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Universities, from their earliest inception in medieval Europe, have been centers of avant-grade thinking an order of magnitude more complex than in surrounding communities (Bess, 1984, p. 149). Society expects and requires the production of human capital, innovation and new ideas, created all by universities. These outputs, demanded by society, come from effective university decision-making. Universities type of thought has played a crucial role in the inception of society pillars, like science and democratic political theory (Bess, 1984). Universities expanded the frontiers of knowledge and built an educated element of society and therefore, their role was to increase awareness in all aspects of life. This increased awareness remains as a primary use of the university and is borne by decision-making.

**Decision-Making**

There are seven phases of Decision Making, including setting objectives from which to make choices, establishing priorities among the objectives, developing alternatives, evaluating alternatives, choosing the best alternative, assessing potential negative consequences of that choice, and attempting to control for those negative effects (Kepner and Tregoe, 1965). In addition to these phases, they were interested in what might go wrong. They developed a list of problem areas, which is summarized in Table 2.

In addition to (a) problems or goals being addressed in typical decision making situations and (b) leaders with their individual styles preferences often being involved in decision making processes, decision can be isolated and individualized or they can involve groups of people. In both individual and group cases, decisions require a process that is important to understand. Decision making in higher education institutions
environments are highly stratified, and within them it is difficult to specifically articulate clear goals (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). As Kezar and Eckel made it clear, it is easier to reach broad agreement in education when the goals are stated ambiguously. It is easier to understand how decision making processes that incorporate some degree of participation, given that stratification and goal ambiguity are a part of higher education institutions, (Rausch, Halfhill, Sherman, & Washbush, 2001) and clarity across organizational boundaries are more likely to yield purposeful and meaningful decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Potential problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Motivation, skills, attitudes, developmental needs, and personal goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Relationship problems between functions or people; communication problems, accountability, delegation, and responsibility problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Economic or demographic trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Competition, and image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Organizational adaptability of rigidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Not enough of it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-1: Potential Decision Making Problem; Kepner & Tregoe, (1965)

Rausch et al. (2001) articulated six elements or issues to be considered during decision making process. They are:

1. The need to set both realistic and challenging goals
2. The need to ensure appropriate participation
3. The need to communicate effectively with relevant stakeholders
4. The need to ensure co-ordination, and stimulate co-operations
5. The need to have adequate competence available at all stages of decision making
6. The appropriateness of there being reward outcomes for the various stakeholders

(p. 249)

**Definition of Participation**

The literature on educational and business organizations is replete with studies on employee participation. Wagner and Gooding (1987) suggested that participation and its
related topics are among the most widely researched subjects. Despite this extensive coverage, a succinct, unambiguous and consistent definition of participation in organizations has not emerged from the literature for a number of possible reasons. The first possible reason is methodological in nature wherein the construct of participation is not adequately and clearly conceptualized. In reviewing studies of participation and its outcomes in business organizations, Glew, et al (1995) indicated that the researchers generally fail to provide a clear, broadly acceptable definition of participation. A similar view is held by Heller (2003, pp. 147) who claims that the term as used by researchers and practitioners typically “lacks clarity and lends itself to inconsistent applications and confusion.” Part of the confusion may be attributed to the diverse vocabulary often utilized in the literature, often in an inconsistent fashion and without clear definitions, to describe the same general phenomenon. For example, Peterson (1999) refers to participation as voice. Employee involvement, consultation, decentralization, influence-sharing, partnership and empowerment are terms often used to describe the same general construct of participation (Heller, 2003).

A second possible reason for the confusion over the meaning of the term participation is its use in practice and research to describe different types and degrees of employee involvement in organizational activities. A critical component that may or may not be included in the conceptualization of participation is that of decision making authority. In discussing decision making processes in the work environment, Evans and Fischer (1992, 1971) suggested that participation can “vary in degree from simple consultation to full authority in decision making and in scope from a single project to all aspects of the larger work environment.” Heller and Brown (1995) described
participation through the frame work of an “influence power continuum” that ranges from minimal participation involving information sharing, to a higher level of participation involving opportunities to give advice, to the highest levels of participation involving joint decision making or possibly full control of decisions. Such a range of participation levels is likely to exist in academic departments of universities and colleges.

