

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management / Maria Rita Tagliaventi; Giacomo Carli. - In: HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY. - ISSN 0952-8733. - ELETTRONICO. - 34:4(2021), pp. 812-840. [10.1057/s41307-019-00167-9]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/711365> since: 2021-12-02

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-019-00167-9>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management

Journal Item

How to cite:

Tagliaventi, Maria Rita and Carli, Giacomo (2019). The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management. Higher Education Policy (In Press).

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© [\[not recorded\]](#)

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management

Maria Rita Tagliaventi

Department of Sociology and Business Law, University of Bologna, San Giacomo 3, 40126
Bologna, Italy

Maria Rita Tagliaventi has been Associate Professor since 2001 and has been teaching Organization Management and Theory and Organizational Behavior at the University of Bologna. She was a Fulbright post-doctoral fellow at Stanford University and a visiting scholar at KTH Royal Institute of Technology (Stockholm) and at the Open University (Milton Keynes, UK). She has coordinated various national and international research project units. She is co-author of books and articles in international journals, including Human Relations, Journal of Management Studies, Technovation, Industry and Innovation, Journal of Management Inquiry, Journal of Organizational Change Management, Studies in Higher Education. She has received several international research awards, among which the “Emerald Management Reviews Citation of Excellence as one of the fifty best articles published in 2006 in management”.

Giacomo Carli^a

Department of Strategy and Marketing, The Open University Business School,
Walton Hall, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA, United Kingdom

Giacomo is a Lecturer in Strategic Management at The Open University Business School. After the completion of his PhD in Management in 2012 at the University of Bologna in Italy, he was awarded a PostDoc scholarship at the Department of Management and worked as a project manager for a EU-funded research project on innovation in agriculture. Giacomo had the opportunity to be a teaching assistant at Bocconi University and a visiting PhD student at the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University. Giacomo holds a Master's and Bachelor Degree in Engineering Management, he worked as a management consultant in strategic and organizational change projects in large companies, and he is a Fellow of the High Education Academy. Giacomo's articles have been published in international journals including Studies in Higher Education, Journal of International Management and Industry and Innovation.

^aReference author for communications:

Department of Strategy and Marketing | Faculty of Business and Law

Michael Young Building D1, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA
+44 (0) 1908 332884 | Giacomo.Carli@open.ac.uk

[Click here to view linked References](#)

The Effect of Service on Research Performance: A Study on Italian Academics in Management

Academics all over the world are feeling the increasing pressure to attain satisfactory research performance. Since research is not the only activity required of academics, though, the debate on how it may be coupled with other knowledge transfer activities like teaching, patenting, and dissemination has been captivating scholars interested in higher education. Literature is surprisingly silent about the interplay between research performance and other roles and tasks that faculty are expected to carry out, namely academic citizenship, intended as the service that they provide to their institution, to the scientific community, and to the larger society. Through a negative binomial regression conducted on 692 Italian academics in management, this paper investigates both the direct and moderating effect exerted by academic citizenship on the relationship between research performance in two subsequent evaluation exercises, thus advancing our knowledge of the relationship between research and service. Findings show that institutional service acts as a pure moderator, discipline-based service is a quasi-moderator, while public service exerts only a direct negative effect on research performance. In light of the emergent interplay between research and service, the necessity to boost reflection on academic citizenship is discussed and suggestions for its acknowledgement and advancement are formulated.

Introduction

The pursuit of research performance has become the mantra of academics all over the world (e.g., Vogelgesang *et al.*, 2010; Bak and Kim, 2015). Research excellence is deemed to promote national system development, as well as to introduce valuable transparency and clarity in the management of public resources (Frølich, 2011). Consequently, research on higher education has reinforced the effort to increase our understanding of what may foster or hamper the achievement of a satisfying research performance. Individual characteristics, such as previous performance and embeddedness in an international network of ties, and contextual features, such as university size and orientation to research, have been investigated. In an attempt to better grasp how to enhance research, the relationships between the various tasks and roles expected of academics have been taken into account. In particular, a vibrant debate has delved into the interplay between different knowledge transfer activities, e.g., research, teaching, dissemination, and spin-off creation (e.g., Landry et al., 2010; Bak and Kim, 2015; Rossi and Rosli, 2015), with the goal to realize whether they are complementary, substitute or independent of each other. Surprisingly, academic citizenship, intended as the service provided to the university and to the wider society, has remained in the background of the reflection on higher education (e.g., Vogelgesang et al., 2010; Macfarlane, 2011; Lawrence et al., 2012). Academic citizenship comprises a set of activities and roles that are mostly implicitly expected to be part of the academic profession, but that are often not clearly recognized and rewarded (O'Meara *et al.*, 2019). The ambiguity linked to the status of service in academia calls for a study inquiring into its relationship with research to inform our understanding of how emphasis on research performance impinges upon faculty's other duties and roles.

We investigated the engagement in research and in academic citizenship of 692 Italian faculty in management in the 2004-2013 time span, that is to say, before and after the

introduction of a reform formally endorsing research performance in the appraisal of universities and academics. Based on a negative binomial regression, our findings disclosed how, in addition to the effect of path dependency, visiting scholarship experience, recognition of research achievements, and university orientation to research, public service negatively affected research performance, while service to the scientific community exerted a positive influence. In addition, institutional service negatively moderated the relationship between research performance in two evaluation exercises. Interestingly, a negative moderating effect of discipline-based service enhanced the scientific productivity of academics with limited former research performance, but reduced the performance of scholars with solid publication track records.

Overall, this study helps fill a gap in our knowledge of higher education system functioning, contributing to the comprehension of the interplay between the individual and organizational-level factors that account for research performance. Awareness is here raised towards the fact that academic citizenship influences the attainment of research performance along complex pathways. Consequently, it is high time that policy makers, university managers, and academics took into account service in the design of institutions as well as in the choice of the courses of actions to undertake. The call for making the evaluation of academic citizenship in career pathways less puzzling is reinforced by this paper. Some suggestions for conveying the well-deserved relevance to service are then formulated, based on the consideration that in academia, as in most organizations, individuals do not need to excel in all dimensions, while their employing organizations as a whole should.

The Influence of Academic Citizenship on Research Performance

Almost all higher education systems have been embracing research excellence as their primary target over the past decades (e.g., Knights and Clarke, 2014; Pifer and Baker, 2013).

1 The rationale for promoting better research performance lies in the belief that the quality of
2 research outcomes positively affects the success of single institutions and sustains national
3 development and collective welfare (Fussy, 2017). Research excellence is in fact
4
5 meaningfully referred to as ‘the engine of growth’ (Salter *et al.*, 2017:1769). Given that the
6
7 academic profession is multifaceted (Bak and Kim, 2015; Guarino and Borden, 2017), a
8
9 lively debate has nonetheless addressed the effects that the pursuit of research proficiency can
10
11 have on other academic duties and expectations. In particular, a substitution effort has been
12
13 evoked between research and teaching (Holmstrom and Milgrom, 1991), based on the claim
14
15 that research is about specific contents and contributions to bring to a specialized community,
16
17 whereas teaching is about the ability to convey knowledge to a less expert and more
18
19 heterogeneous audience (Wiley *et al.*, 2016). At the same time, a positive link has been
20
21 posited between these two core tasks of faculty, though, since teaching may help clarify and
22
23 adapt research topics, especially when communicated to diversified sets of students (Hattie
24
25 and Marsh, 1996). In parallel, whether the other types of knowledge transfer that academics
26
27 can engage in and which vary from patenting and spin-off creation to consulting services, are
28
29 substitute, complementary, or independent of research has been largely discussed (Landry *et*
30
31 *al.*, 2010; Rossi and Rosli, 2015).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Although no shared interpretation has emerged yet concerning the interplay between the
42
43 various knowledge transfer activities, teaching included, it is remarkable how academic
44
45 citizenship has been sidelined in the discourse on higher education (Thompson *et al.*, 2005;
46
47 Macfarlane, 2007, 2011; Carli *et al.*, 2018). Academic citizenship represents, alongside
48
49 teaching and research, a pillar of university functioning: these three core sets of activities
50
51 have been referred to as the ‘tripartite vision’ (Macfarlane, 2011) or as the ‘contested triad’
52
53 (Pifer and Baker, 2013) of academic profession, depending on whether they are viewed as
54
55 complementary or substitute for each other. Academic citizenship can be defined as the roles
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and activities that faculty perform for the sake, and on behalf, of their institution. Latest reflection on these much-neglected tasks embrace a perspective that goes beyond the university boundaries to extend to the impact of academics on the wider society, distinguishing between internal and external service (Guarino and Borden, 2017). According to Thompson et al. (2005) and Macfarlane (2007), academic citizenship behaviors can in fact refer to assistance and guidance provided to students, such as counselling and coaching (student service), and to colleagues, such as mentoring PhDs (collegial service), contribution to internal governance bodies like committees and Senate (institutional service), as well as it can refer to reaching a larger audience. This latter ranges from service yielded to the scientific community, such as acting as a reviewer or organizing a scientific conference (discipline-based service), to impacting upon the collective through public lectures or participation in the media (public service). The roles that academics can exert in addition to knowledge transfer activities are key to turning the university, often called a ‘secluded campus’ or ‘ivory tower’, into a ‘placeful university’, i.e., an organization amongst other organizations that share knowledge and set future common development pathways (Nørgård and Bengtsen, 2016). Engaging in academic citizenship requires effort and time and poses a dilemma to faculty, who wonder whether they should take charge of service and what positive or negative consequences their enactment might convey to research and career advancement (e.g., Holland, 1999; Macfarlane, 2011). The scant reflection currently available on the relationship between research and service does not allow yet to formulate any indication to this regard. This paper investigates the very influence that playing out academic citizenship can have on research performance.

