, this study took into account factors that have been found relevant to the development of PSM, such as age, gender and education. Another factor that is related to part-time work that has not been looked into enough is having children, which can often be a reason to start working part-time in the Netherlands. There was no data available on this topic, and it was therefore not included. However, as it strongly relates to part-time work, it is important that this aspect be looked into more in the future. This can create a deeper understanding of the development of PSM as people enter different life phases, more complex than looking simply at age as a number. Hopefully, in the future, this research can function as a basis for the exploration of all these different factors that may have an impact on the concept of PSM and thus on the functioning of civil servants and government as a whole.

## **References:**

- Andersen, L. B., Heinesen, E., & Pedersen, L. H. (2014). How Does Public Service Motivation Among Teachers Affect Student Performance in Schools? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(3), 651-671. doi:10.1093/jopart/mut082
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G., & Walker, R. (2006). Subjective and objective measures of organizational performance: An empirical exploration. *Public Service Performance*, 14-34. doi:10.1017/cbo9780511488511.002
- Billett, S. (2001). Learning through work: Workplace affordances and individual engagement. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 13(5), 209-214. doi:10.1108/eum0000000005548
- Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle Blowers in the Federal Civil Service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(3), 413-440. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024390
- Brewer, G. A., Selden, S. C., & Li, R. L. (2000). Individual Conceptions of Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 60(3), 254-264. doi:10.1111/0033-3352.00085
- CBS Statline. (2019) Employment. Retrieved from <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/en/dataset/81464ENG/table?ts=1623429343944>
- Chandler, J. A. (2000). *Comparative public administration*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. (2003). The Employment Relationship in the U.K. Public Sector: A Psychological Contract Perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(2), 213-230. doi:10.1093/jopart/mug018

De Witte, Hans, and Katharina Näswall. "'Objective' vs 'Subjective' Job Insecurity: Consequences of Temporary Work for Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Four European Countries." *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2003, pp. 149–188., <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831x03024002002>.

Deery, Margaret, and Leo K. Jago. "The Core and the Periphery: An Examination of the Flexible Workforce Model in the Hotel Industry." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 21, no. 4, 2002, pp. 339–351., [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0278-4319\(02\)00013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0278-4319(02)00013-0).

DiIulio, J.D. 1994. Principled agents: The cultural bases of behavior in a federal government bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4: 277-318.

Gard, G. (2001). Work Motivating Factors in Rehabilitation: A Brief Review. *Physical Therapy Reviews*, 6(2), 85-89. doi:10.1179/ptr.2001.6.2.85

Garnero, A., Kampelmann, S., & Rycx, F. (2014). Part-Time Work, Wages, and Productivity. *ILR Review*, 67(3), 926-954. doi:10.1177/0019793914537456

Georgellis, Y., & Tabvuma, V. (2010). Does Public Service Motivation Adapt? *Kyklos*, 63(2), 176-191. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6435.2010.00468.x

Grund, C., & Thommes, K. (2015). Disentangling the Role of Contract Types and Sector Disparities for Public Service Motivation. *IZA Discussion Papers*.

Grund, Christian, and Kirsten Thommes. "The Role of Contract Types for Employees' Public Service Motivation." *Schmalenbach Business Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2017, pp. 377–398.

Horton, S. 2008. History and Persistence of an Idea and an Ideal. In J. L. Perry, & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in Public Management: The call of public service* (pp. 56-79). Oxford: Oxford.

- Houston, D. J. (2011). Implications of Occupational Locus and Focus for Public Service Motivation: Attitudes Toward Work Motives across Nations. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5), 761-771. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02415.x
- Ibanez, Z. (2011). Part-time: Beyond second best? Access to part-time employment: The cases of education and local government in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. *Time & Society*, 20(2), 171-196. doi:10.1177/0961463x10364906
- Jacobsen, Dag Ingvar. "Managing Increased Part-Time: Does Part-Time Work Imply Part-Time Commitment?" *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2000, pp. 187–201., <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520010336713>.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. "Nonstandard Employment Relations: Part-Time, Temporary and Contract Work." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2000, pp. 341–365.
- Keuzenkamp, S. (2009). Deeltijd (g)een probleem in hoofdlijnen. *Sociaal En Cultureel Planbureau*.
- Kim, S. (2006). Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(8), 722-740. doi:10.1108/01437720610713521
- LaPorta, R., Lopez-De-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1998). The Quality of Government. doi:10.3386/w6727
- Lee, Thomas W, and Darryll R Johnson. "The Effects of Work Schedule and Employment Status on the Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Full versus Part Time Employees." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1991, pp. 208–224.
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1998). *Rediscovering institutions the organizational basis of politics*. Enskede: TPB.



Molla, R. (2020, March 20). *How working from home during coronavirus affects productivity and mental health*. Vox.

