

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/45430>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-06-21 and may be subject to change.

Organisational commitment among European university employees



# Organisational commitment among European university employees

Documentation of a survey on predictors and consequences  
of organisational commitment in European universities  
conducted in 2004

Edited by  
S.G.A. Smeenk  
R.N. Eisinga  
J.A.C.M. Doorewaard  
J.C. Teelken

Dans Data Guide 1, Den Haag, 2006

© 2006 DANS

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Data Archiving and Networked Services

Postbus 93067

2509 AB The Hague


T 070 3494450

F 070 3494451

info@dans.knaw.nl

www.dans.knaw.nl

ISBN 90-6984-484-2

The paper in this publication meets the requirements of  ISO-norm 9706 (1994) for permanence.

Lay-out and design: Edita-KNAW

Printer: Stadsdrukkerij Amsterdam NV

The data of this study are available at DANS – Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS study number P1698)

# Contents

Abbreviations vi

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the research	1
1.2 Sample	2
1.3 Questionnaire	2
1.3.1 Design	2
1.3.2 Measurements	3
1.4 Response	7
1.5 Representativeness	10
1.5.1 Age	10
1.5.2 Gender	10
1.5.3 Position	11
1.5.4 Comparisons business/economics and social sciences faculties	12
2. Documentation of the variables	17
2.1 List of variables	17
2.1.1 Level of managerialism	17
2.1.2 Human Resource Management practices	18
2.1.3 Antecedents	19
2.1.4 Organisational commitment	21
2.1.5 Quality of performances	21
2.1.6 Workplace	22
2.2 Guide to the codebook	23
2.3 Documentation of the variables	24
2.3.1 Level of managerialism	24
2.3.2 Human Resource Management practices	26
2.3.3 Antecedents	32
2.3.4 Organisational commitment	45
2.3.5 Quality of performances	49
2.3.6 Workplace variable	57
3. Questionnaire	59
References	69

# Abbreviations

## Countries

BE	Belgium
FI	Finland
DE	Germany
NL	The Netherlands
SE	Sweden
UK	United Kingdom

## Faculties

UA-AE	University of Antwerp – Faculty of Applied Economics
UA-PSS	University of Antwerp – Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
GU-EBA	Ghent University – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
GU-PSS	Ghent University – Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
UL-EAE	University of Leuven – Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics
UL-SS	University of Leuven – Faculty of Social Sciences
JU-BE	Jyväskylä University – School of Business and Economics
JU-SS	Jyväskylä University – Faculty of Social Sciences
UO-EBA	University of Oulu – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
UO-H	University of Oulu – Faculty of Humanities
UT-EA	University of Tampere – Faculty of Economics and Administration
UT-SS	University of Tampere – Faculty of Social Sciences
UB-BSE	University of Bremen – Faculty of Business Studies and Economics
UB-SS	University of Bremen – Faculty of Social Sciences
FU-EBA	Frankfurt University – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
FU-SS	Frankfurt University – Faculty of Social Sciences
UM-EM	University of Magdeburg – Faculty of Economics and Management
UM-HSSE	University of Magdeburg – Faculty for the Humanities, Social Sciences and Education
FUA-EBA	Free University Amsterdam – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
FUA-SS	Free University Amsterdam – Faculty of Social Sciences
UA-EE	University of Amsterdam – Faculty of Economics and Econometrics
UA-SBS	University of Amsterdam – Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
UG-MO	University of Groningen – Faculty of Management and Organisation
UG-BSS	University of Groningen – Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences
GU-BEL	Göteborg University – School of Business, Economics and Law
GU-SS	Göteborg University – Faculty of Social Sciences
UU-SSE	Uppsala University – Faculty of Social Sciences (Economic part)
UU-SSS	Uppsala University – Faculty of Social Sciences (Social part)
VU-ME	Växjö University – School of Management and Economics
VU-SS	Växjö University – School of Social Sciences
CU-CBS	Cardiff University – Cardiff Business School
CU-SS	Cardiff University – School of Social Sciences
UE-ME	University of Edinburgh – Management School and Economics
UE-SPS	University of Edinburgh – School of Social and Political Studies
UEA-M	University of East Anglia – School of Management
UEA-ESS	University of East Anglia – School of Economic and Social Studies <sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> does not exist anymore under this name

# 1. Introduction

This research report provides the documentation of the cross-sectional Web-based survey into the predictors and consequences of organisational commitment among European university employees, conducted by Sanne Smeenk, Rob Eisinga, Hans Doorewaard and Christine Teelken. We used an application called Netquestionnaires to design our questionnaire and conduct our survey. The questionnaire was administered to almost 9600 respondents in six European countries (Belgium, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom) in the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> of November 2004 till the 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2005.

This chapter discusses the background of the research (1.1), the sample (1.2), the questionnaire (1.3), the response (1.4) and the representativeness (1.5).

## 1.1 Background of the research

Since the early 1980s, European universities have been influenced by social, economic and political developments that have reinforced the trend in academic institutions to adopt organisational forms, technologies, management instruments and values that are commonly found in the private business sector (Deem, 1998). This wave of reforms, which has swept across universities and other public organisations all over Europe, is known as 'New Public Management' (NPM) or 'managerialism' (Hood, 1991; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004). It involves 'greater managerial power, structural reorganization, more emphasis on marketing and business generation, moves toward performance-related pay and a rationalization and computerization of administrative structures' (Parker and Jary, 1995: 320). Other themes that appear in accounts of what managerialism entails are, budget transparency, output measurement, increased competition, and use of private sector management techniques (see Aucoin, 1990; Hood, 1991, 1995; Pollitt, 1993).

The timing, pace and extent of managerial changes show some variation among countries, universities and faculties (Hood, 1995). For example, on country level there are high-managerialism adopters such as the United Kingdom, Sweden, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. These countries are followed by The Netherlands, France, Denmark, Norway and Ireland, which are ranged under the group of countries that show a number of marked shifts in the direction of managerialism. Low-managerialism countries are Germany, Greece, Spain, Switzerland, Japan and Turkey (Bleiklie, 2001; Hood, 1995; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004; Thune, 1998).

Although the timing, pace and extent of managerial changes vary among countries, universities and faculties, managerial business-like values and arrangements seem increasingly necessary in academia. However, these values and arrangements are at right angles to the more professional academic values and arrangements that are generally held within universities. There is a vast amount of studies that suggest that the contradiction between managerial and professional values leads to unintended



behaviour of the individual academics, such as lower organisational commitment (Bryson, 2004; Deem, 1998; Prichard and Willmott, 1997; Ylijoki, 2003). As Boccock and Watson (1994: 124–25) noted: ‘Many academics have felt dispirited, undervalued, diminished in their autonomy and have suffered an increasing lack of empathy for the goals of institutions’. Simultaneously, a high level of organisational commitment has proven to be important for the realisation of high quality performances (Iles et al., 1990; Lee, 1971; Meyer et al., 1989; Mowday et al., 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Porter, 1985). As the managerial values and arrangements are aimed at efficient and effective quality improvement, some authors claim that the managerialism works against its own intentions (e.g., Bryson, 2004; Chan, 2001; Thornhill et al., 1996; Trow, 1994). This situation is what we call the ‘managerial contradiction’.

Our research examined and compared the effects of various predictors (Human Resource Management practices and antecedents) on university employees’ affective, continuance and normative organisational commitment in various faculties with different levels of managerialism. Likewise, the research examined and compared the effects of the three organisational commitment constructs on the quality of university employees’ performances in various faculties with different levels of managerialism.

## 1.2 Sample

The study draws on a Web survey conducted among 9546 university employees divided over 36 faculties and 18 universities (two faculties per university) in six European countries. As we wanted different managerial contexts that were reasonably comparable in socio-economic terms, we chose six countries that are all located in Western Europe, that are social-economically equally developed, and in which knowledge of the English language is generally high (as we used a questionnaire formulated in English only). Within these countries we selected all universities that have both a business/economics faculty and a social sciences faculty or equivalents thereof. We chose two gamma faculties as we wanted different managerial contexts that are reasonably comparable at the same time. After all, the levels of managerialism do not only differ among countries, but also within countries and even within universities. Subsequently, we randomly picked three universities (and consequently six faculties) per country and searched for the email addresses of the employees of these selected universities on the Internet.

We conducted the survey across the Internet as all university staff is generally provided with access to the Net. Although Web surveys are relatively new for data collection, several researchers have found support for use of the medium (e.g., Cobanoglu et al., 2001; Sills and Song, 2002).

## 1.3 Questionnaire

### 1.3.1 Design

The questionnaire was constructed in the Spring of 2004 and consisted of 83 items divided over 21 questions. It was estimated it would take ten to twelve minutes to fill out the questionnaire. It was structured to encourage the respondents to reflect on their

past and present experiences in the faculty. Following [Swoboda et al. \(1997\)](#) we tried to keep the questionnaire as short and simple as possible. Looking at ourselves as examples, we figured that academic employees would generally not be very attracted by or even dislike clashing titles, flashing pictures and strange fonts. These frills could only slow down the speed of site appearance, especially on older computers with less storage capacity, and consequently restrict the response rate. Also, [Dillman et al. \(1998\)](#) found that a plain questionnaire provides better results in terms of response rate, completeness, and completion time than a fancy version of the same questionnaire.

The questions were formulated in a way that they were relevant to all respondents. In one case, the question about the position in the faculty filtered the respondents who had to answer the question about the number of activities (articles, books, presentations etc.) they had done since January 1<sup>st</sup> 2002. This question was not relevant for support and administrative employees and for student assistants. The questionnaire was pre-tested in the Summer of 2004 through a pilot survey held in two Dutch faculties (a business/ economics faculty and a social sciences faculty) of the same university. This led to some minor adaptations to the formulation and sequence of the questions.

Further, to control for the potential effects of common method variance ([Podsakoff et al., 2003](#)), we applied different response formats for the measurement of the HRM practices (single choice question, numerical entry, five-point Likert scale), the antecedents (single choice with and without optional text-response, date and numerical entry, five-point Likert scale), organisational commitment (five-point Likert scale), and quality of performances (five-point Likert scale and numerical entry). Moreover, we improved scale items by reducing item ambiguity, social desirability, and demand characteristics, and we deleted equivalent and irrelevant items. Because we applied tested and common-used scales to measure most of the concepts, we were careful in altering the scale formats, anchors and scale values in order to preserve the original scale validities. We conducted the Harman's one-factor test ([Podsakoff and Organ, 1986](#)) to check for the possible influence of common method variance. As the unrotated factor analysis of the variables used in the study resulted in 21 factors, with the first factor explaining only 16 percent of the common variance, our findings are not much affected by the problem of common method variance.

### 1.3.2 Measurements

Standard and study-specific measures are provided for the level of managerialism, the HRM practices, the antecedents, the three organisational commitment constructs, and the quality of performances. The complete questionnaire can be found in Chapter 3.

*Level of managerialism* The managerial developments within universities or faculties involve seven dimensions ([Hood, 1995](#)): degree of disaggregation (diversification of study disciplines and expansion of student numbers), competition between universities or faculties, a move towards more explicit and measurable standards of performance, attempts to control according to pre-set output measures, the use of management practices drawn from the private sector, stress on discipline and parsimony in resource use, and a move towards more hands-on management. Academics have been

asked to indicate to what extent they perceive these dimensions of change apply to their faculty.

*Human resource management practices* Recently, Buck and Watson (2002) have modified Arthur's original instrument to measure minimill industrial relations strategies (1992, 1994) in an attempt to make this instrument more appropriate for measuring the areas of interest within the context of higher education. However, closer scrutiny of Buck and Watson's commitment Human Resource system reveals both overlap and deficiency within the 'new', more managerial context of European higher education.

Regarding the proposed overlap between the Human Resource Management practices, Buck and Watson (2002) argue that commitment levels among employees can be positively influenced by increasing the employee discretion and responsibility (the skill level of employees). However, decentralisation already impels both the prudence of employees in decision-making and the responsibility for the consequences of their decisions. The aspect of 'skill level' may therefore be eliminated. Regarding the suggested deficiency, the notions of management style and performance appraisal may be added to the six remaining Human Resource Management practices, since it is argued that the academic 'revolution' has had its demands for 'managerial relations and manager/managed identities and increased control over activities' (Prichard and Willmott, 1997, p. 311). Further, the procedures for handling employee complaints or grievances (due process) may be replaced by the broader concept of employee security, which is fundamental to the implementation of other management instruments (Pfeffer and Veiga, 1999). Finally, [Thornhill et al. \(1996\)](#) discuss that receiving and providing information up and down the organisation is necessary for achieving employee involvement. This element of communication completes the list of Human Resource Management practices that are expected to increase organisational commitment, which further consists of decentralisation (job enrichment), compensation, participation (empowerment), training and development, employment security, social interactions, management style, and performance appraisal.

We measured decentralisation with a four-item scale based on the original instrument of Arthur (1994). In order to measure the level of compensation, the university employees were asked to rate their own salary on a scale from 1 (= very inferior to my efforts) to 5 (= passes my efforts easily) (cf. Boyer et al., 1994). Following [Gaertner and Nollen \(1989\)](#), participation was measured with a four-item scale. To measure the level of training and development, we adapted Arthur's instrument (1994) to make it more appropriate for measuring training and development within the context of higher education. Academics were asked to indicate how many days per year they obtained off-the-job activities away from their immediate work area activities (classes or workshops), on-the-job general skills training not directly related to their current jobs, and on-the-job skills training directly related to their current jobs. We summed the ratings on the items to generate a single composite score. Based on [Gaertner and Nollen \(1989\)](#), employment security was measured by a single item asking the respondents to indicate whether the faculty does all it can do to avoid layoffs.