“Decision-making is a vast subject, embracing such discipline as economics, operation research, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology, and business policy” (Chaffee, 1983, p. 5). Moreover, decision-making occurs at various levels; individual, collective, group, and organizational, involving capabilities of the decision-maker’s mind, the communication of ideas among individuals, and the mathematical calculations that identify optimal choices. These are all important parts of decision-making.

University decision-making that is shared through faculty governance occurs at the organizational level between the faculty and the president. In this view, decision-making is seen as “interactions that take place over time and that lead to select one course of action in preference to others” (Chaffee, 1983, p.5).

Campus decision-making consists of strategic planning. Higher education has continuously struggled to respond to changing circumstances and has therefore tried many different models, theories and approaches (Schuster, Smith, Corak & Yamada, 1994). Higher education has moved from Total Quality Management in the 1990’s to the most recent approach of strategic planning as it attempts to respond to demand of the times and remain sensitive to the institution’s own culture.
Environmental changes in higher education forced numerous universities to address an group of both internal and external issues. Campuses were pushed to attend to the world outside of their institutions. Moreover, the venue of higher education has become the focus of attention by critical outsiders, including disenfranchised alumni and legislators. Though once the boundaries between campuses and the outside world were impermeable, they have become more porous” (Schuster, Smith, Corak, & Yamada, 1994).

Higher education has to adapt itself to changes in the environment (Kerr, 1973). The literature, once predominantly emphasizing the necessity of responding to changing conditions, began to shift to advocate that the campus stance should be relatively proactive. “That is, what had been perceived as threats to institutional well-being could be transformed into opportunities if the institutions could position itself appropriately” (Schuster, Smith, Corak & Yamada, 1994, p. 19). One approach that was forwarded for such positioning was strategic planning as part of decision-making (Schuster, Smith, Corak & Yamada, 1994).

Strategic planning is a part of decision-making. Collier (1981) offers the best definition of how strategic planning is applicable to colleges and universities by developing these five elements of strategic planning: 1) strategic planning is the making of a set of future determining decisions for the university, 2) the total process is composed of both the formulation and implementation of a strategy, 3) strategic decisions require matching the organization’s particular characteristics and resources with its proximate environment, 4) strategic decision require the institution to create its own
future, and 5) the set of decision should be synergistic and increase organizational flexibility (Collier, 1981, p. 86).

Drucker (1980) reported that strategic planning does not stress efficiency, or doing things well, but instead stresses effectiveness and doing the right things “Strategy’s aim is to exploit the new and different opportunities of tomorrow” (Drucker, 1980, p. 61). Strategic planning is difficult to apply because it involves the conceptual capacity to see the university as a whole. Seeing the whole is probably the most important skill of all for those in top management such as the university president. For this very reason of seeing the university as a whole, the university president must see this wholeness through the lens of the faculty who may contribute to effective decision-making and bring the picture together via their specialized knowledge.

Though all decision-making is not strategic, all strategic planning involves decision-making. Shirley (1981, pp. 10-12) developed the best set of criteria of separating the strategic from the tactical decisions. He suggested that strategic decision must 1) be directed toward defining the institution’s relationship with its environment, 2) affect the organization as a whole, 3) be multifunctional in character, i.e., depend on input from a variety of functional areas, and 4) provide direction for the constraints on all administrative and operational activities throughout the institutions.

Decision-making by strategic planning has gained acceptance because people realize that the environment constantly changes, that planning is a process, and that competitors are changing tactics. Hence, one of the qualities of strategic planning is an emphasis on change. Additionally, planning is dynamic rather than static. It involves
openness to the environment and information via inclusion of varied decision-makers such as faculty and the university president.

Plans are not made and then implemented. Rather, plans are continually modified. Mintzberg (1980) argues that strategic plans become a pattern in a stream of decisions. This stream of decisions may prove to be better when faculty members are involved in the process. This may lead to the most effective leadership by the university president as strategic planning is used to make decision not only efficient but also effective. The most effective decisions may result from input by the faculty.