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016. Public Service

Motivation. Retrieved from

<https://kennisopenbaarbestuur.nl:443/tnglite/olap?guid=b8781ed3-4665-41c0-bfa2-74a7fca4bd26>

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (2016) Trendbestand POMO 2004-2016. Betrokkenheid bij de organisatie. Retrieved from

<https://kennisopenbaarbestuur.nl:443/tnglite/olap?guid=351b0589-5893-4d4c-ab81-c54a172e9cc9>

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2019) Trends en Cijfers. Retrieved from <https://kennisopenbaarbestuur.nl/media/256376/trends-en-cijfers-2019-definitief1.pdf>

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2019, December 17). Arbeidsduur en werktijden - situatie vóór 01-01-2020. Retrieved from

<https://www.p-direkt.nl/informatie-rijksperoneel/mijn-werk/huidig-dienstverband/arbeidsduur-en-werktijden>

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3492429

Naff, K. C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(4), 5-16. doi:10.1177/0734371x9901900402

O'Neill, B. S., & Adya, M. (2007). Knowledge sharing and the psychological contract. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(4), 411-436. doi:10.1108/02683940710745969

Pandey, S. K., & Staszky, E. C. (2008). *Antecedents and Correlates of Public Service Motivation* [Scholarly project]. In *Public Management : The Call of Public Service*.

- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2009). *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., Hondeghem, A., & Wise, L. R. (2010). Revisiting the Motivational Bases of Public Service: Twenty Years of Research and an Agenda for the Future. *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 681-690. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02196.x
- Perry, James L., and Wouter Vandenabeele. 2008. Behavioral Dynamics: Institutions, Identities, and Self-Regulation. In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, edited by James L. Perry and Annie Hondeghem, 56–79. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367. doi:10.2307/976618
- 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.  
doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303
- Portegijs, W., Cloin, M., Keuzenkamp, S., Merens, A., & Steenvoorden, E. (2008). Verdeelde tijd. *Sociaal En Cultureel Planbureau*.
- Portegijs, W. (2009). Deeltijd in Nederland in hoofdlijnen. *Sociaal En Cultureel Planbureau*.
- Rainey, H. G. (1982). Professionals in Public Organizations: Organizational Environments and Incentives. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 16(4), 319-336.  
doi:10.1177/027507408201600405
- Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What Is Quality of Government? A Theory of Impartial Government Institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165-190. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00391.x

- Sinclair, R. R., Martin, J. E., & Michel, R. P. (1999). Full-Time and Part-Time Subgroup Differences in Job Attitudes and Demographic Characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(3), 337-357. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1686
- Steijn, B., & Leijnsink, P. (2009). Gemotiveerd voor de publieke zaak? Public Service Motivation in Nederland. *Bestuurswetenschappen*.
- Taylor, J. (2007). The Impact Of Public Service Motives On Work Outcomes In Australia: A Comparative Multi-Dimensional Analysis. *Public Administration*, 85(4), 931-959. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00686.x
- Taylor, J., & Taylor, R. (2010). Working Hard for More Money or Working Hard to Make a Difference? Efficiency Wages, Public Service Motivation, and Effort. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(1), 67-86. doi:10.1177/0734371x10394401
- Thorsteinson, T. J. (2003). Job attitudes of part-time vs. full-time workers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(2), 151-177. doi:10.1348/096317903765913687
- Vandenabeele, W. (2005). Public Service Motivation binnen de Nederlandse overheid. *Christen Democratische Verkenningen*, 259-270. Retrieved June 6, 2021.
- Vandenabeele, Wouter, and Steven Van de Walle. 2008. International Differences in Public Service Motivation: Comparing Regions across the World. In *Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service*, 223–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Visser, J. (2002). The first part-time economy in the world: A model to be followed? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(1), 23-42. doi:10.1177/0952872002012001561

- Walsh, J. (2007). Experiencing Part-Time Work: Temporal Tensions, Social Relations and the Work?Family Interface. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(1), 155-177.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8543.2007.00606.x
- Ward, K. D. (2013). Cultivating Public Service Motivation through AmeriCorps Service: A Longitudinal Study. *Public Administration Review*, 74(1), 114-125. doi:10.1111/puar.12155
- Wielers, R., & Raven, D. (2011). Part-Time Work and Work Norms in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 29(1), 105-113. doi:10.1093/esr/jcr043
- Wright, B. E. (2001). Public-Sector Work Motivation: A Review of the Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(4), 559-586. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003515
- Yerkes, M. (2009). Part-time work in the Dutch welfare state: The ideal combination of work and care? *Policy & Politics*, 37(4), 535-552. doi:10.1332/030557309x435510

## Appendix

### Interview transcripts

Interviewer statements in *cursive*, answers by interviewees not cursive. Transcripts have been translated from Dutch to English. Original Dutch transcripts and other information such as consent forms, interview guide, and names of interviewees is available on request.

#### Interviewee 1:

##### Man, 52, Fulltime worker

*Could you tell me a bit about your background before you started working at the municipality of Maastricht?*

I am a macro-economist, I first worked at the province of Limburg for 15 years, at economic affairs, after which I switched to the economy department of Maastricht.