To measure the level of social interactions, we used Sheldon's instrument (1971), including the items 'I frequently have off-the-job contacts with my colleagues', 'I feel

a part of my work group', and 'I feel a part of my faculty'. To measure the style of management, the academics were asked which management style fits best their manager or management team (Blake and Mouton, 1985): Impoverished Management (laissez-faire management), Country Club Management (friendly atmosphere), Middle of the Road Management (balancing work and people), Authority-Compliance (efficiency), and Team Management (trust and respect). We used the following items to measure the level of communication in the faculty (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree): 'I am adequately informed about what is going on in this faculty', and 'I am adequately informed about changes that affect my job' (cf. DeCotiis and Summers, 1987). Finally, the style of performance appraisal (judgmental-oriented or developmental-oriented) was measured by asking the academics which of the two styles fits best that of their faculty on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = judgmental-oriented, 5 = developmental-oriented).

*Antecedents of organisational commitment* The personal variables age, gender, educational level, organisational tenure, positional tenure, and household size were recorded using six single-item self-report responses. We measured the need for achievement by asking the university employees to indicate their (dis-)agreement with propositions about the importance to perform well and to work hard (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree).

We measured the job and role characteristics career mobility and job challenge by the (dis-)agreement (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree) of academics with propositions on opportunities for career development and the challenge of their work, respectively (cf. Allen and Meyer, 1990). Job level was measured by a single-item scale consisting of eleven position categories ranging from 'dean' to 'other position (please specify)'. Next, role conflict and role ambiguity were measured by using the questionnaire items that loaded .60 or higher in the study of Rizzo et al. (1970) (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree). The autonomy measure used the adapted instrument of Hackman and Lawler (1971). Finally, part-time or full-time employment (working hours) was measured by a single-item self-report response to the office hours that are formally scheduled, excluding any overtime.

With respect to work experiences, we asked the employees' (dis-)agreement (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree) on four propositions about the organisational climate (community, trust, support, and fairness) (cf. DeCotiis and Summers, 1987). To measure the feeling of social involvement, we combined a two-item scale for dealing with others (reliability of .88) and a three-item scale for friendship opportunities (cf. Hackman and Lawler, 1971). (Dis-)agreement with the Allen and Meyer (1990) proposition 'My contribution is important for the larger aims of this faculty' was taken as an indication of personal importance. To measure formalisation, we asked the respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposition that the faculty has clear rules and regulations that everyone is expected to follow closely (cf. Sashkin and Morris, 1987).

*Organisational commitment* Organisational commitment can be measured by a number of different scales (e.g., Cook and Wall, 1980; Morrow and Wirth, 1989; Penley and Gould, 1988; Porter et al. 1974). Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the 24-item Organi-

**Table 1** Response rates per country and faculty

	Potential respondents	Real respondents	Percent per country/faculty	Percent of total response
<i>Belgium</i>	1309	489	37.4%	21.0%
UA-AE	300	79	26.3%	3.4%
UA-PSS	180	66	36.7%	2.8%
GU-EBA	155	50	32.3%	2.2%
GU-PSS	141	55	39.0%	2.4%
UL-EAE	334	148	44.3%	6.4%
UL-SS	199	91	45.7%	3.9%
<i>Finland</i>	1010	187	18.5%	8.0%
JU-BE	83	14	16.9%	0.6%
JU-SS	225	35	15.6%	1.5%
UO-EBA	77	21	27.3%	0.9%
UO-H	209	30	14.4%	1.3%
UT-EA	119	20	16.8%	0.9%
UT-SS	297	67	22.6%	2.9%
<i>Germany</i>	1167	189	16.2%	8.1%
UB-BSE	157	26	16.6%	1.1%
UB-SS	206	37	18.0%	1.6%
FU-EBA	272	44	16.2%	1.9%
FU-SS	142	22	15.5%	0.9%
UM-EM	100	20	20.0%	0.9%
UM-HSSE	290	40	13.8%	1.7%
<i>Netherlands</i>	2919	882	30.2%	37.9%
FUA-EBA	397	101	25.4%	4.3%
FUA-SS	229	110	48.0%	4.7%
UA-EE	384	118	30.7%	5.1%
UA-SBS	1271	405	31.9%	17.4%
UG-MO	255	55	21.6%	2.4%
UG-BSS	383	93	24.3%	4.0%
<i>Sweden</i>	2260	454	20.1%	19.5%
GU-BEL	523	102	19.5%	4.4%
GU-SS	643	147	22.9%	6.3%
UU-SSE	504	58	11.5%	2.5%
UU-SSS	398	103	25.9%	4.4%
VU-ME	104	20	19.2%	0.9%
VU-SS	88	24	27.3%	1.0%
<i>United Kingdom</i>	881	124	14.1%	5.3%
CU-BS	254	34	13.4%	1.5%
CU-SS	152	19	12.5%	0.8%
UE-ME	157	14	8.9%	0.6%
UE-SPS	145	29	20.0%	1.2%
UEA-M	68	16	23.5%	0.7%
UEA-ESS	105	12	11.4%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9546</b>	<b>2325</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

sational Commitment Questionnaire, which has become a widely used instrument to measure affective, continuance and normative organisational commitment (e.g., Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Buck and Watson, 2002; Gaertner and Nollen, 1989; Meyer et al., 1993; Thornhill et al., 1996). The scale has three sub-scales: the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS), and the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS). We tried to improve the scale items by reducing item ambiguity and deleting equivalent and irrelevant items, and used six items for each sub-scale. Responses were made on a five-point disagree-agree continuum (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree).

*Quality of performances* The data on quality of performances were acquired in two ways. Firstly, the respondent was asked for his or her perception on how his or her colleagues would rate the overall quality of the respondent's performances and, if applicable, the quality of the research performances, the quality of the teaching performances, and/or the quality of the management performances.

Secondly, the actual performances of the university employees were measured by asking them to indicate the number of articles they have published in refereed and non-refereed professional or trade journals, the number of chapters in edited volumes they have published, the number of textbooks or other books they have published, the number of research reports they have disseminated internally or to external clients, and the number of presentations they have held at conferences and/or workshops since January 1<sup>st</sup> 2002.

For each way of acquiring data on quality of performances, the ratings on the items have been summed to generate one composite quality score.

*Workplace* To be able to make comparisons between the various countries, universities and faculties, we asked the workplace of the respondents.

#### 1.4 Response

In the Autumn/Winter of 2004/2005 (November 1<sup>st</sup> 2004 to January 31<sup>th</sup> 2005), an email with a link to the questionnaire (see Chapter 3) on the web was sent to these employees, one country after another (to be able to handle the bulk of email that we received after sending the invitation emails). All academics associated with teaching, research or support of these roles (i.e., academics, administrators and other supporting staff) were included in the sample.

Table 1 shows the number of potential respondents that are emailed within each country and each faculty (N = 9546, second column) and the number of university employees that really responded to the questionnaire (n = 2325, third column). The latter numbers are calculated as percentages per country and faculty (fourth column), leading to a total response percentage of 24.4, and they are calculated as percentages of the total response (fifth column).

The non-response numbers that were ineligible for reasons of end of employment contract or retirement, maternity leave, long period absent or sabbatical leave, not able to open the link to the questionnaire, thinking that the mail is wrongly addressed, and undeliverable mail are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2 Ineligibles**

	BE	FI	DE	NL	SE	UK	Total
End of contract/retirement	16	4	12	43	10	16	101
Maternity leave	4	1	2	5	5	0	17
Long period absent/sabbatical leave	11	6	11	105	25	29	187
Not able to open link	5	3	0	10	3	2	23
Thinking wrongly addressed mail	4	3	0	11	6	6	30
Undeliverable mail	46	126	196	428	203	136	1135
<b>Total ineligibles</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>1493</b>

In calculating the response rate (see Table 3), we firstly subtracted the 1493 ineligible respondents from the total number of potential respondents ( $n = 9546$ ). From these 8053 remaining respondents, 2325 respondents filled in the questionnaire. The useable response rate was thus 28.9%, a figure that is comparable with other studies using an online survey such as Kwak and Radler (2000) (27%) and Medlin et al. (1999) (28%).

To improve the response rate we applied various techniques. Firstly, we sent two reminders to non-respondents. The Netquestionnaires application recorded who had not yet responded, who had started but not completed and who had completed the questionnaire. As the number of respondents increased considerably after sending the reminders, the usefulness of reminders is demonstrated. Unfortunately, we do not have quantitative data or statistics on this topic.

In addition, in some of the universities we had one or two contact persons (favourably one from the business/economics faculty and one from the social sciences faculty) who supported the research. We figured that appearance of the contact person's name in the mail to the employees of the university or faculty would improve response rates. At first sight, this assumption is justified as the mean response rate from faculties or universities with a contact person is 26.5% while for those without a contact person is 21.8% (calculated before deduction of ineligibles). However, this result may be coincidentally as we do not know how the response rates would have been without using contact persons. A contact person who is not very popular in the faculty might even have decreased the response rate of that faculty. We did not know all the

**Table 3 Response rates**

	BE	FI	DE	NL	SE	UK	Total
Gross sample size <sup>1</sup>	1309	1010	1167	2919	2260	881	9546
Ineligibles <sup>2</sup>	86	143	221	602	252	189	1493
Net sample size	1223	867	946	2317	2008	692	$n=8053$
Number of respondents	489	187	189	882	454	124	$n=2325$
<b>Response rate</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>28.9%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Total number of email addresses

<sup>2</sup> Ineligibles comprise (a) end of employment contract or retirement, (b) maternity leave, (c) long period absent or sabbatical leave, (d) not able to open the link to the questionnaire, (e) email is wrongly addressed, and (f) undeliverable mail.

contact persons well enough to judge his or her social position within the faculty.

Furthermore, respondents were offered the possibility to receive a paper version of the questionnaire. This was intended to meet the preferences of the respondents. As few as nineteen paper versions have been sent to respondents in all countries, twelve of which have been returned (63%).

We also offered the respondents the opportunity to fill in the questionnaire in multiple sessions so the process of filling in could be tuned to their own conveniences and needs. The mean number of sessions was 1.24 with a standard deviation of .938. Of all respondents, 91.3% filled in the questionnaire in a single session, 0.9% in two sessions, 5.0% in three sessions, and the remaining 2.8% of the respondents required more than three sessions.

Finally, as gratitude to their assistance and another way to possibly increase the response rate, we raffled off 25 coupons of € 40,- (or equivalent for the Swedish and British respondents) among those who completed the questionnaire. All winners received mails in which they were notified that they had won € 40,- (or equivalent).

At the end of the questionnaire, we asked the respondents to comment on the questionnaire. This feedback illustrates some of the problems encountered by the respondents. Table 4 shows the distribution of comments over the six sample countries. Remarkable is the relative high percentage regarding the problems due to faculty/country context in Germany (7.4%). Examination of the individual German comments reveals that the university structure in Germany is different than is assumed in the questionnaire. Other percentages that are relatively high are the 9.6% in Finland and 8.1% in Great Britain regarding the problem that the questionnaire misses an aspect. It appears from examination of the individual comments in these countries that it is particularly the difference between commitment to the faculty and commitment to the department that they think is inadequately addressed in our questionnaire.

**Table 4** *Distribution of comments per country*

	BE n=489	FI n=187	DE n=189	NL n=882	SE n=454	UK n=124	Total n=2325
Interesting/good/ good luck	1.6%	4.3%	4.2%	2.0%	3.1%	3.2%	2.3%
Technical problems	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Problems due to personal context	1.2%	0.5%	1.6%	1.2%	3.3%	2.4%	1.6%
Problems due to faculty/ country state	0.2%	0.0%	7.4%	0.5%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%
Question(s) not relevant	1.6%	1.6%	0.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Covering problems	3.1%	9.6%	3.7%	4.8%	3.5%	8.1%	4.6%
Problems due to formulation/English	2.5%	1.6%	1.6%	3.2%	2.6%	3.2%	2.7%
Questionnaire takes longer to fill in	0.2%	1.1%	1.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>338</b>



## 1.5 Representativeness

We examined whether the respondents differ from the general population of academics in the six sample countries using  $X^2$  goodness-of-fit tests for the variables age, gender and position. The population data of Belgium were retrieved from [www.vlir.be](http://www.vlir.be) and showed the statistics for 2004 in full time employees (fte), except for age for which the statistics are recorded in persons. We retrieved the age population data of Finland from [statfin.stat.fi](http://statfin.stat.fi) recorded in persons in 2003. For the gender and position population data of Finland, we used *Universities 2004; Annual Report* written by the Opetusministeriö, Koulutus- ja tiedepolitiikan osasto (Ministry of Education, Department for Education and Science Policy) (2005). The data for gender are recorded in number of person work years in 2004, whereas for position the data are recorded in persons employed in 2004. We used *Bildung und Kultur; Personal an Hochschule; 2004* by the Statistisches Bundesamt (2005) for the population data on gender and position (recorded in persons employed in 2004). We retrieved the Dutch population data over 2004 from [www.vsnu.nl](http://www.vsnu.nl). The information on age and gender are recorded in persons, while the data on position are documented in fte. The population data of both Sweden and the United Kingdom show the statistics of these countries for 2004 in persons. We retrieved the Swedish information from the report *Higher Education. Employees in Higher Education 2004* by Högskoleverket and Statistiska centralbyrån (2005), whereas the British data were found in the HEFCE (2005) report *Staff employed at HEFCE funded HEIs; Trends, profiles and projections*.

### 1.5.1 Age

As can be seen in Table 5, in all countries except Sweden ( $\chi^2 = 5.69$ ) the age distribution of the sample deviates significantly from the population's age distribution. Looking at the percentages within the countries, we see that in each country the respondents younger than 35 are clearly overrepresented, whereas the respondents between 35 and 55 as well as those of 55 and older are generally underrepresented relative to their population proportions. The 'Total' column provides a very rough indication of the distribution of age in all six countries together. As the  $X^2$  at one degree of freedom is 604.24, the age sample distribution differs significantly from the age population distribution.