Studies have been flourishing about the factors that promote or hamper the attainment of research performance. According to a line of reasoning, individual-level characteristics are more relevant than institutional-level factors in engendering research outcomes (e.g.,

O'Connor and O'Hagan, 2016). From a different perspective, it is mostly institutional features that drive and determine research effort and achievements (Lewis, 2014; Lewis and Ross, 2011). It is more likely, though, that individual and institutional characteristics jointly affect the capability to carry out research and attain satisfactory results (George and Jones, 2012; Vogelgesang *et al.*, 2010). Adhering to this latter interpretation of academic life, the rest of the paper will delve into the factors that may sustain or hinder research performance that the literature on this issue has proposed as prominent.

Among the individual characteristics, path dependency, embeddedness in an international network, visiting fellowship experience, and acknowledgement of researcher status will be taken into account as antecedents of research performance. In addition, organizational features such as university orientation to research and size will be considered. Finally, the effects of the enactment of academic citizenship will be fleshed out.

Path Dependency

The capability to carry out high-quality research can be impacted by previous research experience. Behavioral consistency theory posits that human achievements be influenced by previous performance in the same domain (Wernimont and Campbell, 1968). Individuals tend in fact to stick to previous courses of action that have turned out to be satisfying and rewarding. From a psychological point of view, this trend can be framed within the search for self-continuity as a means to be socially validated by others: repeating well-established behaviors enables self-verification, thus reinforcing the professional identity in this case (Ashforth, 2000; Swann *et al.*, 1987). Specifically, scholars who have formerly accomplished a good publication record tend to remain productive over time (Carli *et al.*, 2018; Salter *et al.*, 2017). A cumulative advantage for scientific recognition has been claimed for the hard sciences (Bonaccorsi *et al.*, 2017): researchers who have a distinguished publication record

are endowed with more resources, such as laboratories, equipment, and team members, which sustain their research effort and achievements over time. Accordingly, the following hypothesis can be formulated:

Hypothesis 1: Subsequent research performance is positively related to previous research performance.

Embeddedness in an International Network

The literature on higher education has stressed the importance of network ties to achieve outstanding research outcomes. Outperformers are usually nested within a network of international collaborations able to offer a fertile environment for conducting research: availing oneself of a set of international linkages likely conveys interesting hints to start investigations as well as provides support throughout the whole process (e.g., Adams et al., 2005; Lee and Bozeman, 2005). In particular, cooperation with international coauthors can be fruitful for promoting and seeing through publication processes, as they can offer access to new perspectives on how to do research that colleagues located in the same environment cannot convey (Benedetto et al., 2016; Daraio and Moed, 2011). Therefore, it can be conjectured that:

Hypothesis 2: Research performance is positively related to international collaborations.

Visiting Scholarship Experience

Exposure to different contexts, especially international settings, can be beneficial for faculty's research. Shielded from daily obligations and consolidated patterns of behavior, academics can free up their mind, build new connections, and get stimuli to undertake high-quality research (Defazio et al., 2009; Edler et al., 2011). This evidence gets corroborated when a researcher moves from the periphery of the research arena towards the center, i.e.,

from less to more prestigious institutions, and opportunities for launching and finalizing new studies increase (Jonkers and Cruz-Castro, 2013). The support to research that experiences in a stimulating environment provide leads to the formulation of the below hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Research performance is positively related to visiting scholarship experiences.

Acknowledgment of Researcher Status

The attainment of academic awards signals the relevance of the research carried out to the scientific community, thus communicating the researcher status, and usually plays an important role in tenure evaluation processes (Lutter and Schröder, 2016). The impact of academic awards on research performance has been debated, and a distinction has to be made concerning whether they are due to an outstanding performance in research or in other tasks such as teaching or fundraising (Allison and Long, 1990). In the first case, it is plausible that, according to expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), there be a virtuous relationship between the achievement of public recognition for a behavior and the willingness to reinforce the same conducive behavior: if individuals apply input (time, effort, competencies, relationships) to reach a performance that is rewarded with valuable outcomes, then the motivation to reapply the same—or even bigger—input is high. Accordingly, research-related recognition is likely to commit academics further to the pursuit of high-quality research outcomes. These considerations lead to formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Research performance is positively related to research awards.

Academic Citizenship

Enacting service inside and outside the institution can endanger commitment to research. This statement, which resonates with daily experience in academia, emerges from the reflection on academic citizenship (e.g., Thompson et al., 2005; Lawrence et al., 2012;

1 Bolden et al., 2014). Academic citizenship in fact diverts attention and consumes time that
2 could be profitably spent on research. This holds particularly true for institutional and public
3 service, which call for different skills from those needed to produce valuable research and
4 whose opportunities for mutual fertilization with research is still scant (Thompson et al.,
5 2005; Guarino and Borden, 2017). A different claim can be made for discipline-based
6 service: since it addresses and unfolds within the scientific community, profitable synergies
7 between acting as a reviewer or organizing a conference and producing good pieces of
8 research can be expected (Macfarlane, 2011). Accordingly, the following hypotheses can be
9 formulated:

10 *Hypothesis 5a: Research performance is negatively related to institutional service*

11 *Hypothesis 5b: Research performance is negatively related to public service*

12 *Hypothesis 5c: Research performance is positively related to discipline-based service*

13 As anticipated above, organizational features can also influence the capability to perform
14 outstanding research. The literature on higher education has highlighted the relevance of the
15 orientation to research of the academic context as well as the effect of the university size.

16 **Contextual Orientation to Research**

17 The ability to achieve a brilliant publication record is affected by the surrounding
18 environment. A context that at different levels fosters research through the allocation of
19 appropriate resources (e.g., funding, administrative staff, support to project bid elaboration)
20 and explicitly rewards it is expected to lead to better research performance (Salter *et al.*,
21 2017). The orientation to research of the context in which faculty are nested can exert a
22 positive influence at various levels, varying from the university to which one belongs to the
23 department to which one is affiliated, to the colleagues of the same discipline who operate in
24 the same department (Carli *et al.*, 2018). Some studies conducted on PhD socialization

processes help grasp the importance of the social environment on research achievements.

Hottenrott and Lawson (2017) showed how PhD students who availed themselves of attentive and expert advisors and proactive research group tended to make scientific and career choices that put research centerstage. Relatedly, Park and Gordon's work (1996) testified to how PhD students who were able to publish thanks to the endorsement and guidance enjoyed during their PhD program remained more productive after the program was over than colleagues who did not have this opportunity. In the end, the beneficial effect that a research-oriented context can have on faculty research performance can be elaborated as follows:

Hypothesis 6: Research performance is positively related to university research orientation.

University Size

The bigger endowment of resources that are usually available to large-sized universities can create a fertile setting to conduct research. The tangible and intangible assets, which range from specialized staff to international cooperation agreements, that large institutions can offer to their members sustain their capability to carry out and finalize high-quality research (Landry *et al.*, 2010; Taylor and Cantwell, 2015). This assumption, corroborated by empirical evidence, is particularly relevant for disciplines that necessitate significant hardware and facility investments, such as laboratories and machines in the STEM field (Bonaccorsi *et al.*, 2015). Consequently, the below hypothesis can be formulated:

Hypothesis 7: Research performance is positively related to university size.