*Okay. I am now going to give you a number of statements, I want you to give me an answer on a scale of 0 to 4, 0 being I completely disagree, 4 being, I completely agree. After this we will go more in depth on the answers.*

*I selflessly commit myself to society*

2

*I find it important to substantively contribute to the public good.*

3

*I find it more important to substantively contribute to society, than to succeed in my personal life.*

3

*Serving the public interest is an important motive in my daily life. (At work or outside)*

3

*Through my work I contribute to the public good.*

4

*Okay, now on all of these statements your answers were on the higher side, would you say that this is an indication of your norms and values?*

Yes I would definitely say it is.

*And why do you think you have these norms and values? What do you think most influenced you?*

From a broader social perspective I think it really is related to how I was raised, which is also reflected in education. As a macroeconomist you always look at the broader perspective, not just short-term, in order to choose the path for the country. You never really know where these things come from, but I think it mostly the way I was raised.

*Okay, so this is all before you started your career. Do you think your work-environment has also had any impact?*

I think I already had these values, but that where I worked also had influence. So a province, a governmental organization, which works for a broader purpose, and a municipality, and not as a consultant for a company, which was also an opportunity.

It was a reason to choose it, to do the work I do for the government, and the setting in which you work contributes to that attitude. I'm not here for 1 citizen or for myself, but for the economy of the city, for the entrepreneurs, for the inhabitants, so that contributes.

*When you talk about the setting do you mean the organization as a whole or do you mostly mean the team-members and colleagues?*

Mostly direct colleagues, that is the most determinative, and then I mean the department. It determines, well, not who you are, but how you deal with things. Because you also receive feedback.

*So do you think your direct colleagues would answer the same to the statements or higher or lower?*

I think so, there is no one that I think is there for themselves or to earn money. We have a decent salary at the government, but I don't think there are enough incentives.

*Now I would like to give you two more statements.*

*First statement: I feel like a part of the family at this organization.*

I need to think about that, cause it is quite nuanced. If we're talking about a direct group of colleagues it is a 4. But if we make it broader to include management, council members, then its a 2, but immediate colleagues a 4.

*Would you say you feel at home in this organization?*

Yes definitely. 4

*You said you feel like a member of the family with your team members, in what is this reflected?*

You notice it from the attention for each other, if things are not going well, there is someone to listen to you, or people notice it and approach you themselves, that is one. The second, there are a lot of social gatherings organized with the group and subgroups, which increases the feeling.

*This is more in social terms, but what about in terms of sharing knowledge, collaboration, motivating each other?*

If you're talking about the more work side of things then it is definitely the case, everybody is very open to each other.

*And this is the case with everybody, or is it more or less with certain people, for example because of age differences, or other characteristics?*

No, those don't have any influence, everyone is different so with some people you have a better connection than with others, cause everyone is different. There are colleagues I talk more to and ones I talk less to. Bu on average, when it is needed everyone is there for each other.

*So you would say that in terms of interaction, socially you don't have a click with everyone, but in terms of helping each other and motivating each other this is not relevant?*

Concerning helping each other you go to the people who are working on the topic or have expertise on it. Others may be working on different issues so I don't actively approach them. But if I have a question or they have a question we help one another.

*So characteristics are not relevant here?*

No, I have a colleague that is very young, and I can have a good discussion with him, but i also have a colleague who is almost retiring, for example.

*And concerning contributing to society, you don't see any difference between colleagues? Or groups of colleagues?*

That is a difficult question, but society includes everyone, so you cannot make a difference, everyone wants to contribute to society, or an aspect of society in their own way I think.

## **Interviewee 2:**

**Woman, 52, Parttime worker (However as she notes, including overtime it could easily be full time)**

*Okay. I am now going to give you a number of statements, I want you to give me an answer on a scale of 0 to 4, 0 being I completely disagree, 4 being, I completely agree. After this we will go more in depth on the answers.*

*I selflessly commit myself to society*

3/2

*I find it important to substantively contribute to the public good.*

4

*I find it more important to substantively contribute to society, than to succeed in my personal life.*

Mostly a mix, so I would say a 2

*Serving the public interest is an important motive in my daily life. (At work or outside)*

4

*Through my work I contribute to the public good.*

4

*Okay, now on all of these statements your answers were on the higher side, would you say that this is an indication of your norms and values?*

Yes.

*And why do you think you have these norms and values? What do you think most influenced you? For example education, upbringing or work experience?*

I think it is education and upbringing together.

*And after you started working at the municipality of Maastricht did that have any impact?*

Yes because if you feel like you fit in and you are working towards a common goal you will put in more effort.

*And is this then more because of the values of the organization as a whole, or more interaction with colleagues?*

I think more colleagues and team members. And something specifically in maastricht that I noticed compared to work in The Hague is that people are very driven, people are very chauvinistic, and want to put in the work for the city, there is a huge drive.

*So if I ask you colleagues about the same statements would they give me the same answers?*

I assume so yes, unless they interpret the question differently. We work in the economy department, we deal with the economic interests of the city, maybe some colleagues would say that they work mainly for the entrepreneurs and businesspeople.