**Models of Decision Making Process**

Administrators and researchers have often identified systems of governance to summarize decision making processes in complex organizations, such as those found in institutions of higher education. The four early forms of governance used to summarize decision making process are: rational model, bureaucratic, collegial system and political activity or participation democracy. Riley and Baldrige (1997) suggested that such models organize the way one perceives the decision making process and the way one analyzes as well as help to determine one’s action. For example, if one perceives the system as bureaucratic in nature, one uses established policies or procedures to achieve one’s goals. If one perceives the processes to be collegial, one may seek to appeal to colleagues’ reasoning to persuade them to achieve one’s desired goals. If one perceives the decision making process to be political, one forms groups or coalitions to exert pressure on decision makers to achieve one’s desired goals. Currently, six types of decision making models have emerged in the literature as the most widely used: bureaucratic, collegial, political, rational, anarchical and autocratic, (Chaffee 1983).
Bureaucratic Model: One of the most influential descriptions of decision making process or governance of complex organization was Webber’s (1947) bureaucracies. He suggested that bureaucracies are networks of groups dedicated to some limited goal and organized to achieve maximum efficiencies. The system is regulated by principles of nationalism and legality. The bureaucracy as seen by Webber included appointment to office, competency as a basis for promotion, salary as the national form of payment, and tenure as the sign of competency (Baldridge, 1971).

The bureaucratic model of decision making process seeks stability with strategic orientation to maintain the status quo. Formally described roles dictated the activities performed. Individual mandates are governed by rules and regulations (Smart et al., 1997). In the bureaucratic decision making approach, there is a clear link between resources and objectives. There is also the presence of formal hierarchy, formal channels of communication, and formal policies and rules that govern most of the institution’s work.

Collegial Model: some writers (Goodman, 1962; Millet, 1962) rejected the bureaucratic model of decision making as useful in institutions of higher education and recommended the collegial model. They argued that decision making in academic institutions should not be like the hierarchical process espoused by the bureaucratic model. Instead, there should be full participation of the academic community, especially faculty, in the decision making process. They emphasized that the collegial model is better suited for the interpersonal relationships which exist within colleges and universities. Baldridge et al (1991) described the collegial model as one where the academic community fully participates in the decision making process. Under this concept, the community of
scholars would administer their own affairs and the bureaucratic administration would have little or no influence (Millet, 1962).

**Political Model:** the political model, developed in 1971, differs from the collegial model and the bureaucratic model. The political model views institutions as miniature political systems. The political model assumes that major policymaking decisions commit the organization to definite goals and set management strategy for reaching those goals. Since policy is so important, people and interest groups seek to influence those decisions. In such systems, conflict is natural (Baldridge et al., 1991).

**Rational Model:** the rational model consists of selecting the alternative whose outcome ranks highest in the decision maker’s payoff function (Alison, 1971). The rational model includes some bureaucratic organization structure. In this system, goals and objectives are translated in payoffs; alternative consequences for each decision choice are analyzed and the choice with the best payoff is chosen. The rational model works in an environment where goals are clear, process values logic and order, a linear relationship exists between goals and outcomes, outcome is determined by the values of the organization, and the values of the organization are based on consensus.

**Organized Anarchy:** the organized anarchy model differs from the well organized bureaucracy or the decision by consensus collegial models. Developed by Cohen and March (1974), this model is characterized by ambiguous or strongly contested goals, clients demanding voices in the decision making process and unclear technology. Organizations using the anarchical model are very vulnerable to their environment. The leaders in an anarchical system must project a sense of competence, integrity and dedication to many different constituencies.
Autocratic Model: the autocratic model (Chaffee, 1983) suggests that one central authority makes the decision. It recognizes the use of power as the essential difference between this model and the bureaucratic model. Little communication is required, and little input from the organization is permitted in the decision making process. Most decisions would be made centrally and communicated downward. Administration will tolerate feedback in such systems, but the feedback must follow prescribed channels, which greatly contributes to the possibility of miscommunication.

As noted from the description of the autocratic model, this model has many overlapping elements of the political and bureaucratic models. It also is based on decision making process where the decision is made by a centralized power authority. According to Fryer and Lovas (1991), this type of decision making process is not practical to the process used in complex organizations such as institutions of higher education. In addition, communication, which is essential to the discussion of organizational effectiveness (Fryer & Lovas, 1991) is lacking in an autocratic environment.