The Moderating Effect of Academic Citizenship on Research Performance

Academic citizenship can be posited to moderate the relationship between individual and organizational-level antecedents and research performance. Undertaking service that does not directly address research, such as institutional and public service, can not only subtract time

and effort from research, but requires skills and competencies, such as negotiation, conflict management, and verbal abilities, that do not match the skills and competencies necessary to carry out excellent research. The literature on higher education has underlined the potential for divergencies that taking on heterogeneous roles—instructor, researcher, organizational representative—can spawn, as well as the complications that it brings (e.g., Bolden et al., 2014; Knights and Clarke, 2014; Pifer and Baker, 2013). Conversely, some complementarity can be expected between discipline-based service and research (Macfarlane, 2007; Pifer and Baker, 2013). In this case, knowledge foundations and competencies are similar and a virtuous learning cycle can take place leading individuals to produce more valuable research. Along this line of reasoning, the following hypotheses can be expressed:

Hypothesis 8a: Institutional service moderates the relationship between previous and subsequent research performance, such that the effect of previous research performance on subsequent research performance is weakened when institutional service is high.

Hypothesis 8b: Public service moderates the relationship between previous and subsequent research performance, such that the effect of previous research performance on subsequent research performance is weakened when public service is high.

Hypothesis 8c: Discipline-based service moderates the relationship between previous and subsequent research performance, such that the effect of previous research performance on subsequent research performance is reinforced when discipline-based service is high.

Control variables

The need to control for some variables has been raised in the literature. Gender has been often evoked as a variable able to explain different publishing patterns. Male faculty are expected to produce more research than their female colleagues, although the quality of outcomes is still debated: according to some studies, women carry out fewer publications, but with a higher target (e.g., Long and Fox, 1995; Groot and García-Valderrama, 2006).

Academic rank has been extensively called into question, too, although its influence remains controversial (Baccini *et al.*, 2014). Based on some evidence, full professors enjoy the so-called ‘status effect’: they are involved in publications by their peers owing to their reputation and visibility in the scientific community (Tien and Blackburn, 1996). Conversely, according to other studies, once obtained the tenure, full professors are less motivated than lower-ranking colleagues to undertake research (e.g., Xie and Shauman, 1998). Eventually, some contributions do not disclose any significant relationship between rank and research performance (Over, 1982).

Also the interplay of discipline and research performance has prompted discussion in the literature on higher education (Jaffe, 2014; Landry *et al.*, 2010). The intensity of knowledge transfer activities, among which stands out research, is affected by the field in which academics operate, with academics in STEM and management producing a high volume of activities aimed at disseminating knowledge beyond the scientific community (Salter *et al.*, 2017). Figure 1 represents the hypotheses of the paper.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Data

To test our hypotheses, we collected data on Italian academics in management in the 2004-2013 period. This time frame was chosen to take into account two evaluation exercises promoted by the Italian National Agency for the Evaluation of the University and Research System (ANVUR): the former gauged the research outcomes achieved between 2004 and 2010, while the latter measured research performance from 2011 to 2013. In between the two periods, marking a dramatic change in Italian higher education, lied the so-called Gelmini

1 reform issued in 2010 that fostered research performance as the main evaluation target of
2 individuals, departments, and universities, and introduced a two-step process for career
3 progressions (Anon, 2010; Frischknecht, 2008; Rebora and Turri, 2013). All faculty who aim
4 for a promotion to associate or full professor must undergo a National Qualification Exam
5 (Abilitazione Scientifica Nazionale or ASN) that is based first on the attainment of given
6 research outcomes, measured through ‘threshold values’ equal to the research performance
7 medians in the discipline, and then, if and only if these values are met, on the analysis of the
8 publication record, product contents, and curriculum vitae (CV) by national committees.
9 Subsequently, individuals who have successfully passed the Qualification Exam can apply
10 for the positions opening at single universities; at this stage, candidates’ publication record,
11 product contents, and CV are gauged by locally appointed committees. Italian academia
12 represents an interesting and extreme case when research performance is under study
13 (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007; Bonaccorsi et al., 2017), as research performance had been
14 declining nationwide since 2008 and an institutional action was evoked to bring its relevance
15 to the fore (Cartlidge, 2010). Within this framework, academics in management are
16 prominent since they have long been unbalanced on the generation of knowledge addressing
17 practitioners, such as consulting services for public and private companies, while sidelining
18 the pursuit of research excellence (Salter *et al.*, 2017). Consequently, meeting high research
19 requirements has been remarkably challenging for these academics, who had to rethink and
20 adjust their behavioral patterns (Butler *et al.*, 2015). In addition, interest in management is
21 enhanced by the fact that it comprises many different fields, thus offering an exhaustive
22 outlook (Salter *et al.*, 2017).

23 In particular, we gathered and analyzed data concerning 692 faculty members in the fields of
24 accounting, strategy, marketing, banking, and finance, distributed in 63 universities. 59.8%
25 are males, 43.8% are assistant professors, 27.7% are associate professors, and 28.5% are full
26

1 professors. The χ^2 tests used to compare the sample with the Italian population of academics
2 in the same disciplines confirmed that there are not significant differences in distribution
3
4 across gender and academic rank.
5
6

7 CVs represent an established source to analyze academic careers since they allow to keep
8
9 track of activities, roles, and achievements over time (e.g., Gaughan, 2009) and are becoming
10
11 the main reference for career advancements (Macfarlane and Burg, 2019). CVs were used to
12
13 grasp visiting scholarship, research awards, and the number of academic citizenship activities
14
15 and roles performed (institutional, discipline-based, and public service). CVs were collected
16
17 from the National Qualification Exam website for 28.5% of the sample and downloaded from
18
19 universities' and research projects' websites for academics who did not participate in the
20
21 qualification process. The National Qualification Exam website collects the CVs of
22
23 candidates who wish to participate either in the assessment procedure or in committees: these
24
25 latter are sorted out of a list of faculty who comply with 'threshold values' that are usually
26
27 higher than those required of the former. It is noteworthy that the National Qualification CV
28
29 format has become the standard for CV elaboration in Italy since its launch in 2012;
30
31 consequently, there is substantial homogeneity in the information reported across CVs that
32
33 abide by this format. The criterion of consistency with the qualification exam format drove us
34
35 in the retention of CVs among those available on the Internet. We then fine-tuned the sample
36
37 selection by discarding CVs that were not updated to January 2014 at least, as the 2010-2013
38
39 national evaluation exercise comprised all the data up to December 2013 included. We met
40
41 several times to define coding criteria with two coders based on batches of CVs that each of
42
43 us had singularly examined, then regularly again to discuss and solve doubtful cases that
44
45 arose during further independent coding (Gioia *et al.*, 2013).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Information about publications of academics and networks of international collaboration
57
58 were retrieved from the Scopus database (Chavarro *et al.*, 2017). Additionally, reports
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

published by ANVUR and the database on the Italian Research Evaluation Exercise (Valutazione della Qualità della Ricerca or VQR) provided data about university research orientation, while reports by the Statistical Office of the Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research (MIUR) were used to gather data on university size.

Variables

Research performance can be traced back to two significant dimensions that have been identified in the lively debate targeting the appraisal of research performance. The former refers mostly to the quantity of publications on indexed journals carried out by each academic, also known as scientific productivity (Lee *et al.*, 2015; Moed, 2010), while the latter parses out the impact of publications on the scientific community, or scientific influence (e.g., Glänzel, 2008; Moed, 2010).

Among the various and somewhat controversial measures of scientific influence proposed in the literature, such as the journal impact factor and h-index, the number of citations appears to be the most widely used (Bongioanni *et al.*, 2014). Accordingly, we counted the number of papers listed on Scopus for each academic in the 2011-2013 period (Harzing and Alakangas, 2016) as a proxy for scientific productivity and the number of citations received from every scholar as reported on Scopus (Daraio *et al.*, 2018) as a proxy for scientific influence. This second measure was standardized by the number of years since the publication date of each paper, as earlier articles are likely to be cited more than later products¹.

The independent variables were elaborated for the years going from 2004 to 2010. Previous scientific productivity and previous scientific influence were measured with the same

¹ To avoid endogeneity, we calculated citations respectively for the papers published in the first evaluation exercise and for those published in the second exercise, which differ in their time length. We counted the citations per author reported on Scopus at 2017. For both periods, we adjusted the citation per paper by the number of years since its publication date: for instance, if a paper published in 2012 received 20 citations at 2017, we divided 20 by the years from 2012 to 2017, i.e., 5, counting 4 citations for that paper.

approach as the dependent variables to test Hypothesis 1 on path dependency.

International collaborations were defined as the count of each academic's co-authors affiliated to a foreign university (Ponomariov and Boardman, 2010). In our case, we counted them using the authoring data reported on Scopus.

Inspired by Jonkers and Cruz-Castro (2013), visiting scholarship was defined as a binary variable coded as 1 if the academic had done at least a period of visiting in a foreign university between 2004 and 2010, and 0 otherwise.