*Now I would like to give you two more statements.*

*First statement: I feel like a Member of the family at this organization.*

Yes I think so, that is a 3 or 4. Especially now that we work from home we notice what we're missing out on.

*Would you say you feel at home in this organization?*

Yes, also 3 or 4 here.

*So from this can i assume that it is a close-knit group of colleagues?*

Yes, there are closer connections, there are people that have been with the organization longer, but on average people are very attached to the team, the organization, the city.

*In what kind of behavior is this reflected? Being attentive to each other; sharing knowledge, motivating each other?*

I think getting together, motivating each other, collaborating, creating enthusiasm, that shows it. We also notice that now. If you're working at home you cannot get something off your chest, talk to someone, have a discussion. I have a colleague I never worked with much before, and now we call after every meeting to discuss what we thought of it, something you would normally do automatically. And now you do it very actively. We have mandatory work team events, but besides that people

often go out for drinks together. A number of colleagues from the team that live in Maastricht go eat fish together every Friday, at 1,5 meter distance.

*So you say you talk more now to this colleague you used to talk less to. Would you say you feel close to everyone in the team or are there differences, for example based on age, man/woman, parttime and fulltime differences?*

There are people you have more with in terms of content, but there are also people you have a connection with and people you don't who you meet less outside of work. But that's what happens with a team of 30 people. Age, part time, man woman does not really matter, more if you have a connection or of if you work on the same topic.

*Not only on a social level but also in terms of motivating each other and creating enthusiasm?*

Yes, you notice it now with the working from home, how important it is to motivate and create enthusiasm with each other, through the computer that is much more difficult. You miss it now.

*Do you think your colleagues would also say it is a close-knit group?*

I think some colleagues might say there are different groups forming within the team, and it can always be improved.

*And this formation of subgroups, is that based on certain characteristics?*

Mostly work content I would say, people working on certain topics were put together, and they started forming a bit of a group.

*And you work part-time, do you think that has any impact on your or other colleagues' position within the group?*

Mostly the people that work part-time, they come back on their day off for drinks together, or a trip. So that does not really matter. That might be a bit of the enthusiasm, or maybe the bottleneck for part timers that they are expected to come back every time and they also do it. There is not a big difference there I think. On average the work for part timers is not less, and you are expected to somehow cope with it, also now in this situation. For example we have evenings with citizens, and brainstorm sessions, and there are times when you have this once or twice a week, and everyone participates. I have the impression that at the ministry people were more paying attention to overtime, and not working too much. It might be a bit too much, because we all have an iPad we are expected to respond fast, it's a bit the culture. I think it is not necessarily positive, it can stress people out a bit.

### **Interviewee 3:**

#### **Woman, 35, full time employee.**

Since May first I have been officially working here for one year. Before that I worked for a smaller municipality, also in Zuid Limburg. A smaller municipality. And before that I worked in the province of Limburg. So still the government. I studied European studies and a master's in cultural studies.

*And you work parttime or fulltime?*

Fulltime.

*Was it a conscious decision to work fulltime?*

Yes it was.

*Why exactly?*

Because my partner has his own business, and I am the stable factor in terms of income.

*And you have always worked full time?*

always.

*Okay. I am now going to give you a number of statements, I want you to give me an answer on a scale of 0 to 4, 0 being I completely disagree, 4 being, I completely agree. After this we will go more in depth on the answers.*

*I selflessly commit myself to society*

Yes I quite agree, so let's say 3, because your work for the government has a societal impact.



*I find it important to substantively contribute to the public good.*

Yes I think a 2

*I find it more important to substantively contribute to society, than to succeed in my personal life.*

Yes a 3

*Serving the public interest is an important motive in my daily life. (At work or outside)*

A 2

*Through my work I contribute to the public good.*

Yes, a 3

*For most of these you answered 2 or 3, would you say this is a reflection of your norms and values?*

Yes.

*And what do you think is the cause of this, the origin?*

I think kind of the work in the government. By working for the government for the last 12 years. I think it is a different perspective than a commercial enterprise, or as an independent entrepreneur, you are concerned with the citizen, who is the customer of the government. Everything you do is for the city, or the region you work for, and in the interest of that area so I think it is because of that.

*So you say it is mostly your working environment. It started only after you started working for the government?*

I think it is partially also because of how you are raised, but I think working for the government, where I ended up somewhat coincidentally after an internship has had the biggest impact. Before I barely knew what the government did except for passports and such practical affairs, and so there is much more going on.

*So can you specify what part of the working environment was most important for this. Such as the organization and its goals as a whole, or more interaction with immediate colleagues?*

The organization mostly, what it represents, the tasks of a municipality or a province.

*And concerning your colleagues, do you think they share these values?*

I think most of my colleagues try to perform their tasks for the public good, and try to take that into account yes.