Decision Making Areas

The areas of decision making in which faculty participate vary from institution to institution; however, six functions were identified for this study. These areas include academic affairs, student affairs, personnel decisions, financial affairs, professional/personal development and planning processes.

Academic Affairs: Perhaps the area of college life, for which faculty is most responsible, is the area of academics. This is, usually without question, the faculty’s “primary
domain” (Dykes, 1968, p. 2). The AAUP/ACE/AGB Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966) suggested that faculty maintain primary responsibility in matters of academic policy relating to curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, and research faculty status. The literature reflects faculty primacy over academic matters. The Carnegie Foundation (1982) acknowledged four prerogatives of the professorate: “to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it will be taught and who may be admitted to study” (p 4). Corson (1975) elaborated on the academic role of faculty.

The faculty is usually granted a substantial responsibility for making decisions as to academic policy. Such decisions include those dealing with the organization of academic departments, the framing of educational programs, degree requirements, the content of courses, assignment of teachers to courses, and patterns of student education (p. 239).

Faculty participation in curriculum issues has deep historical roots, with faculty either completely controlling the curriculum or maintaining the strongest influence upon it (Floyd, 1985; Levine, 1978; Millett, 1978). Curriculum areas in which faculty exercise influence include the evaluation and revision of present educational programs, establishment of new educational programs and determination of degree requirements (Millett, 1978; Powers & Powers, 1983; Stowe, 1992). Furthermore, Powers and Powers (1983) argued that matters affecting academic freedom are also under purview of the faculty.

The professional lives of community college faculty center around classroom teaching. Findings from two studies (Astin, Korn & Dey, 1991; Carnegie Foundation for
the Advancement of Teaching, 1989) show that community college faculty spends more hours per week in the classroom than their colleagues at four-year colleges and universities. They also are more likely to view teaching as their primary interest and to indicate that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for faculty promotion.

**Student affairs:** Findings from several surveys in US indicate that community college faculty view teaching and contact with students as the most gratifying aspects of their work (Diener, 1985; Riday, Bingham & Harvey, 1985; Stecklenin & Willie, 1982). Powers and Powers (1983) acknowledged that it is generally accepted that matters pertaining to policies governing the academic performance of students fall in faculty jurisdiction.

Corson (1975) claimed that the authority of faculty “to make decisions as to the composition of the student body and as to those aspects of student life that will affect the educational process is sometimes claimed by faculties” (p. 241). Apparently, some reticence exists on the part of faculty to participate in matters relating to student affairs. Faculty involvement in issues related to student affairs lower than other decision making areas (Nead’s, 1994). Student affairs were also the area in which faculty preferred to have the least amount of involvement. Perhaps faculty lack of interest in this area results from the growth of student services support staff. Stowe (1992) suggested that the traditional faculty function of setting criteria for student admission is being entirely developed or strongly influenced by state regulatory agencies. However, Foresi (as cited in Savell, 1983) indicated an increasing interest on the part of community college faculty in “student personnel affairs, student government affairs and student organizations advising” (p. 36).
**Personnel Decisions:** faculty personnel decisions play an important role in determining the success an institution has in attracting and retaining personnel to fulfill its mission (Savell, 1983). Corson (1975, pp. 240) claimed that faculty personnel decisions are “usually” entrusted to faculty based on the rationale that “as professionals, faculty members alone are qualified to pass judgment on the capabilities of individuals who will be expected to teach, perform research, or render services requiring expertise in a particular discipline.” It is generally accepted that policies that set standards of professional performance for faculty members fall within the realm of faculty responsibility (Powers & Powers 1983). Floyd (1985) described the faculty’s responsibility for determining its own membership.

Faculty at most institutions participate in making decisions on most significant matters related to faculty status; assisting in recruiting new faculty; approving backgrounds of candidates for appointment; setting faculty performance standards; participating within their disciplines in peer review on matters of tenure, promotion and dismissal; and sitting on committees to hear faculty grievances (Floyd, 1985, pp. 30).

Dykes (1968) found faculty assigning a “determining” role to faculty regarding personnel policies, whereas Savell’s (1983) community college faculty ascribed a “joint action” role. Determining indicates the faculty has final authority, and joint action signifies agreement by faculty and other college constituencies.