Research awards were based on the coding of academics' CVs considering several types of acknowledgements, such as best paper and best dissertation awards (Allison and Long, 1990; Lutter and Schröder, 2016).

Academic citizenship was measured by three variables—institutional, public and discipline-based service—according to Macfarlane (2005, 2007), Thompson et al. (2005), Vogelgesang et al. (2010), and Bolden et al. (2014).

Information on institutional service was coded from CVs as a variable that counts the activities and roles undertaken by each academic to serve university committees and boards between 2004 and 2010. Some examples are membership in the faculty or department boards, in the Senate, in PhD program committees, or in other committees (e.g., funding, internationalization, quality assurance) and the roles of Head or Deputy Head of Department, Dean or Deputy Dean.

Similarly, public service was appraised as the count of activities and roles related to service in public bodies and non-profit organizations, such as membership in boards of directors or in boards of auditors, roles in the boards or committees of professional associations, membership in authorities or formal roles in regional or local institutions.

Discipline-based service was defined as the number of roles in editorial boards of scientific journals (e.g., editor in chief, senior editor, associate editor) or in conference committees

(e.g., conference program chair, member of the scientific committee or of the organizing committee) or as reviewers.

The research orientation of the university was gathered from the detailed report published by ANVUR on the 2004-2010 evaluation exercise, using the rates assigned to research quality.

University size was defined as a categorical variable, dividing universities into three classes: small (fewer than 10,000 students), medium (between 10,000 and 20,000 students), and large (more than 20,000 students).

Control variables on gender and rank (assistant, associate, and full professor) were taken from CVs, while the discipline was coded as a categorical variable to attribute academics to three wide subject areas: accounting, strategy and marketing, and finance.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations among variables.

Remarkably, the dependent variable's mean is similar to the first predictor (Previous Scientific Productivity), although this latter was calculated on a three-year timeframe instead of seven, as the two subsequent evaluation exercises differed in their time span. Few correlations among independent variables above the cutoff of 0.6 involved previous scientific productivity, international collaborations, and previous scientific influence, but they did not generate effects of multicollinearity, as we checked by assessing the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF).

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 presents descriptive data on scientific productivity reporting mean values, standard deviations, and median values for university size, gender, academic rank, and discipline. A generalized increase in productivity from the first to the second evaluation exercise can be noted, although the second exercise period lasted less, as specified above. This trend can be

grasped from the median values, which all moved to 1 in the second exercise. Moreover, we observed a reduction in standard deviations from the first to the second period, highlighting a convergence towards the mean values.

 Insert Table 2 about here

Method

The nature of the dependent variables, scientific productivity measured by papers published on Scopus-indexed journals and scientific influence measured by citations, suggested not to use an OLS regression to test the hypotheses, but a negative binomial model that is able to explain the particular distribution of count variables with over-dispersed outcomes (Lee and Jung, 2017). The likelihood-ratio test for the overdispersion coefficient (alpha) was performed to verify whether the negative binomial model had a better fit than a Poisson model assuming equal mean and variance: the resulting value testified to a significant increase in fit using a negative binomial model.

The aim of our study is to look at the combined influence of individual and institutional-level variables on scientific productivity and influence. The use of a multilevel analysis enabled to distinguish the effects of the context from individual features and activities (Klein *et al.*, 1999). To explain variability at the university level, we developed a random intercept model (Snijder and Bosker, 1999), assessing differences among universities and measuring the variance of the intercept related to individuals' university membership.

The equation of the multilevel model is:

$$(1) \ln y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + u_j + e_{ij}$$

Model (1) is a random intercept model, where the intercept can vary across groups, i.e., universities. y_{ij} represents the productivity or influence of the individual i in the university j .

The random part of the model is given by u_j and e_{ij} . u_j is the group effect, which is assumed to follow a normal distribution with mean equal to zero and variance σ_u^2 that we measured in the analysis, while σ_e^2 is the variance of the residuals' distribution. We calculated the Interclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and the significance values of both variances. Likelihood-ratio tests were conducted to compare the fit of the multilevel model with the correspondent negative binomial models, always finding a significant improvement of fit with the multilevel approach, as reported at the bottom of Tables 2 and 3.

In our theorizing, the three moderation hypotheses (8a, 8b and 8c) were first combined with hypotheses on the direct effect of the moderators on the dependent variable 'scientific productivity' (5a, 5b and 5c). The combination of these hypotheses means that we were looking for quasi-moderation effects where the moderator had also a direct influence on the criterion variable. To empirically test quasi-moderations, according to the method suggested by Sharma et al (1981), we performed a hierarchical regression with three models: Model 1 with the independent variables as regressors, as argued above, Model 2 including the moderators as regressors, Model 3 adding the interaction terms between moderators and the regressors at stake, as follows:

$$(2) \ln y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \beta_2 z_{ij} + u_j + e_{ij}$$

$$(3) \ln y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \beta_2 z_{ij} + \beta_3 (x_{ij} \times z_{ij}) + u_j + e_{ij}$$

Adopting hierarchical regression analysis, it is possible to distinguish between a pure moderation and a quasi-moderation. This latter requires that both the effect of the interaction term between the moderator variables and the independent variable and the effect of the moderator as independent variable be significant.

In order for a moderation effect to be detected, the beta of the interaction term in Model 3 must be significant ($\beta_3 \neq 0$). Subsequently, to evaluate if it is a pure or a quasi-moderation effect, the significance of the relationship of the moderator with the criterion variable in

Model 2 must be verified. If β_2 is significant, Model 1 and Model 2 are different, and z is a quasi-moderator; if not, the two models are equivalent, and z is a pure moderator. The same approach was adopted to study scientific influence, using a hierarchical regression in models 4, 5 and 6, considering previous scientific influence in the interaction term.

To estimate the parameters of the negative binomial regressions we used robust estimators to control for mild violation of underlying assumptions, as suggested by Cameron and Trivedi (2013). The VIF tests for multicollinearity showed an average value equal to 1.79 and a maximum value equal to 3.52, below the suggested cutoff of 10 (Hair *et al.*, 2010).

Findings

In this section, the results of the three negative binomial regressions related to scientific productivity are presented. Then, the other three models for scientific influence are introduced by stressing the differences from findings on scientific productivity.

In Table 3 the effects of the independent variables on the criterion variable are displayed as exponential coefficients that measure how much the dependent variable would change for a unitary variation in the independent variable. If an exponential coefficient is higher than 1, it means that the predictor has a positive effect given by the coefficient value minus 1.

Conversely, if the exponential coefficient is inferior to 1, the independent variable has a negative effect equal to 1 minus the coefficient value. Table 3 reports also the level of significance and standard errors, while the fit parameters are listed at the bottom.

Insert Table 3 about here

Model 1 partially confirmed the first hypothesis on path dependency: academics who published a large number of papers in the previous evaluation exercise were more likely to be

productive in the following exercise. An additional paper published from 2004 to 2010 increased the predicted outcomes by 15.8%. Nevertheless, previous research influence did not exert a significant influence on scientific productivity. Having an impact with former publications did not make the scholars under exam more productive later.

International collaborations did not exert a significative effect on scientific productivity, thus leaving Hypothesis 2 unconfirmed, while having been a visiting scholar at a foreign university wielded a significant payoff in terms of scientific productivity (52.1%), supporting Hypothesis 3.

Research awards had only a partially significant effect on scientific productivity in Model 1, but their positive effect was verified in Models 2 and 3 that better approximate our data.

According to Model 3, a research award could raise research outcomes by 8.1%, thereby giving support to Hypothesis 4.

Model 2 included academic citizenship variables that were also tested as moderators: first, we observed their direct effect on scientific productivity, which did not turn out to be as posited.

Institutional service did not appear to have a significant direct effect on productivity.

Consequently, Hypothesis 5a was not confirmed. Conversely, roles and activities connected to public service had a significative negative effect (-3.2%) on research outcomes, in line with Hypothesis 5b. Finally, we found that past discipline-based service enhanced subsequent scientific productivity with a positive significant effect equal to 2.3%, confirming Hypothesis 5c, too.

Contextual factors posited in Hypotheses 6 and 7 can be gleaned from Model 1. Hypothesis 6 on the effect of university ranking was confirmed. Working in a university with a good research outlook facilitated scientific productivity. As can be observed from Table 1, the scale used to assign rates in the evaluation exercises run by ANVUR is quite compressed, going from 0 to 0.588. Model 1 showed that a 0.1 increase in ANVUR ranking impacted

positively on scientific productivity (80.4%).

Hypothesis 7 was not confirmed by data analysis: working in a large institution did not exert a significant effect on research outcomes. A coordination issue might be at play (George and Jones, 2012): while large universities can yield more resources than smaller ones, organizing and coordinating them in a way that is beneficial to scholars might be difficult and generate inefficiencies in research processes (Brandt and Schubert, 2013).