### 1.5.2 Gender

The gender distribution in the sample (see Table 6) deviates significantly from the distribution in the population in Sweden ( $\chi^2 = 14.83$ ) and the United Kingdom ( $\chi^2 = 6.86$ ). The sample values of Belgium ( $\chi^2 = .08$ ), Finland ( $\chi^2 = .03$ ), Germany ( $\chi^2 = .00$ ) and the Netherlands ( $\chi^2 = 3.19$ ) are representative for the population values of these countries. The overall sample distribution over the six countries (column 'Total') does not differ significantly from the population distribution;  $\chi^2$  at one degree of freedom is .02. This means that according to the gender distribution our sample is representative for the population.

**Table 5** Age

Age		Country						Total <sup>2</sup>
		BE	FI <sup>1</sup>	DE	NL	SE	UK	
<35 yrs	Sample	275	57	71	309	107	34	853
	% within country	68.2%	36.8%	37.8%	43.3%	29.0%	33.7%	36.7%
	Population	10329	1673	n.a.	19667	10541	32123	74333
	% within country	48.7%	21.6%	n.a.	38.3%	19.8%	16.8%	22.8%
35 - 55 yrs	Sample	99	76	60	287	168	41	671
	% within country	24.6%	49.0%	31.9%	40.2%	45.5%	40.6%	31.3%
	Population	8218	4256	n.a.	23233	26442	106920	169069
	% within country	38.8%	54.9%	n.a.	45.3%	49.5%	55.8%	52.0%
55 yrs	Sample	29	22	24	118	94	26	289
	% within country	7.2%	14.2%	30.3%	16.5%	25.5%	25.7%	32.0%
	Population	2644	1826	n.a.	8407	16377	52667	81921
	% within country	12.5%	23.5%	n.a.	16.4%	30.7%	27.4%	25.2%
$X^2_2$		61.43*	23.33*	n.a.	8.64*	5.69	21.51*	604.24*

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and two degrees of freedom is 5.991, the  $X^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Based on teaching staff. The categories 30-39 and 50-59 that have been used in the original Finnish tables have been equally divided over '<35'-category and the 'between 35 and 55'-category, and the 'between 35 and 55'-category and '>55'-category, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Calculated without Germany

**Table 6** Gender

Gender		BE	FI <sup>1</sup>	DE <sup>2</sup>	NL	SE	UK	Total
Male	Sample	225	37	101	397	220	61	1041
	% within country	56.4%	60.7%	69.2%	55.5%	59.1%	59.2%	58.0%
	Population	9602	4908	163576	29656	31261	88863	327866
	% within country	55.7%	61.7%	69.2%	58.8%	49.2%	46.4%	57.8%
Female	Sample	174	24	45	318	152	42	755
	% within country	43.6%	39.3%	30.8%	44.4%	40.9%	40.8%	42.0%
	Population	7632	3046	72802	20768	32332	102847	239427
	% within country	44.3%	38.3%	30.8%	41.2%	50.8%	53.6%	42.2%
$X^2_1$		.08	.03	.00	3.19	14.83*	6.86*	.02

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and one degree of freedom is 3.841, the  $X^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Based on teaching staff: professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers

<sup>2</sup> Based on scientific staff: deans, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, Ph.D students and other scientific staff

### 1.5.3 Position

As shown in Table 7, the sample distribution of position deviates significantly in all countries and overall (column 'Total') from the population's position distribution. Looking at the percentages within the countries, we see that the scientific staff are

**Table 7** *Position*

<i>Position</i>		<b>BE</b>	<b>FI</b>	<b>DE</b>	<b>NL</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Scientific staff</i> <sup>1</sup>	Sample	418	153	174	679	395	101	1920
	% within country	85.7%	82.7%	93.0%	77.0%	88.2%	82.1%	83.3%
	Population	10798	15800	236378	21889	31334	95713	411912
	% within country	62.7%	52.9%	27.2%	53.0%	49.3%	45.4%	55.1%
<i>Other staff</i> <sup>2</sup>	Sample	70	32	13	194	53	22	384
	% within country	14.3%	17.3%	37.0%	23.0%	11.8%	17.9%	16.7%
	Population	6437	14093	152686	19424	28059	115025	335724
	% within country	37.3%	47.1%	67.3%	47.0%	44.1%	54.6%	44.9%
$\chi^2_1$		110.36*	90.18*	81.79*	213.56*	243.44*	66.81*	742.58*

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and one degree of freedom is 3.841, the  $\chi^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Deans, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, Ph.D students and other scientific staff

<sup>2</sup> Support and administrative staff, student assistants and other staff

overrepresented, while the other staff are underrepresented relative to the proportions in the population. As the survey was aimed at all university employees (both academic, administrative and supportive staff), it might be that not all supportive staff, which is categorised under the header of 'other staff', has an own email address and/or access to the Internet. In other words, not all university employees, in particular the supportive staff, might have been reached by the Internet.

The significant deviations in above goodness-of-fit tests may have various (combinations of) reasons. Firstly, as population data on the three variables (age, gender and position) in the six countries were predominantly based on the numbers of all possible faculties together, we compared our sample that only focuses on business/economics and social sciences faculties with the 'broad' population. We could not compare the sample values with population values based on employees of business/economics and social sciences faculties only as these data are not available for all countries and all variables (age, gender and position). However, when available we compared the sample values with the population values specified per faculty (see 1.5.4). Secondly, the population data for the six countries are recorded in different years and in different ways (either in persons or in fte). Finally, the method of a web survey may attract respondents who are familiar with computers but keep away those who are not.

#### 1.5.4 Comparisons business/economics and social sciences faculties

Looking at the gender structures specified for the business/economics and social sciences faculties in the Netherlands (Table 8), we see that the sample is representative for the population both within ( $\chi^2 = .21$  and  $\chi^2 = .54$ ) and across ( $\chi^2 = .62$  and  $\chi^2 = 2.51$ ) the two types of faculties.

With regard to the gender structures in the Swedish business/economics and social sciences faculties (Table 9), the sample is only representative for the population's distribution of males across the two types of faculties ( $\chi^2 = .87$ ).

**Table 8** Dutch gender structure specified for two faculties

Gender	Faculty (NL)		$\chi^2_1$	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Male	Sample	142	255	.62
	% within gender	35.8%	64.2%	
	% within faculty	67.3%	50.6%	
	Population	1549	2562	
	% within gender	37.7%	62.3%	
	% within faculty	65.8%	52.2%	
Female	Sample	69	249	2.51
	% within gender	21.7%	78.3%	
	% within faculty	32.7%	49.4%	
	Population	805	2343	
	% within gender	25.6%	74.4%	
	% within faculty	34.2%	47.8%	
$\chi^2_1$		.21 <sup>1</sup>	.54 <sup>1</sup>	

The gender structures specified for the two types of faculties in the United Kingdom (see Table 10) indicate that the sample is representative for the population within the two faculty types ( $\chi^2 = .02$  and  $\chi^2 = 2.35$ ). Further, the sample is representative for the population's distribution of females across the two types of faculties ( $\chi^2 = .64$ ). Looking at the distribution of scientific staff over the business/economics and social sciences faculties in Belgium (see Table 11), it appears that the sample is representative for the population ( $\chi^2 = .06$ ). With regard to the position structures in the Dutch business/economics and social sciences faculties (Table 12), the sample is representative for the population across the two types of faculties ( $\chi^2 = .88$ ,  $\chi^2 = .85$  and  $\chi^2 = .33$ ).

**Table 9** Swedish gender structure specified for two faculties

Gender	Faculty (SE)		$\chi^2_1$	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Male	Sample	91	129	.87
	% within gender	41.4%	58.6%	
	% within faculty	63.2%	56.6%	
	Population	992	1598	
	% within gender	38.3%	61.7%	
	% within faculty	74.8%	47.1%	
Female	Sample	53	99	42.18*
	% within gender	34.9%	65.1%	
	% within faculty	36.8%	43.4%	
	Population	334	1793	
	% within gender	15.7%	84.3%	
	% within faculty	25.2%	52.9%	
$\chi^2_1$		10.71*	8.18*	

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and one degree of freedom is 3.841, the  $\chi^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

**Table 10** British gender structure specified for two faculties

Gender <sup>1</sup>	Faculty (UK)		X <sup>2</sup> <sub>1</sub>	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Male	Sample	33	28	23.45*
	% within gender	54.1%	45.9%	
	% within faculty	66.0%	52.8%	
	Population	2508	4343	
	% within gender	36.6%	63.4%	
	% within faculty	65.0%	63.0%	
Female	Sample	17	25	.64
	% within gender	40.5%	59.5%	
	% within faculty	34.0%	47.2%	
	Population	1350	2550	
	% within gender	34.6%	65.4%	
	% within faculty	35.0%	37.0%	
X <sup>2</sup> <sub>1</sub>	.02	2.35		

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and one degree of freedom is 3.841, the X<sup>2</sup>-score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Based on permanent academic staff

Concerning the comparison of the Swedish sample distribution of position with the population distribution of position (see Table 13), it appears that the distribution within the business/economics faculty is representative ( $\chi^2 = 4.98$ ) as well as the distribution of professors across the two faculties ( $\chi^2 = 1.67$ )

As most of the comparisons in this subsection indicate that the sample values do not differ significantly from the population values, the sample seems representative for the population.

**Table 11** Belgian position structure specified for two faculties

Position	Faculty (SE)		X <sup>2</sup> <sub>1</sub>	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Scientific staff <sup>1</sup>	Sample	277	212	.06
	% within position	56.6%	43.4%	
	Population	658	515	
	% within position	56.1%	43.9%	

<sup>1</sup> Deans, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, Ph.D students and other scientific staff.

**Table 12 Dutch position structure specified for two faculties**

Position	Faculty (SE)		$\chi^2_1$	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Professors <sup>1</sup>	Sample	22	40	.88
	% within position	35.5%	64.5%	
	% within faculty	8.0%	6.6%	
	Population	263	373	
	% within position	41.4%	58.6%	
Other scientific staff <sup>2</sup>	% within faculty	11.2%	7.6%	.85
	Sample	185	432	
	% within position	30.0%	70.0%	
	% within faculty	67.5%	71.2%	
	Population	1382	2976	
Other staff <sup>3</sup>	% within position	31.7%	68.3%	.33
	% within faculty	58.7%	60.7%	
	Sample	67	135	
	% within position	33.2%	66.8%	
	% within faculty	24.5%	22.2%	
$\chi^2_2$	Population	709	1556	.33
	% within position	31.3%	68.7%	
	% within faculty	30.1%	31.7%	
		8.97*	29.00*	

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and two degrees of freedom is 5.991, the  $\chi^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Deans and professors

<sup>2</sup> Associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, Ph.D students and other scientific staff

<sup>3</sup> Support and administrative staff, student assistants and other staff

**Table 13 Swedish position structure specified for two faculties**

Position	Faculty (SE)		$\chi^2_1$	
	Business/economics	Social sciences		
Professors <sup>1</sup>	Sample count	30	36	1.67
	% within position	45.5%	54.5%	
	% within faculty	19.4%	15.0%	
	Population count	177	292	
	% within position	37.7%	62.3%	
Other scientific staff <sup>2</sup>	% within faculty	13.3%	8.6%	19.98*
	Sample count	125	204	
	% within position	38.0%	62.0%	
	% within faculty	80.6%	85.0%	
	Population count	1149	3099	
$\chi^2_1$	% within position	27.0%	73.0%	19.98*
	% within faculty	86.7%	91.4%	
		4.98	12.45*	

\* As the critical value at  $\alpha = .05$  and one degree of freedom is 3.841, the  $\chi^2$ -score is significant. The sample values differ significantly from the population values.

<sup>1</sup> Deans and professors

<sup>2</sup> Associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, researchers, Ph.D students and other scientific staff



## 2. Documentation of the variables

In this chapter, a list of variables (2.1) and a guide of the codebook (2.2) are presented. Then, the variables of the study are documented thematically (2.3).

### 2.1 List of variables

In the list below, the variable names (first column) and variable labels (second column) used in this documentation and in the SPSS file are reported thematically as presented in Section 1.3.2. The numbers in the third column (Q) indicate to which question or statement in the original questionnaire the variable refers (see Chapter 3). The page numbers in the fourth column (P) refer to the full documentation of the variable in Section 2.3.