**Financial affairs:** The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing boards, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities.
Corson (1975) suggested that as campus resources decreased, faculty became more active in pursuing those resources. However, he indicated the faculty’s role in financial decision making is typically limited to recommendations about the annual budget. Floyd (1985) discounts any participation on the part of faculty with regards to budgetary processes at most institutions. In his study of faculty at state colleges, Stowe (1992) found individual faculty had little or no impact in the area of financial planning; however, representative faculties were involved in the process.

Generally, budgeting is viewed as the responsibility of campus administrators, even though on some campuses, administrators attempt to include various campus constituencies in budgetary decision making processes (Chabotar, 1995). Chabotar (1995) advocates a participative budgetary process, which involves the establishment of a budget committee. The budget committee, typically including broad campus representation (faculty, administrative staff, support staff and students), prepares the annual budget, based on requests from various campus departments and units. The recommended budget is submitted to the president for approval by the institution’s governing board. Chabotar (1995) acknowledges that participative budgeting takes more time, but he believes a budget developed with genuine participation is more likely to be understood, especially in relation to the rationale for core budget priorities. In addition to budgeting, faculty also wants input in matters pertaining to capital improvements.

**Professional/Personal Development**: this area concerns the extent to which faculty control the professional activities in which they engage. Studying samples limited to community college faculty, Hutton and Jobe (1985) found lack of professional development opportunities as the least satisfying aspect of their job. Relatively few
faculties in community colleges feel pressured by their institutions to publish, possibly because of the limited incentives for publishing. National surveys comparing two year and four-year faculty find the former much less likely to engage in activities relating to research, publishing and delivering papers at discipline based conferences (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). In addition, relatively few community college faculties hold a Ph.D. and rarely are encouraged by their institutions to receive one (Palmer, 1994). Palmer (1994) noted that the pursuit of scholarship is an individual prerogative in community colleges – pursued as a personal endeavor rather than a requirement of the profession.

**Planning/Institutional goals:** It was not until the 1970s and 1980s that planning began having a direct impact on educational policy. Since then faculty, to varying degrees, have sought input into institutional planning activities (Floyd, 1985). Richardson, Blocker and Bender (1972) maintained that “every institution must have a procedure through which objectives are established, plans for achieving these objectives are designed, and procedures developed to evaluate institutional effectiveness as well as the relative contribution of the persons involved” (p. 92).

In Nead’s (1994) study of community college faculty, faculty indicated that their present level of involvement in setting institutional goals was in the discussion range. Discussion indicates only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty. Savell (1983) also found faculty’s present role in the discussion range, while presidents and academic deans believed faculty played a greater “consultative” role in setting institutional goals.
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to an individual’s positive or negative attitude toward his or her job (Robbins, 2000). Job satisfaction can be defined as “an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying” (Kalleberg, 1977, pp. 126). Job satisfaction can also be defined as the extent to which rewards actually received meet or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards (Porter, 1961). Simply put, job satisfaction is the extent to which a person likes his or her job (Spector, 1997).

There are two approaches regarding the conceptualization and definition of job satisfaction. The first approach examines a macro or global job satisfaction, in which the survey instrument is designed to assess the overall feelings about a job. Although job satisfaction is viewed as a composite phenomenon, the emphasis is on the overall evaluation of job satisfaction (Jayaratne, 1993). A typical survey question on overall Job Satisfaction simply asks “Overall, do you feel satisfied with your job?”

The second approach emphasizes various facets of job satisfaction, in which the survey instrument measures different aspects of the job separately. It is universally accepted that job satisfaction is the extent to which an individual is satisfied with different aspects of the job (Jayaratne, 1993). Overall job satisfaction is a result of combinations of a multifaceted evaluation of the job. Commonly measured facets include satisfaction with pay, promotions, supervision, job security, work load and working conditions.
Importance of Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction is important due to three important reasons. First, the humanitarian perspective is that people deserve to be treated fairly and with respect. Job satisfaction is to some extent a reflection of good treatment. Second, the utilitarian perspective is that job satisfaction can lead to behavior by employees that affect organizational functioning. Furthermore, job satisfaction can be a reflection of organizational functioning (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

Job satisfaction has been a source of interest and concern for decades and remains an important topic (Gruenberg, 1979; Spector, 1997; Tobias, 1999; Altman, 2002). The literature presents many definitions of job satisfaction according to the individual perspective and the interest (Gruenberg, 1979). Major commonly used definitions of job satisfaction are presented as follows:

1. Hoppock (1935) defined it as “any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to truthfully say, I am satisfied with my job” (p. 47).