I think as an organization you also need to aim for that, that you make sure your employees are constantly aware of what the organization is meant for, because otherwise it can quickly become bureaucratic or rigid., which often happens within the government. That does not serve the public interest. there are rules made to serve the public interest, but the public interest needs to prevail and not the rules. And that sometimes does happen. So it can reinforce each other, but also go the other way, and worsen each other. I think as an organization you need to watch out for that, to keep your goal clearly in mind. Colleagues can reinforce each other in this way, but it depends on the control of the organization as a whole whether that is possible or not.

*And concerning these statements I just gave you, would your colleagues and team members give the same answers, or higher or lower? And are there differences between colleagues?*

I don't expect much of a difference, cause they all work for the government. You are all occupied with the public interest, so you once started with idea that you do this for the people of the city, or the region, en who use it, that is the target audience. I can not imagine it is very divergent. Maybe someone experiences that less, but I would think it very strange if someone would completely disagree.

*What other factors except work environment and maybe upbringing do you think could have an influence on values, and the answers to these statement?*

I think education plays a role in the sense that an education offers a perspective of where you could end up with this education, what type of job, what organization.

*Now I would like to give you two more statements.*

*First statement: I feel like a Member of the family at this organization.*

Well I feel welcome in the organization, and I feel at home working for the government, if you mean that with a part of the family yes, a 3. But I would not say that I am very amicable with the colleagues outside of work. In that way not, but that is because of my personality.

*Would you say you feel at home in this organization?*

Yes, a 4.

*Okay, you just said that being part of the family is more concerning the government as a whole than the team or group of colleagues.*

Yes, your team is of course an important factor in this. I think working for the government, it is not for everyone, and it is of course very different from working in the commercial world. So I think you generally have to want to work for the government, but of course your team helps a lot with that home feeling of being welcome, collegiality. Those are important aspects to enjoy your work.

*So as far as the team is concerned, you mean mainly on a social level, how you interact, or does it also have an influence on knowledge sharing, motivating, enthusing one another, ?*

Yes, it is very important if in your team you have a number of people who challenge you to look differently, or with whom you can brainstorm, people from whom you can learn something and grow - I think that is important in a team.

And you find that this is also the case in a team in which you work.

Yes I think so. That is also one of the reasons why I made the switch last year from a very small municipality to a larger municipality. Yes, to keep developing and growing.

*So you think that collaboration with colleagues is better for your development and growth.*

yes.

*Okay, and do you feel that this is with everyone in the group or are there groups that interact more with each other? and are there any differences between these groups?*

Yeah, I think there sure is, I think someone who is 60 is different from someone age 35, I think if you are 35 you are even more concerned with your development and your career and if you are a bit older you may be counting the days a bit more. And then you are less busy with your career and you are just fine with things being a bit more on autopilot.

*And with regard to part-time workers, for example: you see them less - is it the case that you are less likely to share knowledge or motivate each other.*

That is very much up to the person and their attitude. If he has a full 100 percent effort on the days that there is, I don't think that is a lesser colleague because he or she is part-time. It really depends on how that person is in it, or if they just sit there to fill those hours and

quickly go back home to the children, yes that is of course a different approach than if someone is just there 20 or 24 hours full commitment to their work.

*And generally speaking, you feel that part-time workers are very committed or that they feel more like sitting there just to fill hours.*

In general, I think everyone makes a lot of effort, so not really a difference between part-time people and full-time. But in the team I'm on, part-time is usually 4 days, so that's quite a lot. There are very few colleagues who only work 20 or 24 hours.

*Do you think your colleagues would answer the same to these last statements? Yes, I think so, I think so.*

*Do you feel that you have also learned a lot personally, through the cooperation with colleagues and whether that has helped to motivate you.*

Yes, I certainly have a number of colleagues that I am happy to be able to discuss with them, and which gives me a different perspective. Yes, I think there are enough colleagues who meet that need.

*Okay, especially when it comes to sharing knowledge or is it also on when people are down, or nothing is going correctly, they can cheer you up, motivate you to get started.*

Yes, both. It depends a bit on the situation, sometimes it is good if you can complain to someone and then continue working, to let it go to get a bit of understanding or just a boost. I think that is just as important as more support in terms of work substance.

*And who would look for if you need it? Is that a certain kind of person?*

That depends a bit on the personality, on the type of people if you have a connection with them. Yes, I think that's mostly personal. And perhaps also in terms of work content.

*Okay, for example if you are working on the same project?*

Yes, otherwise I would be less likely to go there.

#### **Interviewee 4:**

##### **Male 30, Fulltime worker**

*I will first ask you some questions about your background, so how long have you been working at the municipality?*

I have been working for the municipality for 2.5 years now

*And what did you do before that?*

I worked for the Parkstad region, a partnership of 8 municipalities in Limburg, and for that I come from property development.

*and what have you studied.*

urban planning, a master in urban planning in utrecht.

*And you are currently working part-time or full-time.*

i work full time now.

*Okay, and that was a conscious choice to work full-time?*

Yes, I started full-time and so on.