Model 3 shows the three interaction terms that we intended to delve into. The first interaction between previous scientific productivity and institutional service emerged as significant, giving support to Hypothesis 8a. Moreover, the non-significance of the direct effect of the moderator on the criterion variable, which was tested in Model 2, as anticipated by the lack of support for Hypothesis 5a, confirmed that institutional service was a pure moderator of the relationship between previous and subsequent scientific productivity. This effect is represented in Figure 2, which shows the predicted values of the dependent variable for different levels of former scientific productivity and of institutional service, keeping the other variables at their average. Each line stands for the expected productivity of academics with different levels of institutional service engagement, ranging from 0 to 9. The x-axis shows the number of papers reported on Scopus in the 2004-2010 time length. Lines are almost totally overlapping for low values of previous scientific productivity, but, looking at academics who published 9, 12, or even more papers in the previous evaluation exercise, a clear difference stands out: those who had performed less institutional citizenship published more, while those who had been more committed to this type of service reduced their possibility of generating the same amount of papers as colleagues who had not excelled in this service. It is noticeable that academics who had published few papers were not negatively impacted by their commitment to institutional citizenship. The moderation effect became relevant for academics who had formerly strongly focused on the advancement of their publication

records: enacting institutional academic citizenship lowered the number of publications expected of them according to path dependency in the following exercise.

Insert Figure 2 about here

The interaction term involving public service did not turn out to be significant, thereby providing no support for Hypothesis 8b. Only a direct effect of public service on the dependent variable was confirmed (see Hypothesis 5b).

A significant effect of discipline-based service as a moderator was found, but with a different trend from the one hypothesized (8c): in fact, evidence ran counter the conjecture that high values of discipline-based service enhanced the effect of previous scientific productivity on the criterion variable. Our findings depicted that increasing commitment to discipline-based citizenship reduced the impact of previous scientific productivity on predicting future outcomes. An explanation of this effect might lie in the action of discipline-base service as quasi-moderator instead of pure moderator: its direct effect on the dependent variable was significant and positive in Model 2, as testified by the support found for Hypothesis 5a.

Playing out discipline-based service had a positive impact on the dependent variable, but as the engagement in this activity increased, it lessened the positive effect of previous scientific productivity on the dependent variable. Figure 3 provides a visual representation to better comprehend this complex pattern. The lines show, as per Figure 3, the expected number of research outcomes at different levels of commitment to discipline-based service, while the x-axis depicts different levels of previous scientific productivity.

Insert Figure 3 about here

1 Faculty who had published few Scopus-indexed papers in the previous evaluation exercise
2 (<6) obtained some benefits from the enactment of discipline-based service, in comparison
3 with those who did not have any involvement in this type of academic citizenship. This result
4 might be interpreted as a positive impact of discipline-based service for faculty members with
5 a limited publication record, who might learn from doing reviews or participating in
6 conference committees. Variance in the moderator proved to be ineffective at around six
7 publications to then capsize: academics who had carried out a large number of Scopus papers
8 in the past were expected to produce more research outcomes if they were less involved in
9 discipline-based service. This trend might be due to the fact that well-experienced academics
10 who took on editorial roles or actively served on conference committees had to reduce time
11 and energy dedicated to research: no positive spillover was recorded.

12 Control variables confirmed some of the conjectures that had been formulated. First, being a
13 female increased the likelihood of producing more high-quality research, in line with Groot
14 and García-Valderrama's findings (2006). We did not find any significant effect of academic
15 rank and of discipline on scientific productivity.

16 The variance of the intercept related to university membership and the variance of the
17 residuals were found highly significant. The ICC showed that, conditional to the fixed-effects
18 covariates, research productivity was scarcely correlated within the same university,
19 accounting for 15.6% of the total residual variance (Model 3).

20 The results found for the multilevel negative binomial models performed on scientific
21 influence (number 4, 5 and 6 reported in Table 4) were very similar to the results related to
22 scientific productivity. We underline the few emergent differences.

23 -----
24
25 Insert Table 4 about here
26
27 -----

1 First, being in a medium-sized university negatively affected scientific influence (-47.7%)
2 compared with belongingness to a small university, and being in strategy rather than in
3 accounting exerted a positive effect, even though only in Model 4. The main difference
4 between scientific productivity and influence stemmed from the analysis of moderation
5 effects: while a quasi-moderation between discipline-based service and scientific influence
6 proved to be significant, consistently with Hypothesis 8c, the interaction between research
7 influence and institutional service was not significant.
8

9 As with the previous models focusing on scientific productivity as dependent variable, both
10 the variances of the group effect and of the residuals were significant, with a low ICC (8.5%),
11 which indicates that university membership did not account for much of the overall residual
12 variance.
13
14

15 Discussion

16 In the debate on universities becoming ‘psychotic’ and academics becoming ‘bipolar’ due to
17 the multiple, often conflicting, expectations placed on them (Sievers, 2008; Bolden *et al.*,
18 2014), the relationship between research performance and academic citizenship has
19 surprisingly been sidelined. When reflecting upon the levers to enhance research performance
20 in fact, the effect that service within and outside the university boundaries can exert has been
21 only marginally, and mostly theoretically, called into question. Conversely, a great deal of
22 attention has been devoted to grasping other individual and organizational-level antecedents.
23 This study enriches our comprehension of the antecedents and moderators of research
24 performance by including different types of academic service.
25

26 Our findings, rooted in 692 Italian academics in management, show that research
27 performance is influenced by previous research-oriented individual achievements, such as
28 scientific productivity, research awards, and international co-authorship, and by the
29

orientation to research of the university to which a scholar belongs. A complex relationship links service and research. Public service in fact negatively influenced research performance, without exerting any moderation effect, while institutional service negatively moderated the path dependency effect on research productivity in two subsequent evaluation exercises. A possible explanation could be that actively contributing to university management requires the development of specific skills and behaviors, e.g., political and decision making abilities, that encroaches upon successful research pathways (e.g. Tagliaventi *et al.*, 2019). In addition, discipline-based service has a quasi-moderation effect on the relationship between research performance in two subsequent evaluation exercises. The direct effect of discipline-based service is positive, but the moderation effect tells us something more: academics with a limited publication record could benefit from the effect of discipline-based commitments that reinforced their scant publication experience, whereas productive academics would enjoy less publication success if they committed to more discipline-based activities. It is plausible that engagement in the scientific community represents a learning opportunity for the former, but a burden and a distraction for the latter. We posited a positive mediating effect based on the affinity between activities directed at the scientific community and activities aimed at publishing. Conversely, findings seem to contradict this expectation and to corroborate the service nature of discipline-based citizenship, highlighting its kinship to the other types of academic citizenship rather than to research.

Interesting contributions to management of higher education systems ensue from the above considerations. First of all, we can claim, thus testifying to a well-voiced concern (e.g., Lawrence et al., 2012; Macfarlane, 2011; Vogelgesang et al., 2010), that academic citizenship, while benefiting the university and the wider collective, takes a toll on research. As Knights and Clarke (2014) stated, pursuing research can turn academic life into a ‘bittersweet symphony’ in which activities that differ in nature, such as publishing and being

1 a good citizen of the university, are hard to be matched. It is particularly remarkable that
2 acting as editor or even reviewer and organizing scientific conferences and workshops likely
3 foster the development of skills and ties that sustain a high research performance for faculty
4 who formerly had an inadequate publication record. This consideration sheds a different light
5 on forms of active participation of junior researchers in the scientific community that might
6 be interpreted as interfering with the straightforward attainment of research goals. As a
7 matter of fact, service to colleagues in the same field enhances, rather than puts at risk, the
8 achievement of brilliant research performance by academics who need to further their
9 publication record. This hint contributes to the conversation on socialization to the academic
10 profession, which has largely stressed the influence of the closest environment, such as the
11 department's orientation to research and the advisor's publication record, on research training
12 (Hottenrott and Lawson, 2017). A profitable approach to research can ensue from a
13 proximate context that fosters research, but also from involvement in the more distant
14 scientific community.