#### 2.1.1 Level of managerialism

<b>Name</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Q</b>	<b>P</b>
ManagerA	The number of study disciplines in the faculty has increased since I started working here	6a	xxx
ManagerB	The number of student enrolments to the faculty has increased since I started working here	6b	
ManagerC	The faculty is under pressure to compete with similar faculties at other universities	6c	
ManagerD	Explicit measuring standards are the largest part of the quality evaluation in the faculty	6d	
ManagerE	In the faculty, the evaluation of teaching and research is mainly carried out with assessment criteria set by 'the managers', rather than by 'peers'	6e	
ManagerF	The faculty has increasingly applied private sector management techniques, such as performance management and efficiency controlling	6f	
ManagerG	The faculty is under pressure to reduce expenditures	6g	
ManagerH	The faculty's management is characterised by a control orientation rather than a developmental orientation	6h	



### 2.1.2 Human Resource Management practices

Name	Label	Q	P
<b>DECENTRALISATION</b>			
HRMA	I monitor data on my productivity	10a	
HRMB	I determine my work flow (tasks-ordering)	10b	
HRMC	I have the possibility to develop new research and/or teaching programs	10c	
HRMD	I have part in faculty decisions about investments in new projects	10d	
<b>COMPENSATION</b>			
Salary	How would you rate your academic salary?	8	
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>			
HRME	I am given the possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work	10e	
HRMF	I am satisfied with my possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work	10f	
HRMG	There should be more employee involvement	10g	
HRMH	I wish to have more say in decisions about my work	10h	
<b>TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
TrainiA1	Off-the-job activities such as classes or workshops, away from your immediate work area (Open)	9a	
TraininA	Off-the-job activities such as classes or workshops, away from your immediate work area (Not applicable)	9a	
TrainiB1	On-the-job general skills training not directly related to your current job (Open)	9b	
TraininB	On-the-job general skills training not directly related to your current job (Not applicable)	9b	
TrainiC1	On-the-job general skills training directly related to your current job (Open)	9c	
TraininC	On-the-job general skills training directly related to your current job (Not applicable)	9c	
<b>EMPLOYMENT SECURITY</b>			
HRM2A	This faculty does enough to avoid layoffs	11a	
<b>SOCIAL INTERACTIONS</b>			
HRM2B	I frequently have off-the-job contacts with my colleagues	11b	
HRM2C	I feel a part of my department	11c	
HRM2D	I feel a part of my faculty	11d	
<b>MANAGEMENT STYLE</b>			
Mgtstyle	Which of the following phrases characterises best the top management at your faculty?	12	

COMMUNICATION

HRM2E	I am adequately informed about what is going on in this faculty	11e
HRM2F	I am adequately informed about changes that affect my job	11f

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Perfappr	On a scale from 1 to 5, towards which of the two styles does the performance appraisal in your faculty tends?	13
----------	---	----

2.1.3 Antecedents

Name	Label	Q	P
AGE			
Age	What is your age?	18	
GENDER			
Sex	What is your sex?	19	
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL			
Educatio	What is the highest degree of education you have completed?	21	
Educati6	What is the highest degree of education you have completed? (please specify) (Open)	21	
ORGANISATIONAL TENURE			
Orgtenur	In what year did you start working at the faculty?	3	
POSITIONAL TENURE			
Postenur	In what year did you start at the position you currently have at the faculty?	4	
HOUSEHOLD SIZE			
Partner	Including yourself, how many people live in your household?	20	
NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT			
JobroleA	It is important for me to do my work the best I can	7a	
JobroleB	It is important for me to work hard, even if I don't like the work	7b	
CAREER MOBILITY			
JobroleC	I have real opportunities for career development in the faculty	7c	
JOB CHALLENGE			
JobroleD	The work I am doing at the faculty is very challenging	7d	

## JOB LEVEL

Position	Which of the following best describes your current rank at the faculty?	2
Positi11	Which of the following best describes your current rank at the faculty? (please specify) (Open)	2

## ROLE CONFLICT

JobroleE	I have to do things that should be done in a different way	7e
JobroleF	I work under incompatible policies and guidelines	7f

## ROLE AMBIGUITY

JobroleG	I have divided my working time properly	7g
JobroleH	I know exactly what my responsibilities are	7h
JobroleI	I know exactly what the faculty expects of me	7i

## LEVEL OF AUTONOMY

JobroleJ	I have the freedom to do many different things in my job	7j
JobroleK	I have the possibility of independent thought in my job	7k
JobroleL	I have the freedom to do what I want in my job	7l

## WORK HOURS (PART-TIME/FULL-TIME)

Workhour	How many hours do you formally work per week, excluding any overtime?	5
----------	---	---

## ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE

WorkstrA	There is a sense of community among my colleagues	14a
WorkstrB	My colleagues trust each other	14b
WorkstrC	I can always get assistance from my colleagues if I ask for it	14c
WorkstrD	In the faculty, everyone is treated fairly	14d

## SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT

WorkstrE	Working with colleagues is a central part of my job	14e
WorkstrF	In my job, I have the possibility to support colleagues	14f
WorkstrG	In my job, I have the possibility to talk to other employees about other things than 'business'	14g
WorkstrH	My job is often solitary	14h
WorkstrI	In my job, I have the possibility to develop close friendships	14i

## PERSONAL IMPORTANCE

WorkstrJ	My contribution is important for the larger aims of this faculty	14j
----------	--	-----

## FORMALISATION

WorkstrK	The faculty has clear rules and regulations that everyone is expected to follow closely	14k
----------	---	-----

### 2.1.4 Organisational commitment

Name	Label	Q	P
<b>AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT</b>			
AffcommA	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the faculty	15a	
AffcommB	I enjoy discussing the faculty in a positive sense with people outside it	15b	
AffcommC	I really feel as if the faculty's problems are my own	15c	
AffcommD	I easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one	15d	
AffcommE	I feel like 'part of the family' at the faculty	15e	
AffcommF	The faculty has a great deal of personal meaning for me	15f	
<b>CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT</b>			
ConcommA	I am afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up	15g	
ConcommB	It would be hard for me to leave the faculty right now	15h	
ConcommC	Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave the faculty now	15i	
ConcommD	I could leave the faculty at no cost now	15j	
ConcommE	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving the faculty	15k	
ConcommF	I continue to work for the faculty because leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice	15l	
<b>NORMATIVE COMMITMENT</b>			
NorcommA	Employees generally move from organisation to organisation too often	15m	
NorcommB	I do not mind at all when employees jump from organisation to organisation	15n	
NorcommC	If I got offered a job elsewhere I would feel uncomfortable to leave the faculty	15o	
NorcommD	I believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation	15p	
NorcommE	Nowadays, things are better than in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers	15q	
NorcommF	I think that wanting to be a 'company man or woman' is still sensible	15r	

### 2.1.5 Quality of performances

Name	Label	Q	P
<b>QUALITY OF PERFORMANCES IN PERCENTAGES</b>			
QualperA	The overall quality of your performances	16a	
QualperB	The quality of your research performances	16b	
QualperC	The quality of your teaching performances	16c	
QualperD	The quality of your management performances	16d	

QUALITY OF PERFORMANCES IN ACTIVITIES

QualactA	Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals (Open)	17a
QualacA1	Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals (Not applicable)	17a
QualactB	Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals (Open)	17b
QualacB1	Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals (Not applicable)	17b
QualactC	Number of published chapters in edited volumes (Open)	17c
QualacC1	Number of published chapters in edited volumes (Not applicable)	17c
QualactD	Number of textbooks, or other books (Open)	17d
QualacD1	Number of textbooks, or other books (Not applicable)	17d
QualactE	Number of research reports disseminated internally or to external clients (Open)	17e
QualacE1	Number of research reports disseminated internally or to external clients (Not applicable)	17e
QualactF	Presentations at conferences and/or workshops (Open)	17f
QualacF1	Presentations at conferences and/or workshops (Not applicable)	17f

2.1.6 Workplace

Name	Label	Q	P
Workplac	At which faculty are you employed?	1	

## 2.2 Guide to the codebook

To illustrate the layout of the documentation of the variables documented in Section 2.3, an example is given in Figure 1. The letters in parentheses refer to the notes presented below the figure.

**Figure 1** Example of the layout of the documentation of the variables

(a) <b>Example</b>	(b) This is the label of the example variable				
(c)	QI: 6c				
(d)	Condition: only asked if position is code 9 or code 10				
	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
	0	Don't know	327	14.1	
	1	Does not apply at all	343	14.8	15.7
	2	Applies very little	312	13.4	16.4
	3	Applies to some extent	435	18.7	14.9
	4	Applies to a large extent	305	13.1	20.8
	5	Applies completely	366	15.7	14.6
	888	System missing	197	8.5	17.5
	999	Missing value	40	1.7	
(j)	Mean: 2.55, standard deviation: 1.693				

<sup>(a)</sup> indicates the variable name used in the SPSS file.

<sup>(b)</sup> indicates the variable label used in the SPSS file.

<sup>(c)</sup> indicates the question identification (QI) which refers to the question or statement in the original questionnaire.

<sup>(d)</sup> indicates the condition under which a question or statement was submitted to the respondent. It refers to an answer given to a preceding question or statement. This line is omitted when a question or statement was submitted to all respondents.

<sup>(e)</sup> indicates the code values for the single answer categories.

<sup>(f)</sup> indicates the value labels.

<sup>(g)</sup> indicates the absolute frequencies of the variable.

<sup>(h)</sup> indicates the relative frequencies of the variable.

<sup>(i)</sup> indicates the relative frequencies of the variable adjusted for system missings and missing values.

<sup>(j)</sup> indicates the mean and standard deviation of the variable.

## 2.3 Documentation of the variables

### 2.3.1 Level of managerialism

**ManagerA** The number of study disciplines in the faculty has increased since I started working here

QI: 6a

0	Don't know	327	14.1	15.7
1	Does not apply at all	343	14.8	16.4
2	Applies very little	312	13.4	14.9
3	Applies to some extent	435	18.7	20.8
4	Applies to a large extent	305	13.1	14.6
5	Applies completely	366	15.7	17.5
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	40	1.7	

Mean: 2.55, standard deviation: 1.691

**ManagerB** The number of student enrolments to the faculty has increased since I started working here

QI: 6b

0	Don't know	367	15.8	17.6
1	Does not apply at all	197	8.5	9.4
2	Applies very little	201	8.6	9.6
3	Applies to some extent	349	15.0	16.7
4	Applies to a large extent	362	15.6	17.3
5	Applies completely	613	26.4	29.3
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	39	1.7	

Mean: 2.95, standard deviation: 1.844

**ManagerC** The faculty is under pressure to compete with similar faculties at other universities

QI: 6c

0	Don't know	135	5.8	6.5
1	Does not apply at all	32	1.4	1.5
2	Applies very little	193	8.3	9.2
3	Applies to some extent	591	25.4	28.3
4	Applies to a large extent	669	28.8	32.1
5	Applies completely	467	20.1	22.4
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	41	1.8	

Mean: 3.45, standard deviation: 1.323

**ManagerD** Explicit measuring standards are the largest part of the quality evaluation in the faculty

QI: 6d

0	Don't know	455	19.6	21.9
1	Does not apply at all	112	4.8	5.4
2	Applies very little	382	16.4	18.4
3	Applies to some extent	557	24.0	26.8
4	Applies to a large extent	433	18.6	20.8
5	Applies completely	139	6.0	6.7
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	50	2.2	

Mean: 2.39, standard deviation: 1.575

**ManagerE** In the faculty, the evaluation of teaching and research is mainly carried out with assessment criteria set by 'the managers', rather than by 'peers'

QI: 6e

0	Don't know	388	16.7	18.6
1	Does not apply at all	248	10.7	11.9
2	Applies very little	522	22.5	25.0
3	Applies to some extent	458	19.7	21.9
4	Applies to a large extent	342	14.7	16.4
5	Applies completely	133	5.7	6.4
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	37	1.6	

Mean: 2.25, standard deviation: 1.499

**ManagerF** The faculty has increasingly applied private sector management techniques, such as performance management and efficiency controlling

QI: 6f

0	Don't know	367	15.8	17.6
1	Does not apply at all	274	11.8	13.1
2	Applies very little	511	22.0	24.5
3	Applies to some extent	548	23.6	26.2
4	Applies to a large extent	282	12.1	13.5
5	Applies completely	106	4.6	5.1
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	40	1.7	

Mean: 2.20, standard deviation: 1.433

**ManagerG** The faculty is under pressure to reduce expenditures

QI: 6g

0	Don't know	167	7.2	8.0
1	Does not apply at all	41	1.8	2.0
2	Applies very little	123	5.3	5.9
3	Applies to some extent	444	19.1	21.3
4	Applies to a large extent	518	22.3	24.9
5	Applies completely	788	33.9	37.9
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	47	2.0	

Mean: 3.67, standard deviation: 1.476



**ManagerH** The faculty's management is characterised by a control orientation rather than a developmental orientation

QI: 6h

0	Don't know	358	15.4	17.2
1	Does not apply at all	184	7.9	8.8
2	Applies very little	566	24.3	27.1
3	Applies to some extent	487	20.9	23.4
4	Applies to a large extent	333	14.3	16.0
5	Applies completely	157	6.8	7.5
888	System missing	197	8.5	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	

Mean: 2.35, standard deviation: 1.485

### 2.3.2 Human Resource Management practices

**HRMA** I monitor data on my productivity

QI: 10a

1	Does not apply at all	453	19.5	23.4
2	Applies very little	429	18.5	22.2
3	Applies to some extent	589	25.3	30.5
4	Applies to a large extent	368	15.8	19.0
5	Applies completely	95	4.1	4.9
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	60	2.6	

Mean: 2.60, standard deviation: 1.177

**HRMB** I determine my work flow (tasks-ordering)

QI: 10b

1	Does not apply at all	59	2.5	3.0
2	Applies very little	167	7.2	8.6
3	Applies to some extent	499	21.5	25.6
4	Applies to a large extent	902	38.8	46.3
5	Applies completely	320	13.8	16.4
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	47	2.0	

Mean: 3.65, standard deviation: .955

**HRMC** I have the possibility to develop new research and/or teaching programs

QI: 10c

1	Does not apply at all	334	14.4	17.2
2	Applies very little	289	12.4	14.9
3	Applies to some extent	516	22.2	26.5
4	Applies to a large extent	584	25.1	30.0
5	Applies completely	221	9.5	11.4
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	50	2.2	

Mean: 3.04, standard deviation: 1.261

**HRMD**

I have part in faculty decisions about investments in new projects

*QI: 10d*

1	Does not apply at all	924	39.7	47.4
2	Applies very little	507	21.8	26.0
3	Applies to some extent	328	14.1	16.8
4	Applies to a large extent	144	6.2	7.4
5	Applies completely	48	2.1	2.5
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	

Mean: 1.92, standard deviation: 1.073

**Salary**

How would you rate your academic salary?