*I will now give you a number of statements and I want you to answer to what extent you agree with this statement than on a scale from 0 to 4. 4 is I totally agree with one. 0 I completely disagree.*

Okay

*I am selflessly committed to society.*

Yes, 3.

*then the following statement: I think it is important to make a substantial contribution to the public good.*

4

*Okay then I think it is more important to make a substantial contribution to the cooperation society than to have personal success.*

4

*serving the public good is an important motive in my daily life, at work or outside.*

2

*Then the last statement: through my work I contribute to the public good.*

4

*You have answered very high on all these statements? Would you say this gives an indication of you and your values .*

Yes, I think so, that is interesting. It is not that I originally had this, you end up somewhere from your studies, and then you think more of this is a nice topic, but eventually once you start working with a city council and all that, you will notice, we are doing good things for the municipality and the region, and that is how you notice it. So I think it developed more during the 2.5 years that I now work at the municipality of Maastricht.

*Okay, so you say that these standards and value, as far as commitment to society is concerned, that has been shaped more when you started working than before.*

Less before that but more indeed afterwards.

*Okay, and would you say that it's more because of dealing with direct colleagues and colleagues who share these standards and values, or that it's about the bigger story, the purpose of the organization as a whole.*

I think more the organization as a whole, if you come into contact with the city council often, Of course also colleagues, but that is a little less for me, I think, more the broader story, and therefore the city council, and that way I have come to understand how much impact this can have.

*Okay, and do you feel that your colleagues would answer the same thing to these statements, that they would also be quite high?*

Yes, I do have that feeling.

*Okay, now I have two other statements, the first statement is:*

*I feel like a part of the family in this organization.*

A 2 for that

*Okay, and I feel at home in this organization.*

4, very much

*And what does that mean, that you feel at home in this organization?*

*Is it mainly due to a close group of colleagues, or more simply in general, the purpose of the organization.*

Yes a lot of support, and the team, I am 29 and I think there are a lot of opportunities, it is an organization where as a young civil servant you get a lot of opportunities to grow. To tackle important themes as a project leader, which makes me feel at home with the municipality of Maastricht.

*And part of the family, what do you mean by part of the family and why did you answer a 2 there, what is the motivation behind that.*

Well, I think, that is more for me, As a colleague, there is always a certain distance, we are very friendly, but it is not as if I share a lot of private matters or at least not regularly. And because of that I answered a 2.

*Okay, so that's actually more on a social level that it's a little less a part of the family.*

Yes. exactly.

*And if we're not talking about the social aspect but sharing knowledge motivating each other, support, is that the same or higher?*

That is higher, or at least I would like it higher, that is not higher. I would also describe that as a 2, because I think there can be more encouragement, more as a team.

*And do you notice that it is more important to you with certain people or groups than with others or is it the same with everyone?*

Yes there is a difference, I happened to work in 2 teams. One team was younger and there people thought in possibilities, in the other team this was less that we motivate each other to think differently.

*So age can play a role? are there other factors that can influence this, such as male / female or part-time?*

Look part-time, depends on the definition, 4 days is actually part-time, which is a lot, many people with us work 4 out of 5 days. And that is a bit in between. If you look at people who work full-time, you see more, you have more contact with them. If you are going to look at male / female I don't really have an idea about that, it is more the team atmosphere, the attitude of the manager, things like that. I think that is also a big part of what freedom you use as a civil servant.

*Okay. You say that part-time might play a role. Do you notice, for example, that people who work less than 4 days, that you have less contact with them or that you would deal with them less quickly, or is there little difference?*

Yes, in the end I think, if you work three days, you just have a little less contact, you are just a little less present. I think that it does matter, that that creates more or less bonding, also depends on the person, but I notice as a full-timer that there is a difference. As a full-timer I notice a lot more.

*okay, and do you think that the people who work part-time are less involved in the organization, you say that you have those norms and values, that you have that is partly due to the working environment, which could also affect part-timers that they have less of it.*

I think it depends on how you start, if you start as a youngster as a part-timer I think you have more trouble. As a young full-timer I notice that I need this time to finish my tasks and to understand everything, as a part-timer you get that less. So I think that could certainly play a role.

*Okay, so you're actually saying that if someone is just starting out as a part-timer can have a big impact but much less if you've been working longer, it would have less of an impact.*

Yes, I think so. I think you know more about how the organization works, technical details and stuff.

*Is that is the case with regard to technical details, what about regarding motivation, commitment to the public good.*

Content is of course included. But it is difficult, I think it does not matter in principle, but in terms of, affinity I think that at work noticing and learning things in the organization that you can just do that better as a full-timer. But I would not distinguish how motivated they are for the public good, between part-timers and full-timers.

*And the statements I just gave you do you think your teammates would answer the same as you, or higher or lower, and is there a difference?*

I think they may estimate the family a little higher. There is a great sense of team, so I think three for them in both

*And what is the main reason for this, do you think?*

Based on my estimate, maybe some people say that team is more like family, more involved in private affairs, that is why it is slightly higher, the others I think is slightly lower, because I estimate that quite high.