15 Policy makers, university managers, and ultimately faculty themselves should keep a special
16 eye on academic citizenship. If academic citizenship and research performance are
17 potentially conflicting, as emerges from this study, the importance of academic citizenship
18 needs to be clearly communicated and rewarded in systems that emphasize research. Up to
19 now, the reasons and potential returns for embarking on service have been ambiguous. In
20 some contexts, service is considered as part of the 'contested triad' alongside research and
21 teaching (Krause, 2009), with the implicit expectation that it might be somewhat taken into
22 account for tenure. In other cases yet, performing academic citizenship can even turn into a
23 disadvantage, since people are deemed to take charge of service to make up for their inability
24 to perform research successfully (Thompson *et al.*, 2005). Assessment and reward for service
25 is still 'foggy as opposed to clear' (O'Meara et al., 2019, p. 5). Time is ripe for rethinking the

1 way academic citizenship is gauged and compensated in academic careers. The need to
2 formally recognize the relevance of service for university functioning and, in general, for
3 societal advancement has been expressed in the literature (e.g., Lawrence *et al.*, 2012;
4 Macfarlane, 2011). Thompson et al. (2005) recommended that academic citizenship
5 requirements be specified when opening positions. Extending Valentine and Sandborg's
6 (2013) reflection on medicine school faculty, O'Meara et al. (2019) proposed that academics
7 be assigned credits for their various activities and given the chance to trade credits in one
8 area for credits in other areas to generate an overall system equity. Along this line of
9 reasoning on the development of a 'choice environment' (Kahneman, 2011), Maiden and
10 Perry (2011) and Curcio and Lynch (2017) advocated for a planned and shared rotation of
11 less and more-preferred, less and more time-consuming academic tasks so that they are no
12 longer carried out by the same people, who end up undermining their research potential.
13 We join and integrate this call from another perspective: departments could be designed and
14 managed so as to comprise individuals with different domains of expertise and excellence—
15 some in teaching, others in research, others yet in service, thus echoing what happens in
16 companies, where different functional orientations (e.g., sales, marketing, and R&D)
17 altogether are expected to produce satisfying organizational performance. Groups composed
18 of heterogeneous members, each of them outperforming in at least one domain, instead of all
19 targeting the same domain and refraining from the others, would live up to the expectation of
20 bettering the overall higher education system.

21 **Limitations and Hints for Future Research**

22 This work has limitations that can pave the way for additional studies on the interplay
23 between research and academic citizenship. First of all, it gleans on from Italian management

1 faculty only: considering scholars in different fields and countries would enable us to get a
2 more thorough view on the relationship between heterogeneous types of academic activities
3 and roles. How female faculty live and handle possible competing requirements deserves
4 further elucidation. A ‘gendered nature’ of service has been claimed in the literature
5 (Babcock *et al.*, 2017; Vogelgesang *et al.*, 2010). Women tend to take charge of service,
6 often repeatedly over time: they are so keen on ‘institutional housekeeping’ that a ‘gully of
7 service’ has been highlighted for them (Guarino and Borden, 2017, p. 674). Implicit social
8 biases have been taken into account. Women are scarcely willing to negotiate their position
9 and are the target of requests for ‘not-promotable’ tasks from male colleagues as well as from
10 students, who both perceive them as nurturing and prone to help (Babcock *et al.*, 2017). In
11 parallel, women have been shown through a range of investigation tools varying from survey
12 to focus groups, and from interviews to annual faculty activity reports, to be less focused on
13 research than men (Bozeman and Gaughan, 2011). Our study unravels that female scholars
14 were able to respond to the pressure to advance scientific productivity prompted by an
15 institutional reform through a heftier increase in papers published on Scopus-indexed journals
16 than their male colleagues. Further investigation should complement this evidence by
17 unraveling whether a stronger publication effort came at the expense of service involvement
18 or whether and how female faculty succeeded in balancing heterogeneous courses of action.
19 Additionally, a more thorough outlook on knowledge transfer activities that takes into
20 account patenting, spin-offs, consulting, funding, and teaching, would allow us to better grasp
21 the influence that the different tasks and roles enacted by faculty exert on each other. Finally,
22 we invite academics to proceed along the pathway of understanding the complex intertwining
23 of factors that underlie daily behaviors and choices in university life, and that ultimately
24 determine our performance as individual scholars, but also as members of a collective.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Adams, J.D., Black, G.C., Clemmons, J.R. and Stephan, P.E. (2005) 'Scientific teams and institutional collaborations: Evidence from U.S. universities, 1981–1999' *Research Policy* 34(3): 259–285.
- Allison, P.D. and Long, J.S. (1990) 'Departmental Effects on Scientific Productivity' *American Sociological Review* 55(4): 469.
- Anon (2010) 'Assessment time' *Nature*. 468(7327): 1001–1002.
- Ashforth, B. (2000) *Role Transitions in Organizational Life*. 1 edition ed. Mahwah: Routledge.
- Babcock, L., Recalde, M.P., Vesterlund, L. and Weingart, L. (2017) 'Gender Differences in Accepting and Receiving Requests for Tasks with Low Promotability' *American Economic Review* 107(3): 714–747.
- Baccini, A., Barabesi, L., Cioni, M. and Pisani, C. (2014) 'Crossing the hurdle: the determinants of individual scientific performance' *Scientometrics* 101(3): 2035–2062.
- Bak, H.-J. and Kim, D.H. (2015) 'Too much Emphasis on Research? An Empirical Examination of the Relationship Between Research and Teaching in Multitasking Environments' *Research in Higher Education* 56(8): 843–860.
- Benedetto, S., Cicero, T. and Malgarini, M. (2016) 'Determinants of research quality in Italian universities: Evidence from the 2004 to 2010 evaluation exercise' *Research Evaluation* 25(3): 257–263.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J. and O'Brien, A. (2014) 'Citizens of the academic community? A societal perspective on leadership in UK higher education' *Studies in Higher Education* 39(5): 754–770.
- Bonaccorsi, A., Cicero, T., Ferrara, A. and Malgarini, M. (2015) 'Journal ratings as predictors of articles quality in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences: an analysis based on the Italian Research Evaluation Exercise' *F1000Research* 4: 196.
- Bonaccorsi, A., Daraio, C., Fantoni, S., Folli, V., Leonetti, M. and Ruocco, G. (2017) 'Do social sciences and humanities behave like life and hard sciences?' *Scientometrics* 112(1): 607–653.
- Bongioanni, I., Daraio, C. and Ruocco, G. (2014) 'A quantitative measure to compare the disciplinary profiles of research systems and their evolution over time' *Journal of Informetrics* 8(3): 710–727.
- Bozeman, B. and Gaughan, M. (2011) 'Job satisfaction among University faculty: Individual, work and institutional determinants' *Journal of Higher Education* 82(2): 154–186.
- Brandt, T. and Schubert, T. (2013) 'Is the university model an organizational necessity? Scale and agglomeration effects in science' *Scientometrics* 94(2): 541–565.
- Butler, N., Delaney, H. and Spoelstra, S. (2015) 'Problematizing 'Relevance' in the Business School: The Case of Leadership Studies: Problematizing 'Relevance' in the Business School' *British Journal of Management* 26(4): 731–744.
- Cameron, A.C. and Trivedi, P.K. (2013) *Regression Analysis of Count Data*. 2 edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Capano, G. (2011) 'Government continues to do its job. A comparative study of governance shifts in the higher education sector' *Public Administration* 89(4): 1622–1642.
- Carli, G., Tagliaventi, M.R. and Cutolo, D. (2018) 'One size does not fit all: the influence of individual and contextual factors on research excellence in academia' *Studies in Higher Education*.
- Cartlidge, E. (2010) 'Italian Parliament Passes Controversial University Reforms' *Science* 330(6010): 1462–1463.
- Chavarro, D., Tang, P. and Ràfols, I. (2017) 'Why researchers publish in non-mainstream journals: Training, knowledge bridging, and gap filling' *Research Policy* 46(9): 1666–1680.
- Curcio, A.A. and Lynch, M.A. (2017) 'Addressing Social Loafing on Faculty Committees' *Journal of Legal Education* 67(1): 242–262.
- Daraio, C., Fabbri, F., Gavazzi, G., Izzo, M.G., Leuzzi, L., Quaglia, G. and Ruocco, G. (2018) 'Assessing the interdependencies between scientific disciplinary profiles' *Scientometrics* 116(3): 1785–1803.
- Daraio, C. and Moed, H.F. (2011) 'Is Italian science declining?' *Research Policy* 40(10): 1380–1392.
- Defazio, D., Lockett, A. and Wright, M. (2009) 'Funding incentives, collaborative dynamics and scientific productivity: Evidence from the EU framework program' *Research Policy* 38(2): 293–305.
- Edler, J., Fier, H. and Grimpe, C. (2011) 'International scientist mobility and the locus of knowledge and technology transfer' *Research Policy* 40(6): 791–805.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. and Graebner, M.E. (2007) 'Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges' *Academy of Management Journal* 50(1): 25–32.
- Frischknecht, F. (2008) 'Small countries are unexpected winners in ERC grant tables' *Nature* 454(7205): 690–690.
- Frølich, N. (2011) 'Multi-layered accountability. Performance-based funding of Universities' *Public Administration* 89(3): 840–859.
- Fussy, D.S. (2017) 'Policy directions for promoting university research in Tanzania' *Studies in Higher Education*. 43(9): 1573–1585.
- Gaughan, M. (2009) 'Using the curriculum vitae for policy research: an evaluation of National Institutes of Health center and training support on career trajectories' *Research Evaluation* 18(2): 117–124.
- George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2012) *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. 6 edition, Boston: Pearson.
- Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. and Hamilton, A.L. (2013) 'Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research Notes on the Gioia Methodology' *Organizational Research Methods* 16(1): 15–31.
- Glänzel, W. (2008) 'On some new bibliometric applications of statistics related to the h-index' *Scientometrics* 77(1): 187–196.
- Groot, T. and García-Valderrama, T. (2006) 'Research quality and efficiency' *Research Policy* 35(9): 1362–1376.
- Guarino, C.M. and Borden, V.H. (2017) 'Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?' *Research in Higher Education* 58(6): 672–694.