2. Vroom (1964) defined it as “affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying” (p. 99). He also states “positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction and negative attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction” (pp. 99).

3. Weiss, et al (1966) defined two related terms: “satisfactoriness is a function of the correspondence between the individuals’ abilities and the ability requirements of the job, while satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between the individual’s needs and the reinforcer system on the job” (p. 4). They further state
“where ability requirements and reinforcer system are presumably invariant, satisfactoriness becomes a function of abilities, and satisfaction of function of need.” (pp. 4)

4. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) defined it as “the favorable viewpoint of the worker toward the work role he presently occupies” (pp. 172).

5. Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) defined it as “the feelings a worker has about his job” (pp. 6). They state that it “corresponds both with the worker’s concept of the meaning of the word and with the definition implied by research workers investigating the phenomena of satisfaction” (pp. 6).

6. Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) defined it as “the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of the outcome he feels he should receive” (pp. 53-54).

7. Locke (1976) defined it as “the appraisal of one’s job as attaining or allowing the attainment of one’s important job values, providing these values are congruent with or help fulfill one’s basic needs” (pp. 1319). He also defines it as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (pp. 1300).

8. Hopkins (1983) defined it as “the state of mind that results from an individual’s needs or values being met by the job and its environment” (pp. 32).

9. Lofquist and Dawis (1991) defined it as “an individual’s positive affective evaluation of the target environment; result of an individual’s requirements being fulfilled by the target environment; internal indicator of correspondence; a
pleasant affective state; the individual’s appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirements are fulfilled by the environment (pp. 27).

10. Spector (1997) defined it as “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs” (pp. 2)

11. Brief (1998) defined it as “an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor” (pp. 86)

12. Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (2000) defined it as “an attitude that individuals have about their jobs. It results from their perception of their jobs” (pp. 106).

**Two - Factor theory**

Factor theory describes job factors, which contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Ashbaugh (1982) states that the implication for Factor Theory is “that a person can simultaneously be very satisfied and very dissatisfied (pp. 198).

One important theory cited repeatedly in job satisfaction literature as Factor Theory is Herzberg’s Motivation/Hygiene Theory, also called Two Factor Theory (Beck, 1983). The main concept of Herzberg’s Motivation Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1957; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman 1959; Herzberg, 1966, 1968, 1982) is investigating the question: What do people want from their jobs? This question was investigated by interviewing 200 professional accountants and engineers in Pittsburgh Pennsylvania in the United State of America to describe in detail past situations in which they felt exceptionally good and bad about their jobs and by using a research strategy called “critical incidence technique.” Herzberg’s theory “focuses on two factors: first,
outcomes that can lead to high levels of motivation and job satisfaction and second, outcomes that can prevent people from being dissatisfied” (Sims, 2002, pp. 59).

On the basis of the information obtained, Herzberg concluded that certain factors contribute to job satisfaction and different set of factors leads to job dissatisfaction. His theory calls these factors motivators or satisfiers, which can motivate and satisfy workers, and hygienic or dissatisfiers (also called maintenance), which can only prevent dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). As Herzberg’s theory (1959) states:

When our respondents reported feeling happy with their jobs, they most frequently described factors relating to their tasks, to events that indicted to them that they were successful in the performance of their work and to the possibility of professional growth. Conversely, when feelings of unhappiness were reported, they are not associated with the job itself but with conditions that surround the doing of the job.