*QI: 8*

1	Very inferior to my efforts	192	8.3	9.8
2	Inferior to my efforts	799	34.4	40.8
3	In balance with my efforts	899	38.7	45.9
4	Passes my efforts a bit	55	2.4	2.8
5	Passes my efforts easily	13	.6	.7
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	36	1.5	

Mean: 2.44, standard deviation: .734

**HRME**

I am given the possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work

*QI: 10e*

1	Does not apply at all	101	4.3	5.2
2	Applies very little	322	13.8	16.5
3	Applies to some extent	706	30.4	36.1
4	Applies to a large extent	662	28.5	33.9
5	Applies completely	162	7.0	8.3
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	41	1.8	

Mean: 3.24, standard deviation: .994

**HRMF**

I am satisfied with my possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work

*QI: 10f*

1	Does not apply at all	155	6.7	7.9
2	Applies very little	385	16.6	19.7
3	Applies to some extent	640	27.5	32.8
4	Applies to a large extent	619	26.6	31.7
5	Applies completely	153	6.6	7.8
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	42	1.8	

Mean: 3.12, standard deviation: 1.064

**HRMG**

There should be more employee involvement

QI: 10g

1	Does not apply at all	144	6.2	7.5
2	Applies very little	509	21.9	26.4
3	Applies to some extent	742	31.9	38.5
4	Applies to a large extent	403	17.3	20.9
5	Applies completely	129	5.5	6.7
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	67	2.9	

Mean: 2.93, standard deviation: 1.018

**HRMH**

I wish to have more say in decisions about my work

QI: 10h

1	Does not apply at all	258	11.1	13.2
2	Applies very little	676	29.1	34.7
3	Applies to some extent	623	26.8	32.0
4	Applies to a large extent	287	12.3	14.7
5	Applies completely	104	4.5	5.3
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	46	2.0	

Mean: 2.64, standard deviation: 1.054

**TrainiA1**

Off-the-job activities such as classes or workshops, away from your immediate work area (Open)

QI: 9a

	0 days	51	2.2	64.6
	1 day	4	.2	5.1
	2 days	4	.2	5.1
	3 days	4	.2	5.1
	4 days	3	.1	3.8
	5 days	4	.2	5.1
	7 days	2	.1	2.5
	10 days	5	.2	6.3
	15 days	1	.0	1.3
	120 days	1	.0	1.3
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	1915	82.4	

**TraininA**

Off-the-job activities such as classes or workshops, away from your immediate work area (Not applicable)

QI: 9a

0	Not applicable	706	30.4	100.0
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	1288	55.4	

**TrainiB1** On-the-job general skills training not directly related to your current job  
(Open)  
*QI: 9b*

	0 days	53	2.3	77.9
	1 day	2	.1	2.9
	2 days	6	.3	8.8
	3 days	1	.0	1.5
	5 days	3	.1	4.4
	10 days	2	.1	2.9
	20 days	1	.0	1.5
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	1926	82.8	

**TraininB** On-the-job general skills training not directly related to your current job  
(Not applicable)  
*QI: 9b*

0	Not applicable	1047	45.0	100.0
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	947	40.7	

**TrainiC1** On-the-job general skills training directly related to your current job (Open)  
*QI: 9c*

	0 days	40	1.7	64.5
	1 day	5	.2	8.1
	2 days	3	.1	4.8
	3 days	1	.0	1.6
	4 days	2	.1	3.2
	5 days	5	.2	8.1
	7 days	1	.0	1.6
	10 days	2	.1	3.2
	20 days	1	.0	1.6
	50 days	1	.0	1.6
	64 days	1	.0	1.6
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	1932	83.1	

**TraininC** On-the-job general skills training directly related to your current job  
(Not applicable)  
*QI: 9c*

0	Not applicable	830	35.7	100.0
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	1164	50.1	

**HRM2A** This faculty does enough to avoid layoffs  
*QI: 11a*

1	Totally disagree	131	5.6	6.8
2	Disagree	319	13.7	16.6
3	Neutral	931	40.0	48.5
4	Agree	454	19.5	23.7
5	Totally agree	84	3.6	4.4
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	75	3.2	

Mean: 3.02, standard deviation: .922

**HRM2B** I frequently have off-the-job contacts with my colleagues  
*QI: 11b*

1	Totally disagree	140	6.0	7.2
2	Disagree	478	20.6	24.6
3	Neutral	480	20.6	24.7
4	Agree	702	30.2	36.1
5	Totally agree	146	6.3	7.5
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	48	2.1	

Mean: 3.12, standard deviation: 1.086

**HRM2C** I feel a part of my department  
*QI: 11c*

1	Totally disagree	60	2.6	3.1
2	Disagree	157	6.8	8.1
3	Neutral	330	14.2	17.0
4	Agree	995	42.8	51.1
5	Totally agree	404	17.4	20.8
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	48	2.1	

Mean: 3.78, standard deviation: .965

**HRM2D** I feel a part of my faculty  
*QI: 11d*

1	Totally disagree	117	5.0	6.0
2	Disagree	306	13.2	15.7
3	Neutral	592	25.5	30.4
4	Agree	765	32.9	39.3
5	Totally agree	168	7.2	8.6
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	46	2.0	

Mean: 3.29, standard deviation: 1.026

**Mgtstyle**

Which of the following phrases characterises best the top management at your faculty?

QI: 12

1	Laissez-faire management <sup>1</sup>	114	4.9	6.1
2	Management people's needs <sup>2</sup>	43	1.8	2.3
3	Management of efficiency <sup>3</sup>	396	17.0	21.3
4	Middle management <sup>4</sup>	686	29.5	36.9
5	Ideal management <sup>5</sup>	619	26.6	33.3
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	136	5.8	

Mean: 3.89, standard deviation: 1.086

<sup>1</sup> Neither care for the employees nor for the interest of the organisation

<sup>2</sup> Full care for the employees but no care for the interest of the organisation

<sup>3</sup> No care for the employees but full care for the interest of the organisation

<sup>4</sup> Little care for the employees and little care for the interest of the organisation

<sup>5</sup> Full care for the employees and full care for the interest of the organisation

**HRM2E**

I am adequately informed about what is going on in this faculty

QI: 11e

1	Totally disagree	98	4.2	5.0
2	Disagree	392	16.9	20.1
3	Neutral	604	26.0	31.0
4	Agree	749	32.2	38.5
5	Totally agree	104	4.5	5.3
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	47	2.0	

Mean: 3.19, standard deviation: .983

**HRM2F**

I am adequately informed about changes that affect my job

QI: 11f

1	Totally disagree	89	3.8	4.6
2	Disagree	357	15.4	18.4
3	Neutral	545	23.4	28.0
4	Agree	845	36.3	43.5
5	Totally agree	107	4.6	5.5
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	51	2.2	

Mean: 3.27, standard deviation: .975

**Perfappr**

On a scale from 1 to 5, towards which of the two styles does the performance appraisal in your faculty tends?

QI: 13

1	A <sup>1</sup>	268	11.5	14.2
2	More A than B <sup>2</sup>	616	26.5	32.5
3	Neutral/both	525	22.6	27.7
4	More B than A	412	17.7	21.8
5	B	72	3.1	3.8
888	System missing	331	14.2	
999	Missing value	101	4.3	

Mean: 2.69, standard deviation: 1.078

<sup>1</sup> It is focussed on control and emphasises accountability and performance measurement

<sup>2</sup> It is focussed on individual strengths and weaknesses, and emphasises development of competences

### 2.3.3 Antecedents

**Age**

What is your age?

QI: 18

18	1	.0	.1
20	1	.0	.1
22	4	.2	.2
23	19	.8	1.0
24	59	2.5	3.1
25	73	3.1	3.8
26	86	3.7	4.5
27	97	4.2	5.1
28	97	4.2	5.1
29	89	3.8	4.7
30	81	3.5	4.3
31	67	2.9	3.5
32	63	2.7	3.3
33	60	2.6	3.2
34	56	2.4	3.0
35	50	2.2	2.6
36	46	2.0	2.4
37	51	2.2	2.7
38	47	2.0	2.5
39	54	2.3	2.8
40	52	2.2	2.7
41	36	1.5	1.9
42	47	2.0	2.5
43	34	1.5	1.8
44	30	1.3	1.6
45	28	1.2	1.5
46	27	1.2	1.4
47	30	1.3	1.6
48	28	1.2	1.5

49		22	.9	1.2
50		43	1.8	2.3
51		23	1.0	1.2
52		31	1.3	1.6
53		19	.8	1.0
54		33	1.4	1.7
55		40	1.7	2.1
56		32	1.4	1.7
57		36	1.5	1.9
58		36	1.5	1.9
59		24	1.0	1.3
60		34	1.5	1.8
61		30	1.3	1.6
62		27	1.2	1.4
63		13	.6	.7
64		19	.8	1.0
65		6	.3	.3
66		5	.2	.3
67		3	.1	.2
68		1	.0	.1
70		2	.1	.1
71		1	.0	.1
72		1	.0	.1
74		1	.0	.1
75		1	.0	.1
77		1	.0	.1
888	System missing	396	17.0	
999	Missing value	32	1.4	
Mean: 39.30, standard deviation: 12.014				

## Sex

What is your sex?

Q1: 19

1	Male	1092	47.0	57.4
2	Female	810	34.8	42.6
888	System missing	395	17.0	
999	Missing value	28	1.2	

## Educatio

What is the highest degree of education you have completed?

Q1: 21

1	High school (grammar school)	34	1.5	1.8
2	Some college	39	1.7	2.0
3	Bachelor's degree	100	4.3	5.2
4	Master's degree	856	36.8	44.8
5	Doctor's degree	829	35.7	43.4
6	Other (please specify) <sup>1</sup>	53	2.3	2.8
888	System missing	395	17.0	
999	Missing value	19	.8	

Mean: 4.35, standard deviation: .851

<sup>1</sup> Educati6



**Educati6**

What is the highest degree of education you have completed? (please specify)

(Open)

Q1: 21

	Pre-university	1	.0	.0
	Art School	1	.0	.0
	MHCIMA <sup>1</sup>	1	.0	.0
	Postvocational diploma	1	.0	.0
	Postgraduate diploma	3	.1	.1
	Licentiate degree <sup>2</sup>	25	1.1	1.1
	Habilitation	21	.9	.9
888	System missing	416	17.9	
999	Missing value	1856	79.8	

Mean: 4.34, standard deviation: .850

<sup>1</sup> Member, Hotel Catering and Institutional Management Association<sup>2</sup> Between Master and Doctor<sup>3</sup> German degree after Doctor**Orgtenur**

In what year did you start working at the faculty?

Q1: 3

	1926	1	.0	.0
	1954	1	.0	.0
	1958	1	.0	.0
	1959	1	.0	.0
	1960	1	.0	.0
	1961	1	.0	.0
	1962	1	.0	.0
	1963	1	.0	.0
	1964	5	.2	.2
	1965	5	.2	.2
	1966	3	.1	.1
	1967	7	.3	.3
	1968	11	.5	.5
	1969	13	.6	.6
	1970	12	.5	.5
	1971	21	.9	.9
	1972	11	.5	.5
	1973	16	.7	.7
	1974	19	.8	.8
	1975	20	.9	.9
	1976	25	1.1	1.1
	1977	15	.6	.7
	1978	16	.7	.7
	1979	9	.4	.4
	1980	12	.5	.5
	1981	10	.4	.4
	1982	17	.7	.7
	1983	11	.5	.5
	1984	20	.9	.9

1985	27	1.2	1.2
1986	22	.9	1.0
1987	25	1.1	1.1
1988	29	1.2	1.3
1989	35	1.5	1.5
1990	35	1.5	1.5
1991	25	1.1	1.1
1992	49	2.1	2.1
1993	40	1.7	1.7
1994	58	2.5	2.5
1995	50	2.2	2.2
1996	62	2.7	2.7
1997	88	3.8	3.8
1998	106	4.6	4.6
1999	147	6.3	6.4
2000	223	9.6	9.7
2001	258	11.1	11.2
2002	338	14.5	14.7
2003	314	13.5	13.6
2004	87	3.7	3.8
999	Missing value	21	.9

---

Mean: 1995.88, standard deviation: 9.338

---

**Postenur**

In what year did you start working at the position you currently have at the faculty?

Q1: 4

1943	1	.0	.0
1969	2	.1	.1
1970	3	.1	.1
1971	3	.1	.1
1972	1	.0	.0
1973	3	.1	.1
1974	5	.2	.2
1975	11	.5	.5
1976	11	.5	.5
1977	3	.1	.1
1978	8	.3	.3
1979	5	.2	.2
1980	12	.5	.5
1981	4	.2	.2
1982	10	.4	.4
1983	1	.0	.0
1984	11	.5	.5
1985	14	.6	.6
1986	6	.3	.3
1987	11	.5	.5
1988	13	.6	.6
1989	24	1.0	1.0
1990	25	1.1	1.1
1991	16	.7	.7
1992	31	1.3	1.3
1993	18	.8	.8
1994	31	1.3	1.3
1995	37	1.6	1.6
1996	36	1.5	1.6
1997	47	2.0	2.0
1998	76	3.3	3.3
1999	118	5.1	5.1
2000	227	9.8	9.9
2001	310	13.3	13.5
2002	421	18.1	18.3
2003	456	19.6	19.8
2004	288	12.4	12.5
999	Missing value	26	1.1

Mean: 1999.57, standard deviation: 5.958

**Partner**

Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

*Q1: 20*

1	1	456	19.6	24.0
2	2	747	32.1	39.3
3	3	269	11.6	14.1
4	4	299	12.9	15.7
5	5 or more	131	5.6	6.9
888	System missing	396	17.0	
999	Missing value	27	1.2	

Mean: 2.42, standard deviation: 1.205

**JobroleA**

It is important for me to do my work the best I can

*Q1: 7a*

1	Totally disagree	3	.1	.1
2	Disagree	17	.7	.8
3	Neutral	63	2.7	3.0
4	Agree	845	36.3	40.8
5	Totally agree	1143	49.2	55.2
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	27	1.2	

Mean: 4.50, standard deviation: .615

**JobroleB**

It is important for me to work hard, even if I don't like the work

*Q1: 7b*

1	Totally disagree	88	3.8	4.3
2	Disagree	418	18.0	20.2
3	Neutral	526	22.6	25.5
4	Agree	833	35.8	40.3
5	Totally agree	200	8.6	9.7
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	33	1.4	

Mean: 3.31, standard deviation: 1.034

**JobroleC**

I have real opportunities for career development in the faculty

*Q1: 7c*

1	Totally disagree	307	13.2	14.9
2	Disagree	586	25.2	28.4
3	Neutral	633	27.2	30.7
4	Agree	443	19.1	21.5
5	Totally agree	95	4.1	4.6
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	34	1.5	

Mean: 2.73, standard deviation: 1.097

**JobroleD**

The work I am doing at the faculty is very challenging

QI: 7d

1	Totally disagree	13	.6	.6
2	Disagree	108	4.6	5.2
3	Neutral	390	16.8	18.8
4	Agree	1134	48.8	54.7
5	Totally agree	427	18.4	20.6
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	26	1.1	

Mean: 3.89, standard deviation: .805

**Position**

Which of the following best describes your current rank at the faculty?