- 1 Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis*.
2 7th edition, Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- 3 Harzing, A.-W. and Alakangas, S. (2016) 'Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science: a
4 longitudinal and cross-disciplinary comparison' *Scientometrics* 106(2): 787–804.
- 5 Hattie, J. and Marsh, H.W. (1996) 'The Relationship Between Research and Teaching: A
6 Meta-Analysis' *Review of Educational Research* 66(4): 507–542.
- 7 Holland, B.A. (1999) 'Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public
8 service' *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 4(1): 37–44.
- 9 Holmstrom, B. and Milgrom, P. (1991) 'Multitask principal agent analyses - incentive
10 contracts, asset ownership and job design' *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 7:
11 24–52.
- 12 Hottenrott, H. and Lawson, C. (2017) 'A first look at multiple institutional affiliations: a
13 study of authors in Germany, Japan and the UK' *Scientometrics* 111(1): 285–295.
- 14 Jaffe, K. (2014) 'Social and Natural Sciences Differ in Their Research Strategies, Adapted to
15 Work for Different Knowledge Landscapes' *PLOS ONE* 9(11): e113901.
- 16 Jonkers, K. and Cruz-Castro, L. (2013) 'Research upon return: The effect of international
17 mobility on scientific ties, production and impact' *Research Policy* 42(8): 1366–1377.
- 18 Kahneman, D. (2011) *Thinking, fast and slow*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- 19 Klein, K.J., Tosi, H. and Cannella, A.A. (1999) 'Multilevel Theory Building: Benefits,
20 Barriers, and New Developments' *Academy of Management Review* 24(2): 248–253.
- 21 Knights, D. and Clarke, C.A. (2014) 'It's a Bittersweet Symphony, this Life: Fragile
22 Academic Selves and Insecure Identities at Work' *Organization Studies* 35(3): 335–357.
- 23 Krause, K. (2009) 'Interpreting changing academic roles and identities in higher education',
24 in Tight, M., Mok, K.H., Huisman, J. and Morphew, C. (eds). *The Routledge International
25 Handbook of Higher Education*, New York: Routledge, pp. 413–425.
- 26 Landry, R., Saihi, M., Amara, N. and Ouimet, M. (2010) 'Evidence on how academics
27 manage their portfolio of knowledge transfer activities' *Research Policy* 39(10): 1387–1403.
- 28 Lawrence, J., Ott, M. and Bell, A. (2012) 'Faculty Organizational Commitment and
29 Citizenship' *Research in Higher Education* 53(3): 325–352.
- 30 Lee, S. and Bozeman, B. (2005) 'The Impact of Research Collaboration on Scientific
31 Productivity' *Social Studies of Science* 35(5): 673–702.
- 32 Lee, S.J. and Jung, J. (2017) 'Work experiences and knowledge transfer among Korean
33 academics: focusing on generational differences' *Studies in Higher Education* 43(11): 2033–
34 2058.
- 35 Lee, Y.-N., Walsh, J.P. and Wang, J. (2015) 'Creativity in scientific teams: Unpacking
36 novelty and impact' *Research Policy* 44(3): 684–697.
- 37 Lewis, J.M. (2014) 'Individual and Institutional Accountability: The Case of Research
38 Assessment' *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 73(4): 408–416.
- 39 Lewis, J.M. and Ross, S. (2011) 'Research funding systems in Australia, New Zealand and
40 the UK: policy settings and perceived effects' *Policy & Politics* 39(3): 379–398.
- 41 Long, J.S. and Fox, M.F. (1995) 'Scientific Careers: Universalism and Particularism' *Annual
42 Review of Sociology* 21(1): 45–71.

- Lutter, M. and Schröder, M. (2016) 'Who becomes a tenured professor, and why? Panel data evidence from German sociology, 1980–2013' *Research Policy* 45(5): 999–1013.
- Macfarlane, B. (2005) 'The Disengaged Academic: the Retreat from Citizenship' *Higher Education Quarterly* 59(4): 296–312.
- Macfarlane, B. (2007) 'Defining and Rewarding Academic Citizenship: The implications for university promotions policy' *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 29(3): 261–273.
- Macfarlane, B. (2011) 'The Morphing of Academic Practice: Unbundling and the Rise of the Para-academic: The Morphing of Academic Practice' *Higher Education Quarterly* 65(1): 59–73.
- Macfarlane, B. and Burg, D. (2019) 'Legitimation, professionalisation and accountability in higher education studies: an intergenerational story' *Studies in Higher Education* 44(3): 459–469.
- Maiden, B. and Perry, B. (2011) 'Dealing with free- riders in assessed group work: results from a study at a UK university' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 36(4): 451–464.
- Moed, H.F. (2010) 'Measuring contextual citation impact of scientific journals' *Journal of Informetrics* 4(3): 265–277.
- Nørgård, R.T. and Bengtsen, S.S.E. (2016) 'Academic citizenship beyond the campus: a call for the placeful university' *Higher Education Research & Development* 35(1): 4–16.
- O'Connor, P. and O'Hagan, C. (2016) 'Excellence in university academic staff evaluation: a problematic reality?' *Studies in Higher Education* 41(11): 1943–1957.
- O'Meara, K., Lennartz, C.J., Kuvaeva, A., Jaeger, A. and Misra, J. (2019) 'Department Conditions and Practices Associated with Faculty Workload Satisfaction and Perceptions of Equity' *The Journal of Higher Education* doi:10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025.
- Over, R. (1982) 'Does research productivity decline with age?' *Higher Education* 11(5): 511–520.
- Park, S. and Gordon, M.E. (1996) 'Publication Records and Tenure Decisions in the Field of Strategic Management' *Strategic Management Journal* 17(2): 109–128.
- Pifer, M. and Baker, V. (2013) 'Identity as a Theoretical Construct in Research about Academic Careers', in Huisman, J. and Tight, M. (eds). *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*, Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 115–132.
- Ponomariov, B.L. and Boardman, P.C. (2010) 'Influencing scientists' collaboration and productivity patterns through new institutions: University research centers and scientific and technical human capital' *Research Policy* 39(5): 613–624.
- Rebora, G. and Turri, M. (2013) 'The UK and Italian research assessment exercises face to face' *Research Policy* 42(9): 1657–1666.
- Rossi, F. and Rosli, A. (2015) 'Indicators of university–industry knowledge transfer performance and their implications for universities: evidence from the United Kingdom' *Studies in Higher Education* 40(10): 1970–1991.
- Salter, A., Salandra, R. and Walker, J. (2017) 'Exploring preferences for impact versus publications among UK business and management academics' *Research Policy* 46(10): 1769–1782.