#### **Interviewee 5:**

**Woman, 29, in the organization for 4 years, works part-time, recently had a child, before that full-time.**

*I will now give you a number of statements and I want you to answer to what extent you agree with this statement than on a scale from 0 to 4. 4 is I totally agree with one. 0 I completely disagree.*

Okay

*I am selflessly committed to society.*

Yes, I actually agree, completely agree, so 4.

*then the following statement: I think it is important to make a substantial contribution to the public good.*

Also a 4.

*Okay then I think it is more important to make a substantial contribution to the cooperation society than to have personal success.*

Often that goes together, I think, a 4 actually. There is also a difference between less personal success and completely failing.

*serving the public good is an important motive in my daily life, at work or outside.*

outside work less I think. 2 is neutral right, so I think 2.

*Then the last statement through my work I contribute to the public good*

I think a 3, because, the council says this is what we are going to do, and it is sometimes questionable whether this in its entirety benefits society.

*You have answered very high on all these statements? Would you say this gives an indication of you and your values .*

Yes

*Where do you think you got these norms and values?*

Where did I get that, I think education but I think that that is mainly something that is inside you, as a child I was already interested in what is happening in the world, and coming up with ways to do something about it. Also less steering perhaps, more thinking things over, wanting to hear different sides of a story. I think that's more in me. That is, of course, reinforced by education and upbringing.

*So you say that it is mainly in yourself, has the working environment at the municipality had any influence?*

I think in some ways, at the same time, this is my second job, the beginning is of course very idealistic, you think I am really committed to the public interest, of course in practice there are many smaller interests, or you do not know all interests Good enough to make a good decision.

And in practice it does become a lot more practical. Often you help the people you know or who demand it, the same people often, so the public interest is not always fully feasible. As a municipality you support it.

*Okay, so the opportunity to serve the public interest is not always there, but the work environment has had an impact on this in terms of commitment.*

Yes I think that is positive.

*Is that mainly the colleagues or the organization as a whole?*

Organization as a whole, but certainly also colleagues and aldermen. That has sometimes been different, but I think the council currently is working on it. It is not always possible, but the intention is there.

*okay, and would you say that your teammates, colleagues, would give the same answer to the statements above?*

Yes, I actually think so.

*On the whole, or are there differences between colleagues?*

I think everyone has it. Ultimately, that's why you started working for the government. I think everyone tries to do that as much as possible. Selfless, the first statement I think it is, but of course we are all human. I am younger, and I may think that you unconsciously favor your peers, older colleagues often say that, but I think that with young people because you have more connection with that, that it can happen unconsciously, that they understand you more also. There may also be a bias in this.

*Would you say it is a close group of colleagues?*

Yes, I think that the municipality and our team are focused on sharing information, and working together, in that sense it is close and there is a lot of coordination.

*Then I now have two statements that are a bit in line with this. The first is: I feel like a part of the family in this organization.*  
Yes, I really feel part of the team but you do have a business relationship with each other, so 2 or 3, I am positive about our team but it is mainly business.

*okay then the following statement: I feel at home in this organization.*  
Yes, I think so a 4.

*So you've talked about and that there are some differences between groups. Is that mainly social, or is it also about collaboration, knowledge sharing motivating each other.*

I think it's more social with each other, that you ask how they are, how your weekend was, those kind of things. There is certainly also exchange. I think especially the youngsters with the older guard, not the older guard among themselves. There is certainly substantive exchange, but that is more in other teams.

*And is motivating each other also an important part of this?*

I think that is for sure, but also complaining to each other, that will certainly also be there.

*You have just talked about differences between young people and the elderly, do you also experience differences between other groups such as men / women, part-time full-time?*

That does not really matter, that I'm less part of the group because I work part-time. The days I am there I also work at the office, not at home, and I am involved in overarching processes, so you will see many colleagues, I do not work individually. So that works positively. You don't see much difference between men and women, but you do see a shift where it used to be a men's stronghold, but where it is now shifting. I also think that the arrival of more younger workers has also created a culture of sharing more information and learning from each other and so on. Young people are given more opportunities and are challenged, and they are appreciated, I appreciate that too.

*Ok so maybe sharing information from each other is more of a youth thing?*

Yes I think yes. But also because as a newcomer you need it to know how to properly perform your tasks.

*And when you were working full-time, was the relationship with part-timers different on these things, that the relationship was different, or that there seemed to be differences in motivation?*

No I don't really think so, look you have the course of life, I now have children and I have to be able to pick them up at 5, after work I will not come again unless there is something very bad, that is different than before, I don't know if that is motivation or priorities that are different now. As the children get older, you get a different focus. Colleagues with older children now go more to work things in evenings, or they take on more work, so to speak.

*So part-time workers are no different in the group?*

They work less on large projects, because that takes time, and you may be a little more off the radar. But I don't think otherwise.

*Okay, and as for the two statements above, would your colleagues generally answer the same thing, do you think?*

I actually think so, maybe everyone says that, but I think so.