QI: 2

1	Dean	16	.7	.7
2	Professor	259	11.1	11.2
3	Associate professor	186	8.0	8.0
4	Assistant professor	219	9.4	9.5
5	Lecturer	203	8.7	8.8
6	Researcher	341	14.7	14.7
7	Ph.D. student	637	27.4	27.6
8	Other scientific staff	67	2.9	2.9
9	Support & admin. staff	325	14.0	14.1
10	Student assistant	32	1.4	1.4
11	Other (please specify) <sup>1</sup>	27	1.2	1.2
999	Missing value	13	.6	

Mean: 5.87, standard deviation: 2.305

<sup>1</sup> Position**Positi11**

Which of the following best describes your current rank at the faculty?

(please specify) (Open)

QI: 2

	Board member	1	.0	.0
	Professor emeritus	13	.6	.6
	Visiting Professor	2	.1	.1
	Reader	2	.1	.1
	Thesis advisor/coordinator	1	.0	.0
	Monitor	1	.0	.0
	International Student Counsellor	1	.0	.0
	Editor	1	.0	.0
	Programme manager	1	.0	.0
	Planning officer	1	.0	.0
	Retired teaching fellow	1	.0	.0
	Language instructor	1	.0	.0
	Foreign language assistant	1	.0	.0
888	System missing	148	6.4	
999	Missing value	2150	92.5	

**JobroleE** I have to do things that should be done in a different way

QI: 7e

1	Totally disagree	116	5.0	5.6
2	Disagree	621	26.7	30.2
3	Neutral	616	26.5	29.9
4	Agree	585	25.2	28.4
5	Totally agree	121	5.2	5.9
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	39	1.7	

Mean: 2.99, standard deviation: 1.023

**JobroleF** I work under incompatible policies and guidelines

QI: 7f

1	Totally disagree	210	9.0	10.2
2	Disagree	743	32.0	36.1
3	Neutral	568	24.4	27.6
4	Agree	429	18.5	20.8
5	Totally agree	108	4.6	5.2
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	40	1.7	

Mean: 2.75, standard deviation: 1.061

**JobroleG** I have divided my working time properly

QI: 7g

1	Totally disagree	56	2.4	2.7
2	Disagree	400	17.2	19.4
3	Neutral	562	24.2	27.3
4	Agree	894	38.5	43.4
5	Totally agree	147	6.3	7.1
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	39	1.7	

Mean: 3.33, standard deviation: .957

**JobroleH** I know exactly what my responsibilities are

QI: 7h

1	Totally disagree	21	.9	1.0
2	Disagree	214	9.2	10.4
3	Neutral	333	14.3	16.1
4	Agree	1132	48.7	54.8
5	Totally agree	367	15.8	17.8
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	31	1.3	

Mean: 3.78, standard deviation: .892

**JobroleI** I know exactly what the faculty expects of me  
*QI: 7i*

1	Totally disagree	63	2.7	3.0
2	Disagree	372	16.0	18.0
3	Neutral	569	24.5	27.5
4	Agree	890	38.3	43.1
5	Totally agree	172	7.4	8.3
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	32	1.4	
Mean: 3.36, standard deviation: .969				

**JobroleJ** I have the freedom to do many different things in my job  
*QI: 7j*

1	Totally disagree	15	.6	.7
2	Disagree	122	5.2	5.9
3	Neutral	218	9.4	10.5
4	Agree	1170	50.3	56.5
5	Totally agree	545	23.4	26.3
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	28	1.2	
Mean: 4.02, standard deviation: .818				

**JobroleK** I have the possibility of independent thought in my job  
*QI: 7k*

1	Totally disagree	12	.5	.6
2	Disagree	58	2.5	2.8
3	Neutral	137	5.9	6.6
4	Agree	1044	44.9	50.4
5	Totally agree	819	35.2	39.6
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	28	1.2	
Mean: 4.26, standard deviation: .749				

**JobroleL** I have the freedom to do what I want in my job  
*QI: 7l*

1	Totally disagree	32	1.4	1.5
2	Disagree	343	14.8	16.6
3	Neutral	468	20.1	22.6
4	Agree	972	41.8	46.9
5	Totally agree	257	11.1	12.4
888	System missing	227	9.8	
999	Missing value	26	1.1	
Mean: 3.52, standard deviation: .960				

**Workhour**

How many hours do you formally work per week, excluding any overtime?  
Q1: 5

0	5	.2	.2
1	10	.4	.4
2	5	.2	.2
4	8	.3	.4
5	3	.1	.1
6	7	.3	.3
7	4	.2	.2
8	33	1.4	1.4
9	3	.1	.1
10	9	.4	.4
11	4	.2	.2
12	16	.7	.7
13	4	.2	.2
15	9	.4	.4
16	19	.8	.8
17	2	.1	.1
18	9	.4	.4
19	21	.9	.9
20	72	3.1	3.2
21	5	.2	.2
22	3	.1	.1
23	6	.3	.3
24	42	1.8	1.8
25	8	.3	.4
26	3	.1	.1
27	9	.4	.4
28	24	1.0	1.1
29	3	.1	.1
30	53	2.3	2.3
31	4	.2	.2
32	159	6.8	7.0
33	2	.1	.1
34	15	.6	.7
35	54	2.3	2.4
36	55	2.4	2.4
37	52	2.2	2.3
38	480	20.6	21.0
39	23	1.0	1.0
40	871	37.5	38.2
41	3	.1	.1
42	20	.9	.9
43	2	.1	.1
44	4	.2	.2
45	41	1.8	1.8
46	1	.0	.0
48	7	.3	.3
50	91	3.9	4.0
999 Missing value	42	1.8	
Mean: 35.49, standard deviation: 9.101			



**WorkstrA** There is a sense of community among my colleagues

QI: 14a

1	Totally disagree	66	2.8	3.4
2	Disagree	248	10.7	12.8
3	Neutral	509	21.9	26.3
4	Agree	946	40.7	48.9
5	Totally agree	165	7.1	8.5
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	33	1.4	

Mean: 3.46, standard deviation: .939

**WorkstrB** My colleagues trust each other

QI: 14b

1	Totally disagree	45	1.9	2.3
2	Disagree	281	12.1	14.6
3	Neutral	604	26.0	31.3
4	Agree	878	37.8	45.5
5	Totally agree	123	5.3	6.4
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	36	1.5	

Mean: 3.39, standard deviation: .893

**WorkstrC** I can always get assistance from my colleagues if I ask for it

QI: 14c

1	Totally disagree	33	1.4	1.7
2	Disagree	149	6.4	7.7
3	Neutral	354	15.2	18.3
4	Agree	1113	47.9	57.5
5	Totally agree	288	12.4	14.9
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	30	1.3	

Mean: 3.76, standard deviation: .858

**WorkstrD** In the faculty, everyone is treated fairly

QI: 14d

1	Totally disagree	158	6.8	8.2
2	Disagree	510	21.9	26.5
3	Neutral	743	32.0	38.6
4	Agree	470	20.2	24.4
5	Totally agree	46	2.0	2.4
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	40	1.7	

Mean: 2.86, standard deviation: .956

**WorkstrE** Working with colleagues is a central part of my job*QI: 14e*

1	Totally disagree	121	5.2	6.3
2	Disagree	450	19.4	23.3
3	Neutral	469	20.2	24.2
4	Agree	713	30.7	36.8
5	Totally agree	182	7.8	9.4
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	32	1.4	

Mean: 3.20, standard deviation: 1.090

**WorkstrF** In my job, I have the possibility to support colleagues*QI: 14f*

1	Totally disagree	15	.6	.8
2	Disagree	78	3.4	4.0
3	Neutral	287	12.3	14.9
4	Agree	1261	54.2	65.3
5	Totally agree	290	12.5	15.0
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	36	1.5	

Mean: 3.90, standard deviation: .721

**WorkstrG** In my job, I have the possibility to talk to other employees about other things than 'business'*QI: 14g*

1	Totally disagree	16	.7	.8
2	Disagree	78	3.4	4.0
3	Neutral	232	10.0	12.0
4	Agree	1205	51.8	62.2
5	Totally agree	405	17.4	20.9
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	31	1.3	

Mean: 3.98, standard deviation: .751

**WorkstrH** My job is often solitary*QI: 14h*

1	Totally disagree	36	1.5	1.9
2	Disagree	303	13.0	15.7
3	Neutral	384	16.5	19.9
4	Agree	877	37.7	45.4
5	Totally agree	331	14.2	17.1
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	36	1.5	

Mean: 3.60, standard deviation: 1.004

**Workstrl** In my job, I have the possibility to develop close friendships  
*QI: 14i*

1	Totally disagree	51	2.2	2.6
2	Disagree	221	9.5	11.4
3	Neutral	576	24.8	29.8
4	Agree	890	38.3	46.0
5	Totally agree	195	8.4	10.1
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	34	1.5	

Mean: 3.50, standard deviation: .916

**Workstrj** My contribution is important for the larger aims of this faculty  
*QI: 14j*

1	Totally disagree	60	2.6	3.1
2	Disagree	256	11.0	13.3
3	Neutral	622	26.8	32.2
4	Agree	848	36.5	43.9
5	Totally agree	144	6.2	7.5
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	37	1.6	

Mean: 3.39, standard deviation: .917

**WorkstrK** The faculty has clear rules and regulations that everyone is expected to follow closely  
*QI: 14k*

1	Totally disagree	112	4.8	5.8
2	Disagree	721	31.0	37.4
3	Neutral	711	30.6	36.8
4	Agree	359	15.4	18.6
5	Totally agree	27	1.2	1.4
888	System missing	358	15.4	
999	Missing value	37	1.6	

Mean: 2.72, standard deviation: .879

### 2.3.4 Organisational commitment

**AffcommA** I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the faculty  
*QI: 15a*

1	Totally disagree	185	8.0	9.7
2	Disagree	426	18.3	22.3
3	Neutral	656	28.2	34.4
4	Agree	530	22.8	27.8
5	Totally agree	111	4.8	5.8
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	36	1.5	

Mean: 2.98, standard deviation: 1.059

**AffcommB** I enjoy discussing the faculty in a positive sense with people outside it  
*QI: 15b*

1	Totally disagree	94	4.0	4.9
2	Disagree	338	14.5	17.7
3	Neutral	708	30.5	37.1
4	Agree	684	29.4	35.9
5	Totally agree	83	3.6	4.4
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	37	1.6	

Mean: 3.17, standard deviation: .937

**AffcommC** I really feel as if the faculty's problems are my own  
*QI: 15c*

1	Totally disagree	275	11.8	14.5
2	Disagree	738	31.7	38.8
3	Neutral	561	24.1	29.5
4	Agree	296	12.7	15.6
5	Totally agree	32	1.4	1.7
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	42	1.8	

Mean: 2.51, standard deviation: .976

**AffcommD** I easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one  
*QI: 15d*

1	Totally disagree	55	2.4	2.9
2	Disagree	379	16.3	19.9
3	Neutral	751	32.3	39.4
4	Agree	615	26.5	32.3
5	Totally agree	106	4.6	5.6
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	38	1.6	

Mean: 3.18, standard deviation: .910

**AffcommE** I feel like 'part of the family' at the faculty  
*QI: 15e*

1	Totally disagree	226	9.7	11.9
2	Disagree	589	25.3	30.9
3	Neutral	636	27.4	33.4
4	Agree	416	17.9	21.8
5	Totally agree	39	1.7	2.0
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	38	1.6	
Mean: 2.71, standard deviation: 1.001				

**AffcommF** The faculty has a great deal of personal meaning for me  
*QI: 15f*

1	Totally disagree	180	7.7	9.4
2	Disagree	569	24.5	29.8
3	Neutral	660	28.4	34.6
4	Agree	446	19.2	23.4
5	Totally agree	54	2.3	2.8
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	35	1.5	
Mean: 2.80, standard deviation: .992				

**ConcommA** I am afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up  
*QI: 15g*

1	Totally disagree	142	6.1	7.5
2	Disagree	353	15.2	18.6
3	Neutral	362	15.6	19.0
4	Agree	727	31.3	38.2
5	Totally agree	317	13.6	16.7
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	
Mean: 3.38, standard deviation: 1.179				

**ConcommB** It would be hard for me to leave the faculty right now  
*QI: 15h*

1	Totally disagree	132	5.7	7.0
2	Disagree	343	14.8	18.1
3	Neutral	374	16.1	19.7
4	Agree	845	36.3	44.5
5	Totally agree	204	8.8	10.7
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	46	2.0	
Mean: 3.34, standard deviation: 1.104				

**ConcommC** Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave the faculty now  
*QI: 15i*

1	Totally disagree	167	7.2	8.8
2	Disagree	482	20.7	25.4
3	Neutral	406	17.5	21.4
4	Agree	663	28.5	34.9
5	Totally agree	183	7.9	9.6
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	
Mean: 3.11, standard deviation: 1.152				

**ConcommD** I could leave the faculty at no cost now  
*QI: 15j*

1	Totally disagree	298	12.8	15.7
2	Disagree	828	35.6	43.6
3	Neutral	425	18.3	22.4
4	Agree	272	11.7	14.3
5	Totally agree	75	3.2	4.0
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	46	2.0	
Mean: 2.47, standard deviation: 1.043				

**ConcommE** I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving the faculty  
*QI: 15k*

1	Totally disagree	185	8.0	9.7
2	Disagree	578	24.9	30.4
3	Neutral	498	21.4	26.2
4	Agree	518	22.3	27.2
5	Totally agree	123	5.3	6.5
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	42	1.8	
Mean: 2.90, standard deviation: 1.102				

**ConcommF** I continue to work for the faculty because leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice  
*QI: 15l*