According to Herzberg’s theory, the motivators’ factors arise from the intrinsic of the job itself and include: achievement, recognition, works itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. On the other hand, the hygiene factors arise from the extrinsic or environment of the job and include: company policy and administration, supervision, relationship with supervisor, working conditions, salary, relationship with peers, personal life, and relationship with subordinates, status and security (Siegel & Lane, 1987), as illustrated in following figure. The hygiene factors can be equivalent to Maslow’s lower level needs and the motivator factors can be equivalent to Maslow’s higher level needs (Herzberg, 1982).
According to Herzberg’s theory, when hygiene needs are not met, workers will be dissatisfied and when hygiene needs are met, workers will be satisfied. However, satisfying hygiene needs will not result in high levels of motivation or even high levels of job satisfaction. For motivation and job satisfaction to be high, motivator needs must be met. As Herzberg’s theory (1959) state:

Improvement in these factors of hygiene will serve to remove the impediments to positive job attitudes. When these factors deteriorate to a level below that which the employee considers acceptable, then job dissatisfaction ensues. However, the reverse does not hold true. When job context can be characterized as optimal, we will not get dissatisfaction, but neither will we get much in the way of positive attitudes (p. 69).

Therefore, the hygiene factors and the motivator factors are operating independently of one another, that means “satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exist on
a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. There are two independent continua that exist, one running from satisfied to neutral and another running from dissatisfied to neutral” as illustrated in the following figure. In other words, motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent. Hygenes are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present, Bockman (1971) notes that “motivators fulfill the individual’s need for growth and hygiene factors help him to avoid discomfort and unpleasantness”.

Figure 2-2; Differential Effects of Hygiene Factors And Motivators (Black & Porter, 2000, p. 374)
The following is one example of the hygiene factors. If company policies were applied to the employees’ unequally or with some favoritism, employees would tend to become de-motivated. However, if the company policies were good and administered in a fair and reasonable manner, employees will feel good but would not be more motivated because of that (Fazzi, 1994). Therefore, Herzberg’s theory stresses the importance of helping individuals satisfy all their needs, not just lower-level needs.

In general, several studies have been cited supporting evidence for the Herzberg’s theory such as Hulin and Smith (1967), Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) and Iacqua, schumacker and Li (1995). However, some researchers have criticized the research supporting the theory such as Dunnette, Campbell and Hake (1967), King (1970) and Koontz and Weihrich (1990).

The justification for studying job satisfaction has been said to come from three conceptually distinct positions, all of which assuming a central role of work in the life of men and women (Morse & Weiss, 1955/1970). It can be studied because job satisfaction is tied to the development of workers as persons and to their dignity, because it is related to quality of living in general and, finally, because a highly satisfied employee will present more pro-organization behaviors than a less satisfied one (Kaleberg, 1977). With somewhat different wording, Smith (1992) has also made reference to the above reasons for studying job satisfaction. The workers’ development as a person is stressed by noting that jobs satisfaction can be related to an individual’s happiness and trust, while quality of life is explicitly dealt with discussing the contribution that job satisfaction can make to life satisfaction in general. Finally and despite the absence of a perfect relationship with specific consequent behaviors like productivity and turnover, the study of job satisfaction
can be highly pragmatic, as it can help identify organizational areas in need of attention, and because satisfied workers, compared to non-satisfied ones, tend to be more adaptable, cooperative and willing to accept change. In a period of great technological and economic dynamics, organizations must adapt continuously to their environments and fostering the above characteristics of a satisfied worker most surely represent, in the long run, significant economic gains to the organization (Smith, 1992).

Ricky W. Griffin (1990), believed the traditional approach to job satisfaction was influenced by recognizing and managing individual characteristics of the job and the employee. Basically, job satisfaction research focused on the attitudes of people developed about five basic dimensions of a job pay opportunities for promotion, the nature of the work itself, policies and procedures of the organizations, and working conditions.

Frederick Hertzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1968) suggested that two sets of factors influence job satisfaction: the first set of factors included responsibilities, achievement, promotion and recognition; the second set were those that caused dissatisfaction and were called “hygiene factors” which included working conditions, technical supervision, interpersonal relations, company policy and administration.

According to Woodruff (1992), the original basis of Hertzberg’s two-factor theory was a survey of approximately 200 engineers and accountants who were asked to describe when they felt especially satisfied and to describe a time when they felt especially dissatisfied result from different causes. Job satisfaction depends on intrinsic factors while job dissatisfaction depends on extrinsic factors.
Figure 1 summarizes aspects of the two dimensional aspects of the job which lead to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Motivators (intrinsic Factors)</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction Hygiene Needs (Extrinsic Factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1. Company Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>2. Peer Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>3. Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job itself</td>
<td>4. Superior-Subordinate Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>5. Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>6. Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2: Hertzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory

This approach was modified by some researchers which suggested that overall expectations an employee brought to the job influenced the outcome of individual satisfaction with the job (Carroll, 1969).