- Sharma, S., Durand, R.M. and Gur-Arie, O. (1981) 'Identification and Analysis of Moderator Variables' *Journal of Marketing Research* 18(3): 291.
- Sievers, B. (2008) 'The psychotic university' *Ephemera*. 8(3): 238–257.
- Snijder, T.A.B. and Bosker, R.J. (1999) *Multilevel analysis: an introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modelling*, London: Sage Publications.
- Swann, W.B., Griffin, J.J., Predmore, S.C. and Gaines, B. (1987). 'The cognitive–affective crossfire: When self-consistency confronts self-enhancement.' *Journal of personality and social psychology* 52(5): 881.
- Tagliaventi, M.R., Carli, G. and Cutolo, D. (2019) 'Can we be all in one?', in: 5th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'19). Universitat Politècnica València.
- Taylor, B.J. and Cantwell, B. (2015) 'Global Competition, US Research Universities and International Doctoral Education: Growth and Consolidation of an Organizational Field' *Research in Higher Education* 56(5): 411–441.
- Thompson, P., Constantineau, P. and Fallis, G. (2005) 'Academic Citizenship: An Academic Colleagues' Working Paper' *Journal of Academic Ethics* 3(2–4): 127–142.
- Tien, F.F. and Blackburn, R.T. (1996) 'Faculty Rank System, Research Motivation and Faculty Research Productivity: Measure Refinement and Theory Testing' *The Journal of Higher Education* 67(1): 2–22.
- Valantine, H. and Sandborg, C.I. (2013) 'Changing the Culture of Academic Medicine to Eliminate the Gender Leadership Gap: 50/50 by 2020' *Academic Medicine* 88(10): 1411–1413.
- Vogelgesang, L.J., Denson, N. and Jayakumar, U.M. (2010) 'What Determines Faculty-Engaged Scholarship?' *The Review of Higher Education* 33(4): 437–472.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964) *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wernimont, P.F. and Campbell, J.P. (1968) 'Signs, samples, and criteria.' *Journal of Applied Psychology* 52(5): 372–376.
- Wiley, C., Wallingford, V., Monllor-Tormos, M. and Konyu-Fogel, G. (2016) 'Faculty Promotion in Business Schools: What Counts and What Should Count?' *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice* 16(4): 105–123.
- Xie, Y. and Shauman, K.A. (1998) 'Sex Differences in Research Productivity: New Evidence about an Old Puzzle' *American Sociological Review* 63(6): 847–870.

Conflict of interest statement

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations

Variables		Mean	SD	Min	Max	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Scientific Productivity	1.895	2.744	0	18	1										
2	Scientific Influence	3.420	7.889	0	60.183	0.742	1									
3	Previous Scientific Productivity	1.704	3.785	0	45	0.576	0.543	1								
4	Previous Scientific Influence	3.502	13.020	0	188.725	0.466	0.539	0.808	1							
5	International Collaborations	0.637	2.441	0	36	0.341	0.447	0.664	0.716	1						
6	Visiting Scholarship	0.272	0.445	0	1	0.248	0.257	0.220	0.210	0.216	1					
7	Research Awards	0.384	1.234	0	14	0.300	0.242	0.382	0.359	0.297	0.107	1				
8	Institutional Service	3.984	4.852	0	32	-0.067	-0.046	-0.073	-0.080	-0.066	0.021	0.083	1			
9	Public Service	1.782	3.462	0	31	-0.087	-0.062	-0.033	-0.020	-0.004	-0.084	0.039	0.140	1		
10	Discipline-based Service	1.637	3.825	0	28	0.145	0.173	0.235	0.174	0.138	0.014	0.131	0.176	0.026	1	
11	University Research Orientation	0.307	0.102	0	0.588	0.264	0.248	0.274	0.230	0.218	0.129	0.164	-0.024	-0.091	0.106	1

Table 2. Descriptive data on Scientific Productivity

University Dimension	Previous Scientific Productivity (2004-2010)			Scientific Productivity (2011-2013)		
	Average	Standard deviation	Median	Average	Standard deviation	Median
Small	1.293	2.415	0	1.813	2.375	1
Medium	2.320	4.302	1	2.022	2.664	1
Large	1.518	3.726	0	1.856	2.837	1
Female	1.522	3.265	0	1.993	2.706	1
Male	1.826	4.096	0	1.829	2.770	1
Assistant Professor	1.244	2.284	0	1.967	2.636	1
Associate Professor	1.677	3.632	0	1.885	2.817	1
Full Professor	2.437	5.361	1	1.792	2.843	1
Accounting	1.118	3.139	0	1.640	2.518	1
Strategy and marketing	2.597	4.489	1	2.287	2.960	1
Finance	1.783	3.816	1	1.922	2.888	1
Total	1.704	3.785	0	1.895	2.744	1

Table 3. Multilevel negative binomial regression results for Scientific Productivity

Independent Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	
Previous Scientific Productivity	1.158***	0.032	1.147***	0.029	1.217***	0.035			
Previous Scientific Influence	0.992	0.005	0.993	0.005	0.989**	0.005			
International Collaborations	0.989	0.031	0.991	0.032	1.002	0.023			
Visiting Scholarship	1.521***	0.130	1.537***	0.125	1.546***	0.140			
Research Awards	1.058*	0.034	1.067**	0.032	1.081***	0.028			
Institutional Service			0.987	0.008	0.998	0.009			
Public Service			0.968*	0.017	0.970*	0.016			
Discipline-based Service			1.023*	0.013	1.056***	0.012			
Previous Scientific Productivity × Institutional Service					0.993***	0.002			
Previous Scientific Productivity × Public Service					0.999	0.004			
Previous Scientific Productivity × Discipline-based Service					0.992***	0.002			
University Research Orientation	8.043***	5.718	7.011***	4.813	5.454***	3.505			
University Dimension (ref.: Small)	0.746	0.141	0.736	0.141	0.753	0.140			
Large university	0.853	0.141	0.830	0.135	0.864	0.137			
Gender (ref.: Female)	0.826**	0.079	0.829*	0.081	0.802**	0.076			
Academic Rank (ref.: Full Professor)	1.257**	0.144	1.301**	0.149	1.286**	0.144			
Assistant Professor	1.158	0.164	1.247	0.178	1.221	0.173			
Associate Professor	1.131	0.134	1.067	0.119	1.031	0.111			
Strategy and marketing	1.054	0.134	0.996	0.115	0.975	0.118			
Finance	0.599*	0.158	0.677	0.173	0.654	0.173			
Constant	-0.417***	0.159	-0.456***	0.163	-0.556***	0.185			
ln(alpha)	0.659***	0.105	0.634***	0.103	0.573***	0.106			
σ²(residuals)	0.104***	0.034	0.105***	0.034	0.106***	0.034			
ICC		0.136		0.142		0.156			
Wald χ2 (Prob. > χ2)		186.31 (0.0000)		242.97 (0.0000)		356.15 (0.0000)			
LR test vs. neg. binomial mode LR χ2 (3) (Prob. > χ2)		19.23 (0.0000)		19.88 (0.0000)		21.49 (0.0000)			

N= 692; ***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Table 4. Multilevel negative binomial regression results for Scientific Influence

Independent Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	Exp. Coef.	Robust Std. Err.
Previous Scientific Productivity	1.182***	0.046	1.167***	0.041	1.190***	0.046
Previous Scientific Influence	1.009	0.011	1.006	0.010	1.014	0.012
International Collaborations	1.049	0.040	1.063	0.043	1.058	0.043
Visiting Scholarship	2.164***	0.338	2.193***	0.348	2.230***	0.369
Research Awards	1.088	0.066	1.103	0.066	1.100	0.068
Institutional Service			0.990	0.021	0.995	0.021
Public Service			0.939**	0.029	0.935**	0.028
Discipline-based Service			1.045**	0.019	1.078***	0.029
Previous Scientific Influence × Institutional Service					0.998	0.002
Previous Scientific Influence × Public Service					1.002	0.008
Previous Scientific Influence × Discipline-based Service					0.996***	0.001
University Research Orientation	53.805***	51.868	44.741***	40.449	36.331***	31.757
University Dimension (ref.: Small)	0.523**	0.145	0.491**	0.138	0.496**	0.149
	0.810	0.207	0.729	0.182	0.753	0.209
Gender (ref.: Female)	0.791	0.142	0.769	0.139	0.751*	0.129
	Male					
Academic Rank (ref.: Full Professor)	1.059	0.208	1.119	0.226	1.117	0.216
	Assistant Professor					
	Associate Professor	0.807	0.887	0.228	0.870	0.219
Discipline (ref.: Accounting)	1.663**	0.427	1.457	0.374	1.442	0.359
	Strategy and marketing					
	Finance	0.788	0.724	0.197	0.702	0.189
Constant	0.425**	0.184	0.536	0.233	0.536	0.238
ln(alpha)	0.915***	0.104	0.893***	0.106	0.873***	0.112
σ ² (residuals)	2.498***	0.260	2.442**	0.258	2.394***	0.269
σ ² (constant)	0.219**	0.116	0.210**	0.118	0.224**	0.116
ICC		0.081		0.079		0.085
Wald χ2 (Prob. > χ2)		140.82 (0.0000)		149.80 (0.0000)		181.43 (0.0000)
LR test vs. neg. binomial mode LR χ2 (3) (Prob. > χ2)		8.42 (0.0019)		7.73 (0.0027)		9.04 (0.0013)

N= 692; ***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .1

Figure 1. Research hypotheses




Figure 2. The full moderation effect of Institutional Service on the relationship between past and future Scientific Productivity.




Figure 3. The quasi-moderation effect of Discipline-based Service on the relationship between past and future Scientific Productivity.