1	Totally disagree	212	9.1	11.2
2	Disagree	611	26.3	32.1
3	Neutral	490	21.1	25.8
4	Agree	492	21.2	25.9
5	Totally agree	96	4.1	5.0
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	
Mean: 2.82, standard deviation: 1.093				

**NorcommA** Employees generally move from organisation to organisation too often  
*QI: 15m*

1	Totally disagree	106	4.6	5.6
2	Disagree	757	32.6	39.8
3	Neutral	812	34.9	42.7
4	Agree	211	9.1	11.1
5	Totally agree	17	.7	.9
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	41	1.8	

Mean: 2.62, standard deviation: .789

**NorcommB** I do not mind at all when employees jump from organisation to organisation  
*QI: 15n*

1	Totally disagree	29	1.2	1.5
2	Disagree	455	19.6	24.0
3	Neutral	607	26.1	32.0
4	Agree	696	29.9	36.7
5	Totally agree	109	4.7	5.7
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	48	2.1	

Mean: 3.21, standard deviation: .924

**NorcommC** If I got offered a job elsewhere I would feel uncomfortable to leave the faculty  
*QI: 15o*

1	Totally disagree	223	9.6	11.7
2	Disagree	733	31.5	38.5
3	Neutral	458	19.7	24.1
4	Agree	439	18.9	23.1
5	Totally agree	49	2.1	2.6
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	42	1.8	

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 1.037

**NorcommD** I believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation  
*QI: 15p*

1	Totally disagree	97	4.2	5.1
2	Disagree	540	23.2	28.3
3	Neutral	619	26.6	32.5
4	Agree	603	25.9	31.6
5	Totally agree	48	2.1	2.5
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	37	1.6	

Mean: 2.98, standard deviation: .951

**NorcommE** Nowadays, things are better than in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers

*QI: 15q*

1	Totally disagree	63	2.7	3.3
2	Disagree	407	17.5	21.5
3	Neutral	815	35.1	43.0
4	Agree	543	23.4	28.7
5	Totally agree	66	2.8	3.5
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	50	2.2	

Mean: 3.07, standard deviation: .877

**NorcommF** I think that wanting to be a 'company man or woman' is still sensible

*QI: 15r*

1	Totally disagree	76	3.3	4.0
2	Disagree	388	16.7	20.6
3	Neutral	827	35.6	43.8
4	Agree	568	24.4	30.1
5	Totally agree	28	1.2	1.5
888	System missing	381	16.4	
999	Missing value	57	2.5	

Mean: 3.04, standard deviation: .852

### 2.3.5 Quality of performances

**QualperA** The overall quality of your performances

*QI: 16a*

0	Not applicable	42	1.8	2.2
1	Bottom 10% (0 – 10%)	5	.2	.3
2	Lower 15% (10 – 25%)	23	1.0	1.2
3	Middle 10% (25 – 75%)	481	20.7	25.3
4	Upper 10% (0 – 10%)	1125	48.4	59.2
5	Highest 10% (0 – 10%)	223	9.6	11.7
888	System missing	386	16.6	
999	Missing value	40	1.7	

Mean: 3.74, standard deviation: .855



**QualperB** The quality of your research performances*QI: 16b*

0	Not applicable	302	13.0	16.0
1	Bottom 10% (0 – 10%)	24	1.0	1.3
2	Lower 15% (10 – 25%)	84	3.6	4.4
3	Middle 10% (25 – 75%)	564	24.3	29.8
4	Upper 10% (0 – 10%)	699	30.1	36.9
5	Highest 10% (0 – 10%)	219	9.4	11.6
888	System missing	386	16.6	
999	Missing value	47	2.0	

Mean: 3.05, standard deviation: 1.537

**QualperC** The quality of your teaching performances*QI: 16c*

0	Not applicable	498	21.4	26.4
1	Bottom 10% (0 – 10%)	9	.4	.5
2	Lower 15% (10 – 25%)	41	1.8	2.2
3	Middle 10% (25 – 75%)	421	18.1	22.3
4	Upper 10% (0 – 10%)	664	28.6	35.2
5	Highest 10% (0 – 10%)	255	11.0	13.5
888	System missing	386	16.6	
999	Missing value	51	2.2	

Mean: 2.80, standard deviation: 1.808

**QualperD** The quality of your management performances*QI: 16d*

0	Not applicable	604	26.0	31.9
1	Bottom 10% (0 – 10%)	27	1.2	1.4
2	Lower 15% (10 – 25%)	118	5.1	6.2
3	Middle 10% (25 – 75%)	443	19.1	23.4
4	Upper 10% (0 – 10%)	529	22.8	27.9
5	Highest 10% (0 – 10%)	175	7.5	9.2
888	System missing	386	16.6	
999	Missing value	43	1.8	

Mean: 2.42, standard deviation: 1.816

**QualactA** Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals (Open)

QI: 17a

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	615	26.5	38.2
1	252	10.8	15.7
2	200	8.6	12.4
3	140	6.0	8.7
4	100	4.3	6.2
5	91	3.9	5.7
6	41	1.8	2.5
7	38	1.6	2.4
8	29	1.2	1.8
9	13	.6	.8
10	20	.9	1.2
11	7	.3	.4
12	9	.4	.6
13	2	.1	.1
14	3	.1	.2
15	11	.5	.7
16	2	.1	.1
17	4	.2	.2
18	3	.1	.2
19	2	.1	.1
20	11	.5	.7
22	2	.1	.1
23	1	.0	.1
24	2	.1	.1
25	3	.1	.2
29	1	.0	.1
30	1	.0	.1
35	1	.0	.1
37	1	.0	.1
40	1	.0	.1
44	1	.0	.1
50	1	.0	.1
888	System missing	624	26.8
999	Missing value	93	4.0

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualacA1** Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals (Not applicable)

QI: 17a

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	Not applicable	17	.7	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1648	72.4	

**QualactB** Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals (Open)

QI: 17b

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0		791	34.0	50.1
1		228	9.8	14.4
2		211	9.1	13.4
3		93	4.0	5.9
4		69	3.0	4.4
5		48	2.1	3.0
6		36	1.5	2.3
7		10	.4	.6
8		16	.7	1.0
9		3	.1	.2
10		36	1.5	2.3
12		9	.4	.6
13		2	.1	.1
14		1	.0	.1
15		8	.3	.5
16		1	.0	.1
17		1	.0	.1
20		4	.2	.3
25		3	.1	.2
30		2	.1	.1
40		2	.1	.1
45		2	.1	.1
50		3	.1	.2
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	122	5.2	

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualacB1** Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals (Not applicable)

QI: 17b

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	Not applicable	14	.6	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1687	72.6	

**QualactC** Number of published chapters in edited volumes (Open)

QI: 17c

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	740	31.8	46.3
1	305	13.1	19.1
2	207	8.9	12.9
3	104	4.5	6.5
4	80	3.4	5.0
5	46	2.0	2.9
6	32	1.4	2.0
7	16	.7	1.0
8	12	.5	.8
9	11	.5	.7
10	15	.6	.9
11	6	.3	.4
12	7	.3	.4
13	4	.2	.3
14	2	.1	.1
15	4	.2	.3
16	1	.0	.1
18	1	.0	.1
19	1	.0	.1
20	2	.1	.1
21	1	.0	.1
25	1	.0	.1
28	1	.0	.1
44	1	.0	.1
888	System missing	624	26.8
999	Missing value	101	4.3

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualacC1** Number of published chapters in edited volumes (Not applicable)

QI: 17c

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	Not applicable	6	.3	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1695	72.9	

**QualactD** Number of textbooks, or other books (Open)*QI: 17d**Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11*

0		1064	45.8	69.5
1		275	11.8	18.0
2		108	4.6	7.1
3		44	1.9	2.9
4		10	.4	.7
5		14	.6	.9
6		3	.1	.2
7		3	.1	.2
10		2	.1	.1
12		2	.1	.1
13		1	.0	.1
14		1	.0	.1
15		2	.1	.1
37		1	.0	.1
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	171	7.4	

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualacD1** Number of textbooks, or other books (Not applicable)*QI: 17d**Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11*

0	Not applicable	16	.7	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1685	72.5	

**QualactE** Number of research reports disseminated internally or to external clients (Open)  
 QI: 17e  
 Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	619	26.6	39.1
1	263	11.3	16.6
2	231	9.9	14.6
3	148	6.4	9.3
4	87	3.7	5.5
5	77	3.3	4.9
6	29	1.2	1.8
7	17	.7	1.1
8	22	.9	1.4
9	7	.3	.4
10	26	1.1	1.6
11	5	.2	.3
12	10	.4	.6
13	2	.1	.1
14	1	.0	.1
15	11	.5	.7
16	3	.1	.2
20	11	.5	.7
21	1	.0	.1
23	1	.0	.1
25	5	.2	.3
30	5	.2	.3
40	1	.0	.1
42	1	.0	.1
50	1	.0	.1
888	System missing	624	26.8
999	Missing value	117	5.0

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualacE1** Number of research reports disseminated internally or to external clients (Not applicable)  
 QI: 17e  
 Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	Not applicable	5	.2	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1696	72.9	

**QualactF** Presentations at conferences and/or workshops (Open)

QI: 17f

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0		219	9.4	13.3
1		149	6.4	9.0
2		193	8.3	11.7
3		204	8.8	12.4
4		172	7.4	10.4
5		157	6.8	9.5
6		109	4.7	6.6
7		48	2.1	2.9
8		81	3.5	4.9
9		17	.7	1.0
10		100	4.3	6.1
11		13	.6	.8
12		41	1.8	2.5
13		4	.2	.2
14		7	.3	.4
15		43	1.8	2.6
16		4	.2	.2
17		7	.3	.4
18		7	.3	.4
19		1	.0	.1
20		27	1.2	1.6
22		1	.0	.1
23		3	.1	.2
25		8	.3	.5
26		1	.0	.1
30		18	.8	1.1
31		1	.0	.1
33		1	.0	.1
35		3	.1	.2
40		5	.2	.3
45		1	.0	.1
50		6	.3	.4
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	50	2.2	

Mean: 2.66, standard deviation: 4.412

**QualactF1** Presentations at conferences and/or workshops (Not applicable)

QI: 17f

Condition: only asked if position is code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 11

0	Not applicable	2	.1	100.0
888	System missing	624	26.8	
999	Missing value	1699	73.1	

### 2.3.6 Workplace variable

<b>Workplac</b>	At which faculty are you employed? <i>Q1: 1</i>			
1	UA-AE	79	3.4	3.4
2	UA-PSS	66	2.8	2.8
3	GU-EBA	50	2.2	2.2
4	GU-PSS	55	2.4	2.4
5	UL-EAE	148	6.4	6.4
6	UL-SS	91	3.9	3.9
7	JU-BE	14	.6	.6
8	JU-SS	35	1.5	1.5
9	UO-EBA	21	.9	.9
10	UO-H	30	1.3	1.3
11	UT-EA	20	.9	.9
12	UT-SS	67	2.9	2.9
13	UB-BSE	26	1.1	1.1
14	UB-SS	37	1.6	1.6
15	FU-EBA	44	1.9	1.9
16	FU-SS	22	.9	.9
17	UM-EM	20	.9	.9
18	UM-HSSE	40	1.7	1.7
19	FUA-EBA	101	4.3	4.3
20	FUA-SS	110	4.7	4.7
21	UA-EE	118	5.1	5.1
22	UA-SBS	405	17.4	17.4
23	UG-MO	55	2.4	2.4
24	UG-BSS	93	4.0	4.0
25	GU-BEL	102	4.4	4.4
26	GU-SS	147	6.3	6.3
27	UU-SSE	58	2.5	2.5
28	UU-SSS	103	4.4	4.4
29	VU-ME	20	.9	.9
30	VU-SS	24	1.0	1.0
31	CU-CBS	34	1.5	1.5
32	CU-SS	19	.8	.8
33	UE-ME	14	.6	.6
34	UE-SPS	29	1.2	1.2
35	UEA-M	16	.7	.7
36	UEA-ESS	12	.5	.5
37	Other	0	.0	.0





### 3. Questionnaire

#### **Academic employees and their commitment to the university**

This questionnaire is part of a study into organisational commitment among European academic employees (both academics, administrators and other supporting staff). It is designed to make completion as easy and fast as possible. Most questions can be answered by simply ticking boxes. Filling in the questionnaire will take 10-12 minutes. Please do not spend too long on any question as it is your perception and your opinion that count; there is no right or wrong answer. The information supplied will be used for research purposes only and all of the information will be treated fully confidential.

The questionnaire has been created for simultaneous use in six countries. Some questions may therefore be phrased in a slightly unfamiliar way. As gratitude for your assistance, we will raffle of 25 coupons of 40 euro (or equivalent) among those who have completed the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for you cooperation!