#### **Interviewee 6:**

#### **Woman, 50, Full Time worker**

*How long have you been working here?*

25 years

*And you work parttime or fulltime?*

I started fulltime, then parttime when my children were born until they were around 14, and now since a few years full time again.

*What is your education background?*

I studied engineering.

*I will now give you a number of statements and I want you to answer to what extent you agree with this statement on a scale from 0 to 4. 4 is I totally agree with one. 0, I completely disagree.*

Okay

*I am selflessly committed to society.*

Yes, but I get paid, so im not sure how selfless that is, but I did purposefully choose to contribute to the city and inhabitants, so agree, but not completely, so 3.

*then the following statement: I think it is important to make a substantial contribution to the public good.*

I think so, a 4, im very proud that I contribute to the city.

*Okay then I think it is more important to make a substantial contribution to the cooperation society than to have personal success.*

Yes I think so, but not completely so a 3

*serving the public good is an important motive in my daily life, at work or outside.*

at work more than in private I think, at work constantly but outside not, so agree but not completely agree. 3

*Then the last statement: through my work I contribute to the public good .*

Yes I think so but maybe not always so a 3.

*You have answered very high on all these statements? Would you say this gives and indication of you and your values .*

That I score high, no I don't think that says anything about my norms and values. There are also people who have rolled into the profession but who do not necessarily think like this. Some people accidentally end up somewhere. In my case I was already focused more on the social side after my studies, but I never thought of this work beforehand. It has to do with interests, but some people are just there by chance, because working at the municipality also has other benefits that you can choose. But in my case I think it has to do with norms and values to a large extent.

*Would you say that this is more formed after you started working for the municipality, or is that something you already had before.*

I think I already had it because I also consciously lent towards social housing corporations during my studies. So I think I have a little bit of that, if I'm ever done with the municipality I would like to help families in need of help.

*Would you say that the work has further strengthened this or has it remained the same?*

I think that has been strengthened in my case, but that's because of the jobs I've had. In some places within the municipality you have that less, I came to people's homes a lot, and I had a lot of contact with people, and then you see a lot.

*Is it more the content of the work, the organization as a whole, or contact with colleagues?*

I think the content mainly. Colleagues and their ideals always play a role, but there are also those who are simply the opposite. But I haven't worked in any other organization so I can't compare it. But I think, if you are together eight hours a day, 5 days a week, that has an influence that cannot be otherwise.

*Okay, and you also worked part-time for a while, was that different in some way?*

Yes, but I usually worked for 3 days at the time, so I think that did not have much impact in my case, but if you work 2 or 2.5 days, you will get a different relation with your colleagues and your work, then there is another ratio. Then you are more concerned with your private life.

*Then I now have two statements. The first is: I feel like part of the family in this organization.*



Yes, I do have that a bit, I miss them now, that is not with everyone, not everyone is nice for you as a person, but I do miss it overall, togetherness, you also make friends, so yes. I think 3, because you don't have that with everyone.

*okay then the following statement: I feel at home in this organization.*

Yes I do, so a 4.

*You just said that you are missing colleagues a little bit in this situation, so would you say it is a close group?*

Part of it is. I work in a group of people of 30, which is also divided into smaller groups that work together.

*So it's more people you work with.*

Yes and then you also discover how someone is, and if you work together with someone more often, you also have more of a bond, then you have someone who helps you and you help them the other way around.

*Is that more social, or to motivate or encourage each other, to learn.*

It starts with the latter and with some people it becomes the first. Of course, there are fewer of those.

*And do you have that with everyone or are there certain people that you always go to when you need help, or motivation.*

I have a handful of people I love to walk up to to discuss with. But there are also many people who either don't care, they don't have the information I need, or we don't fit together personality-wise. And then it becomes more businesslike. And for information, you usually end up going to people your age or older to be honest, I notice that too.

*Is that the same thing, sharing information and motivating or is there a difference?*

No, there is a difference, they are often not the same people.

But I actually think, my husband would say, I don't require being motivated by others because I like my job too much. So I don't often have that problem.

*And for things like this, other than age, are there other differences between the people you go to, like part-time work, for example?*

No, that is more of a practical difference, that they are often not there, or not when you need them and then you have to plan that. So then I schedule an appointment. In terms of motivation, it is of course up to who is there in the moment, and then part-timers are also less often there.

*Do you think your colleagues would answer the same to the first statements regarding commitment to public good?*

I think three quarters yes, because I think that there are also colleagues who are more commercial, that is not a problem, in our team it is also good that there are people like that. It may be because of the subject, their character, but it is also good that there are, that there are different types of people.

*And as for the last 2 statements?*

I think at least half of them are less positive about that, I also say that because we recently had an investigation, and our team scored very low on it, which was mainly due to work pressure, management, a combination of things. And then people become more isolated, those feelings diminish.

*And what about the social aspect and motivation?*

Then we also have a problem, because we are divided as a department, and there is room for improvement in between. And that can be because of anything, if you have more than 10 people you always get groups. Not everyone can always get along, of course.