

Errata

Svenska:

I Studie IV kommer quasi-Poisson-analyser inte att tillämpas, då dessa analyser inte är lämpliga för datatyper som inte utgör räknedata (count data). Följaktligen blir frågeställningen om överdispersion (overdispersion) irrelevant i detta sammanhang. Istället kommer standardmetoden för linjära regressionsanalyser att användas.

Det är dock värt att notera att linjära regressionsanalyser, likt quasi-Poisson-analyserna, producerar jämförbara signifikansnivåer över alla modeller och genom alla steg av analysen. De identifierar även samma variabler som statistiskt signifikanta i samtliga modeller och steg, med likartade relationer mellan skattningar (estimates) och Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR). Sålunda kvarstår argumenten för deras förmåga att förutsäga organisatoriskt åtagande och arbetstrivsel oförändrade. Detta gäller även för kappan.

Som en del av denna errata bifogas linjära regressionsanalyser för alla modeller i samtliga steg, vilka ersätter de tidigare genomförda quasi-Poisson-analyserna. Därmed ersätter Appendix D och E i denna errata Appendix D och E i Studie IV.

English:

In Study IV, quasi-Poisson analyses will not be applied, as these analyses are not suitable for data types that do not constitute count data. Consequently, the question of overdispersion becomes irrelevant in this context. Instead, the standard method for linear regression analyses will be utilised.

However, it is worth noting that linear regression analyses, similar to the quasi-Poisson analyses, produce comparable levels of significance across all models and throughout all stages of the analysis. They also identify the same variables as statistically significant in all models and stages, with similar relationships between estimates and Incidence Rate Ratios (IRR). Thus, the arguments for their ability to predict organisational commitment and job satisfaction remain unchanged. This also applies to the “kappa”.

As part of this erratum, linear regression analyses for all models at all stages are attached, replacing the previously conducted quasi-Poisson analyses. Hence, Appendices D and E in this erratum replace Appendices D and E in Study IV.

Appendix D. Organisational commitment linear regression models.

Coefficients	Education & experience model			Structural factors model			Job demands model			Job demands-resources model			Job demands-resources-openness model		
	Est.	t	p	Est.	t	p	Est.	t	p	Est.	t	p	Est.	t	p
(Intercept)	3.64	3.42	<0.001	3.82	3.16	<0.001	4.78	4.08	<0.001	1.54	0.59	<0.002	1.12	0.17	0.021
Education & Experience															
Teacher (0 = No, 1 = Yes)	-0.03	-0.27	0.21	0.805	-0.02	0.839	0.17	-0.07	0.41	0.158	-0.14	0.509	0.10	-0.10	0.321
Experience within profession (in months)	0.00	-0.00	0.532	0.00	-0.00	0.510	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.362	-0.00	0.879	0.00	-0.00	0.993
Structural Factors															
Child group size	0.00	-0.02	0.819	0.00	-0.02	0.885	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.885	-0.02	0.944	-0.00	-0.02	0.912
Proportion of L2-learners in child group	0.07	-0.32	0.46	0.728	0.00	0.728	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.885	-0.08	0.611	-0.01	-0.31	0.959
Child-staff ratio	-0.05	-0.13	0.03	0.214	-0.02	0.214	-0.02	-0.09	0.06	0.647	-0.00	0.970	-0.00	-0.06	0.928
Job Demands															
Role conflicts				-0.19	-0.37	0.01	0.043	-0.08	-0.23	0.08	0.321	-0.03	-0.18	0.12	0.716
Qualitative demands				-0.14	-0.30	0.01	0.074	-0.10	-0.23	0.03	0.141	-0.08	-0.21	0.05	0.201
Quantitative demands				-0.12	-0.31	0.07	0.207	-0.05	-0.20	0.11	0.542	-0.05	-0.21	0.10	0.481
Job Resources															
Principal support				0.41	0.28	0.54	<0.001	0.41	0.28	0.54	<0.001	0.25	0.10	0.41	0.001
Influence				0.14	-0.00	0.29	0.035	0.14	-0.00	0.29	0.049	0.15	0.01	-0.29	0.035
Co-worker support				0.16	0.02	0.29	0.027	0.16	0.02	0.29	0.027	0.32	0.15	-0.49	<0.001
Organisational Job Resource															
Openness				0.32	0.15	0.49	0.001	0.32	0.15	0.49	0.001	0.32	0.15	0.49	0.001
Model fit															
p	0.81			0.85			<0.001				<0.001				<0.001
R ²	0.002			0.01			0.147				0.432				0.467

Appendix E. Job satisfaction linear regression models.

	Education & experience model			Structural factors model			Job demands-resources model			Job demands-resources-openness model			
Coefficients	Est.	CI	P	Est.	CI	P	Est.	CI	P	Est.	CI	P	
Education & Experience													
(Intercept)	4.08	3.88 – 4.28	<0.001	5.42	4.79 – 6.05	<0.001	5.63	4.97 – 6.29	<0.001	2.74	1.93 – 3.55	<0.001	
Teacher (0 = No, 1 = Yes)	-0.17	-0.39 – 0.05	0.127	-0.16	-0.38 – 0.06	0.142	0.09	-0.13 – 0.30	0.422	0.03	-0.15 – 0.21	0.751	
Experience within profession (in months)	0.00	-0.00 – 0.00	0.814	0.00	-0.00 – 0.00	0.712	0.00	-0.00 – 0.00	0.343	0.00	-0.00 – 0.00	0.829	
Structural Factors													
Child group size	-0.00	-0.02 – 0.02	0.855	-0.00	-0.02 – 0.02	0.794	-0.00	-0.02 – 0.01	0.844	-0.00	-0.02 – 0.01	0.842	
Proportion of L2-learners in child group	0.03	-0.33 – 0.39	0.871	0.03	-0.33 – 0.39	0.871	0.10	-0.23 – 0.43	0.539	-0.08	-0.36 – 0.20	0.569	
Child-staff ratio	-0.06	-0.13 – 0.01	0.115	-0.06	-0.13 – 0.01	0.115	-0.01	-0.08 – 0.05	0.686	-0.01	-0.06 – 0.04	0.734	
Job Demands													
Unnecessary demands					-0.14	0.28 – -0.00	0.032	-0.05	-0.17 – 0.07	0.378	-0.05	-0.17 – 0.07	0.384
Qualitative demands					-0.08	-0.21 – 0.05	0.226	-0.02	-0.13 – 0.10	0.784	-0.01	-0.12 – 0.10	0.855
Quantitative demands					-0.32	0.47 – -0.16	<0.001	-0.26	-0.39 – -0.13	<0.001	-0.26	-0.39 – -0.13	<0.001
Job Resources													
Principal support								0.29	0.18 – 0.39	<0.001	0.26	0.12 – 0.39	<0.001
Co-worker support								0.30	0.18 – 0.42	<0.001	0.29	0.16 – 0.42	<0.001
Organisational Job Resource													
Openness											0.05	-0.10 – 0.21	0.510
Model fit													
P		0.3026							<0.001			<0.001	
R ²		0.011							0.207			0.456	