



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Networking and performance in public organizations : a study of primary schools in the Netherlands

Bekerom, P.E.A. van den

Citation

Bekerom, P. E. A. van den. (2016, November 8). *Networking and performance in public organizations : a study of primary schools in the Netherlands*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/43985>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/43985>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/43985> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Bekerom, Petra van den

Title: Networking and performance in public organizations : a study of primary schools in the Netherlands

Issue Date: 2016-11-08

Appendix

Appendix

Table A1 School background characteristics and school performance for the schools in the analysis and for schools not in the analysis—Chapter 2 (wave 1)

	Schools in analysis (n ≈ 546)		Schools not in analysis (n ≈ 6287)		t-value ^a
	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	
Background characteristics					
Number of students	235.18	137.26	223.61	138.32	1.88+
% Disadvantaged students	29.18	34.40	28.70	38.34	.28
Staff in fte	16.23	8.92	15.84	9.42	.90
		%		%	Cramer's V
Outcomes assessment^b					
Sufficient		72.0		71.5	.003
Insufficient		28.0		28.5	
Denomination					
Non-denominational		28.4		33.2	.050***
Roman Catholic		37.2		29.4	
Protestant		26.0		26.2	
Other denomination		8.4		11.2	
Vision					
Dalton		2.7		2.2	.023
Jenaplan		1.6		2.1	
Montessori		1.1		1.7	
Regular		93.4		92.3	
Other		1.1		1.7	

Note. Data provided by the Central Finance Agency (DUO) and the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

^a Results of parametric two-sample t-tests on difference between mean values of school background characteristics;

^b Assessment of outcomes for 2008 by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

+ < .10; * < .05; ** p < .01

Table A2 School background characteristics and school performance for the schools in the analysis and for schools not in the analysis—Chapter 3 (wave 1)

	Schools in analysis (n ≈ 523)		Schools not in analysis (n ≈ 6318)		t-value ^a
	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	
Background characteristics					
Number of students	233.97	136.30	223.77	138.40	1.61
% Disadvantaged students	29.57	34.81	28.67	38.32	.52
Staff in fte	16.19	8.88	15.85	9.42	.78
		%		%	Cramer's V
Outcomes assessment^b					
Sufficient		72.0		71.5	.003
Insufficient		28.0		28.5	
Denomination					
Non-denominational		28.0		33.2	.053***
Roman Catholic		37.7		29.4	
Protestant		26.2		26.2	
Other denomination		8.2		11.2	
Vision					
Dalton		2.9		2.2	.021
Jenaplan		1.7		2.1	
Montessori		1.2		1.7	
Regular		93.0		92.4	
Other		1.2		1.7	

Note. Data provided by the Central Finance Agency (DUO) and the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

^a Results of parametric two-sample t-tests on difference between mean values of school background characteristics;

^b Assessment of outcomes for 2008 by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

+ < .10; * < .05; ** p < .01

Appendix

Table A3 School background characteristics and school performance for the schools in the analysis and for schools not in the analysis—Chapter 4 (wave 2).

	Schools in analysis (n ≈ 481)		Schools not in analysis (n ≈ 6168)		t-value ^a
	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	
Background characteristics					
Number of students	235.05	139.79	221.06	139.23	2.12*
% Disadvantaged students	25.65	31.19	23.94	32.78	1.10
Staff in fte	14.81	9.75	13.76	9.05	2.43*
Cito test scores 2014 (n = 5135)	534.52	4.23	534.50	4.18	.08
		%		%	Cramer's V
Denomination					
Non-denominational	28.9		32.7		.046**
Roman Catholic	37.6		29.6		
Protestant	22.2		25.8		
Other denomination	11.2		11.9		
Vision					
Dalton	1.9		2.1		.019
Jenaplan	1.5		1.7		
Montessori	1.2		2.2		
Regular	92.7		91.5		
Other	2.7		2.5		

Note. Data provided by the Central Finance Agency (DUO) and the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

^a Results of parametric two-sample t-tests on difference between mean values of school background characteristics;

^b Assessment of outcomes for 2008 by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

+ < .10; * < .05; ** p < .01

Table A4 School background characteristics and school performance for the schools in the analysis and for schools not in the analysis—Chapter 5 (wave 1).

	Schools in analysis (n ≈ 547)		Schools not in analysis (n ≈ 6286)		t-value ^a
	Mean	S.d.	Mean	S.d.	
Background characteristics					
Number of students	235.43	137.26	223.59	138.32	1.92+
% Disadvantaged students	29.26	34.41	28.69	38.37	.34
Staff in fte	16.25	8.92	15.84	9.42	.96
		%		%	Cramer's V
Outcomes assessment^b					
Sufficient		72.0		71.5	.004
Insufficient		28.0		28.5	
Denomination					
Non-denominational		28.5		33.2	.049***
Roman Catholic		37.1		29.4	
Protestant		26.0		26.2	
Other denomination		8.4		11.2	
Vision					
Dalton		2.7		2.2	.023
Jenaplan		1.6		2.1	
Montessori		1.1		1.7	
Regular		93.4		92.3	
Other		1.1		1.7	

Note. Data provided by the Central Finance Agency (DUO) and the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

^a Results of parametric two-sample t-tests on difference between mean values of school background characteristics; ^b Assessment of outcomes for 2008 by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education.

+ < .10; * < .05; ** p < .01