Sanne Smeenk  
Christine Teelken  
Hans Doorewaard  
Rob Eisinga

*We hope this questionnaire is self-explanatory but if you have any questions about this questionnaire or research, please feel free to contact: [s.smeenk@fm.ru.nl](mailto:s.smeenk@fm.ru.nl).*

## 1. At which faculty are you employed?

- Belgium: University of Antwerp – Faculty of Applied Economics
- Belgium: University of Antwerp – Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
- Belgium: Ghent University – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
- Belgium: Ghent University – Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
- Belgium: University of Leuven – Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics
- Belgium: University of Leuven – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Finland: Jyväskylä University – School of Business and Economics
- Finland: Jyväskylä University – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Finland: University of Oulu – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
- Finland: University of Oulu – Faculty of Humanities
- Finland: University of Tampere – Faculty of Economics and Administration
- Finland: University of Tampere – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Germany: University of Bremen – Faculty of Business Studies and Economics
- Germany: University of Bremen – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Germany: Frankfurt University – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
- Germany: Frankfurt University – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Germany: University of Magdeburg – Faculty of Economics and Management
- Germany: University of Magdeburg – Faculty for the Humanities, Social Sciences and Education
- Netherlands: Free University Amsterdam – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
- Netherlands: Free University Amsterdam – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Netherlands: University of Amsterdam – Faculty of Economics and Econometrics
- Netherlands: University of Amsterdam – Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
- Netherlands: University of Groningen – Faculty of Management and Organisation
- Netherlands: University of Groningen – Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences
- Sweden: Göteborg University – School of Business, Economics and Law
- Sweden: Göteborg University – Faculty of Social Sciences
- Sweden: Uppsala University – Faculty of Social Sciences (Economic part)
- Sweden: Uppsala University – Faculty of Social Sciences (Social part)
- Sweden: Växjö University – School of Management and Economics
- Sweden: Växjö University – School of Social Sciences
- UK: Cardiff University – Cardiff Business School
- UK: Cardiff University – School of Social Sciences
- UK: University of Edinburgh – Management School and Economics
- UK: University of Edinburgh – School of Social and Political Studies
- UK: University of East Anglia – School of Management
- UK: University of East Anglia – School of Economic and Social Studies
- Other

## 2. Which of the following best describes your current rank at the faculty?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dean                | <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D. student                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professor           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other scientific personnel       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Associate professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Support and administrative staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Student assistant                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other position (please specify): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Researcher          |   |

3. In what year did you start working at the faculty?

---

4. In what year did you start at the position you currently have at the faculty?

---

5. How many hours do you formally work per week, excluding any overtime?

---

6. Please indicate to what extent the following statements apply to your faculty.

	Does not apply at all	Applies very little	Applies to some extent	Applies to a large extent	Applies completely	Don't know
a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7. Please indicate your agreement with the following propositions concerning your job.**

		Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
a	<i>It is important for me to do my work the best I can</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b	<i>It is important for me to work hard, even if I don't like the work</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c	<i>I have real opportunities for career development in the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d	<i>The work I am doing at the faculty is very challenging</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e	<i>I have to do things that should be done in a different way</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f	<i>I work under incompatible policies and guidelines</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g	<i>I have divided my working time properly</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h	<i>I know exactly what my responsibilities are</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i	<i>I know exactly what the faculty expects of me</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j	<i>I have the freedom to do many different things in my job</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k	<i>I have the possibility of independent thought in my job</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l	<i>I have the freedom to what I want in my job</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**8. How would you rate your academic salary?**

- Very inferior to my efforts
- Inferior to my efforts
- In balance with my efforts
- Passes my efforts a bit
- Passes my efforts easily

**9. In the past year, how many days did you obtain the following training and development activities?**

		Days	Not applicable
a	<i>Off-the-job activities such as classes or workshops, away from your immediate work area</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b	<i>On-the-job general skills training not directly related to your current job</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c	<i>On-the-job general skills training directly related to your current job</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Please indicate the extent to what the following propositions apply to you.

	Does not apply at all	Applies very little	Applies to some extent	Applies to a large extent	Applies completely
a <i>I monitor data on my productivity</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b <i>I determine my work flow (tasks-ordering)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c <i>I have the possibility to develop new research and/or teaching programmes</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d <i>I have part in faculty decisions about investments in new projects</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e <i>I am given the possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f <i>I am satisfied with my possibility to participate in decisions that affect my work</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g <i>There should be more employee involvement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h <i>I wish to have more say in decisions about my work</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Please indicate your agreement with the following propositions about you and your faculty.

	Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
a <i>This faculty does enough to avoid layoffs</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b <i>I frequently have off-the-job contacts with my colleagues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c <i>I feel a part of my department</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d <i>I feel a part of my faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e <i>I am adequately informed about what is going on in this faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f <i>I am adequately informed about changes that affect my job</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Which of the following phrases characterises best the top management at your faculty?

- Laissez-faire management: neither care for the employees nor for the interest of the organisation
- Management of people's needs: full care for the employees but no care for the interest of the organisation
- Management of efficiency: no care for the employees but full care for the interest of the organisation
- Middle management: little care for the employees and little care for the interest of the organisation
- Ideal management: full care for the employees and full care for the interest of the organisation

**13. On a scale from 1 to 5, towards which of the two styles does the performance appraisal in your faculty tends?**

- A. It is focused on control and emphasises accountability and performance measurement
- B. It is focused on individual strengths and weaknesses, and emphasises the development of competences

- A
- More A than B
- Neutral/both
- More B than A
- B

**14. Please indicate your agreement with the following propositions concerning you and your colleagues.**

		Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
a	<i>There is a sense of community among my colleagues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b	<i>My colleagues trust each other</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c	<i>I can always get assistance from my colleagues if I ask for it</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d	<i>In the faculty, everyone is treated fairly</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e	<i>Working with colleagues is a central part of my job</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f	<i>In my job, I have the possibility to support colleagues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g	<i>In my job, I have the possibility to talk to other employees about other things than 'business'</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h	<i>My job is often solitary</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i	<i>In my job, I have the possibility to develop close friendships</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j	<i>My contribution is important for the larger aims of the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k	<i>The faculty has clear rules and regulations that everyone is expected to follow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**15. Please indicate your agreement with the following propositions about your attitude towards the faculty.**

		Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
a	<i>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b	<i>I enjoy discussing the faculty in a positive sense with people outside it</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c	<i>I really feel as if the faculty's problems are my own</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d	<i>I easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e	<i>I feel like 'part of the family' at the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f	<i>The faculty has a great deal of personal meaning for me</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g	<i>I'm afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h	<i>It would be hard for me to leave the faculty right now</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i	<i>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave the faculty now</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j	<i>I could leave the faculty at no cost now</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k	<i>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l	<i>I continue to work for the faculty because leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m	<i>Employees generally move from organisation to organisation too often</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n	<i>I do not mind at all when employees jump from organisation to organisation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o	<i>If I got offered a job elsewhere I would feel uncomfortable to leave the faculty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p	<i>I believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q	<i>Nowadays, things are better than in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
r	<i>I think that want to be a 'company man or woman' is still sensible</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**16. How do you think your colleagues would rate the quality of your performances?**

	Bottom 10% (0-10)	Lower 15% (10-25)	Middle 50% (25-75)	Upper 15% (75-90)	Highest 10% (90-100)	Not applicable
a <i>The overall quality of your performances</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b <i>The quality of your research performances</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c <i>The quality of your teaching performances</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d <i>The quality of your management performances</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**17. How many of the following activities did you do since January 1st 2002?**

	Number	Not applicable
a <i>Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b <i>Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c <i>Number of published chapters in edited volumes</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d <i>Number of textbooks, or other books</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e <i>Number of research report disseminated internally or to external clients</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f <i>Presentations at conferences and/or workshops</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**18. What is your age?**

---

**19. What is your sex?**

- Male
- Female

**20. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

**21. What is the highest degree of education you have completed?**

- High school (grammar school)
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctor's degree
- Other (please specify):

**This is the end of the questionnaire. We would appreciate any comments or questions you may have concerning the questionnaire.**

---

---

---

**In addition to this web survey, we intend to study academic's commitment to the university in a more qualitative way by interviewing academics all over Europe. If you are willing to further discuss this topic with us, please write your email address below. We contact you as soon as possible.**

---

---

**Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!**

**If you have any queries about this questionnaire or research, please contact:**

Drs. Sanne G.A. Smeenk  
Radboud University Nijmegen  
Nijmegen School of Management  
Thomas van Aquinostraat 1.2.07  
P.O. Box 9108 Nijmegen  
The Netherlands  
Phone: +31 24 36 11339  
Fax: +31 24 63 11933  
Email: [s.smeenk@fm.ru.nl](mailto:s.smeenk@fm.ru.nl)



## References

- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990) 'The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1): 1-18.
- Arthur, J.B. (1992) 'The Link Between Business Strategy and Industrial Relations Systems in American Steel Minimills', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 45(3): 488-506.
- Arthur, J.B. (1994) 'Effects of Human Resource Systems on Manufacturing Performance and Turnover', *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3): 670-87.
- Aucoin, P. (1990) 'Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 2(2): 115-37.
- Bateman, T.S. and Strasser, S. (1984) 'A Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment', *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1): 95-112.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1985) *The New Managerial Grid III*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Bleiklie, I. (2001) 'Towards European Convergence of Higher Education Policy?', *Higher Education Management*, 13(3): 9-29.
- Bocock, J. and Watson, D. (1994) *Managing the University Curriculum: Making Common Cause*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Boyer, E.L., Altbach, P.G., and Whitelaw, M.J. (1994) *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bryson, C. (2004) 'The Consequences for Women in the Academic Profession of the Widespread Use of Fixed Term Contracts', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(2): 187-206.
- Buck, J.M. and Watson, J.L. (2002) 'Retaining Staff Employees: The Relationship Between Human Resources Management Strategies and Organizational Commitment', *Innovative Higher Education*, 26(3): 175-93.
- Chan, K. (2001) 'The Difficulties and Conflict of Constructing a Model for Teacher Evaluation in Higher Education', *Higher Education Management*, 13(1): 93-111.
- Cobanoglu, C., Warde, B., and Moreo, P.J. (2001) 'A Comparison of Mail, Fax and Web-Based Survey Methods', *International Journal of Market Research*, 43(4): 441-52.
- Cook, J. and Wall, T. (1980) 'New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organisational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfilment', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53: 39-52.
- DeCotiis, T.A. and Summers, T.P. (1987) 'A Path Analysis of a Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment', *Human Relations*, 40(7): 445-70.

- Deem, R. (1998) 'New Managerialism' and Higher Education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1): 47–70.
- Dillman, D.A., Tortora, R.D., Conradt, J., and Bowker, D. (1998) *Influence of plain vs. fancy design on response rates for Web surveys*. Paper presented at Joint Statistical Meetings. Dallas, TX, August.
- Gaertner, K.N. and Nollen, S.D. (1989) 'Career Experiences, Perceptions of Employment Practices, and Psychological Commitment to the Organization', *Human Relations*, 42(11): 975–991.
- Hackman, J.R. and Lawler, E.E. (1971) 'Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55: 259–86.
- HEFCE (2005) *Staff employed at HEFCE funded HEIs. Trends, profiles and projections*. Issues paper 23.
- Högskoleverket and Statistiska centralbyrån (2005) *Higher Education. Employees in Higher Education 2004*. Serie Utbildning och forskning ISSN 1404-5893.
- Hood, C. (1991) 'A Public Management for All Seasons?', *Public Administration*, 69(Spring): 3–19.
- Hood, C. (1995) 'The 'New Public Management' in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme', *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2/3): 93–109.
- Iles, P., Mabey, C., and Robertson, I. (1990) 'HRM Practices and Employee Commitment: Possibilities, Pitfalls and Paradoxes', *British Journal of Management*, 1(2): 147–57.
- Kwak, N. and Radler, B.T. (2000) *Using the Web for public opinion research: A comparative analysis between data collected via mail and the Web*. Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Portland, OR, May.
- Lee, S.M. (1971) 'An Empirical Analysis of Organizational Identification', *Academy of Management Journal*, 14(2): 213–26.
- Medlin, C., Roy, S., and Ham Chai, T. (1999) *World Wide Web versus mail surveys: A comparison and report*. Paper presented at ANZMAC99 Conference: Marketing in the Third Millennium. Sydney, Australia, November 28 – December 1.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., and Smith, C.A. (1993) 'Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4): 538–51.
- Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D., and Jackson, D.N. (1989) 'Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: It's the Nature of the Commitment that Counts', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1): 152–6.
- Morris, J.H. and Sherman, J.D. (1981) 'Generalizability of an Organizational Commitment Model', *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3): 512–26.
- Morrow, P.C. and Wirth, R.E. (1989) 'Work Commitment among salaried professionals', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34: 40–56.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., and Steers, R.M. (1982) *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

- Parker, M. and Jary, D. (1995) 'The McUniversity: Organization, Management and Academic Subjectivity', *Organization*, 2(2): 319-38.
- Penley, L.E. and Gould, S. (1988) 'Etzioni's Model of Organizational Involvement: A Perspective for Understanding Commitment to Organizations', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9(1): 43-59.
- Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982) *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pfeffer, J. and Veiga, J.F. (1999) 'Putting People First for Organizational Success', *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(2): 37-48.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and Organ, D.W. (1986) 'Self-reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospects', *Journal of Management*, 12: 531-544.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y., and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003) 'Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5): 879-903.
- Pollitt, C. (1993) *Managerialism and the Public Services: Cuts or Cultural Change in the 1990s?* Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2004) *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., and Boulian, P.V. (1974) 'Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5): 603-9.
- Porter, M.E. (1985) *Competitive Advantage*. New York: Free Press.
- Prichard, C. and Willmott, H. (1997) 'Just How Managed is the McUniversity?', *Organization Studies*, 18(2): 287-316.
- Rizzo, J.R., House, R., and Lirtzman, S. (1970) 'Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15: 150-63.
- Sashkin, M. and Morris, W.C. (1987) *Experiencing Management*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Sheldon, M.E. (1971) 'Investments and Involvements as Mechanisms Producing Commitment to the Organization', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2): 143-50.
- Sills, S.J. and Song, C. (2002) 'Innovations in Survey Research, An Application of Web-Based Surveys', *Social Science Computer Review*, 20(1): 22-30.
- Swoboda, W.J., Mühlberger, N., Weikunat, R., and Schneeweiss, S. (1997) 'Internet surveys by direct mailing. An innovative way of collecting data', *Social Science Computer Review*, 15(3): 242-55.
- Thornhill, A., Lewis, P., and Saunders, M.N.K. (1996) 'The Role of Employee Communication in Achieving Commitment and Quality in Higher Education', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(1): 12-20.
- Thune, C. (1998) 'The European Systems of Quality Assurance Dimensions of Harmonisation and Differentiation', *Higher Education Management*, 10(3): 9-25.
- Trow, M. (1994) 'Managerialism and the Academic Profession: The Case of England', *Higher Education Policy*, 7(2): 11-18.
- Ylijoki, O.-H. (2003) *Continuity and Change in Academic Work - A Narrative View*. London, East London Business School, University of East London, Working Papers no. 4.