According to a research article written by Oshagbemi (1997) on “Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Higher Education,” 51.4% of 566 responses from college faculty indicated that teaching and research each contribute about 25% to job satisfaction and 16% to dissatisfaction. These results did not support Hertzberg’s theory that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were separated and distinct; findings revealed the influence of the situation.

Abraham Maslow (1971) proposed a hierarchy of human needs theory in which he defined intrinsic factors as ones coming from personal enjoyment of an activity in contrast to obvious external rewards, obligations, or similar factors. By this, he meant that some needs were more basic and powerful than others. Once the prepotent physiological needs are satisfied, the growth needs represented by the need for “self-actualization” which are based on a positive, life-enhancing force for personal growth and satisfaction, emerge. Part of this life-enhancing force could be described as a feeling of having has some control over events that affected one’s life.
Ambaile (1984) and Kone (1987) stressed that quantity of work may be increased by salaries and bonuses. However, quality of work is tied more to intrinsic factors such as interest, freedom of action, having input into decisions affecting their work, and constructive feedback.

Baker (1985) declared that there was great value in rewarding faculty/staff in the Community College System. He found employees wanted various rewards from their jobs to find them satisfying. Participation in the decision-making process appeared to be viewed as an intrinsic reward.

Though it is commonly assumed that extrinsic incentives and disincentives are necessary to motivate people, Serigiovanni (1996) argued against the idea that “if you want people to do something, you have to give them something in return, what gets rewarded gets done”. Unfortunately, there was a “flip side” to this rule of motivation. What does not get rewarded does not get done. According to Etzioni (1988), attention should be to “what is rewarding gets done”, and “what is good gets done”. These two rules recognized the importance of intrinsic motivation as a source of job satisfaction on one hand and the human tendency to respond to morality, emotions, and social bonds on the other. The evidence suggested that teachers were more likely to engage in long term effort when they found their activities intellectually challenging and significant as opposed to when they had intrinsic reasons for their participation (Hertzberg, 1966).

As Etzioni (1988) reminds us, “human beings pass moral judgments over their urges. For example, people save not only to consume in their old age, but also they believe it is indecent to become dependent on the government or on their children. People pay taxes not merely because they fear the penalties, but also because they consider their
government a legitimate institution. Figure 2 summarized the three motivational rules and their implications for job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What gets rewarded gets done</th>
<th>Extrinsic reasons</th>
<th>Calculated Involvement (they stay involved as along as they like the deal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is rewarding gets done</td>
<td>Intrinsic reasons</td>
<td>Intrinsic involvement (they stay involved without supervision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is thought to be good gets done</td>
<td>Felt duties and obligations</td>
<td>Moral involvement (they stay involved without supervision and even when rewards are not available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-3: Rules of Motivation: Implications for Job Satisfaction

Organizational Commitment

Allen’s and Meyer’s Model of Organizational Commitment

Although several conceptualizations of commitment have appeared in the literature, each reflects one of three general themes. Allen and Meyer (19900 have developed a three-component conceptualized of organizational commitment that has been labeled affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Affective Commitment; affective commitment refers to an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organization. Employees with strong affective commitment expend their energy on behalf of the organization, because they want to do so.

Continuance Commitment; continuous commitment is viewed as a tendency to engage in organizational activities based on the individual’s perceived costs or profit associated with continued participation or losses associated with leaving. Employees with strong continuance commitment expend their energy on behalf of the organization because they feel it is in their interest to do so.
Normative Commitment: normative commitment refers to the belief that one is obligated to the organization after joining. Employees with strong normative commitment expend their energy on behalf of the organization, because they feel they should do so.

Affective, continuance, and normative commitment are not considered to be separate types of commitment distributed among employees. Rather, they are conceptually distinct and independent components of organizational commitment. An employee’s relationship with an organization might reflect varying degrees of all three (Meyer & Allen, 1997). For example, an employee might feel both an emotional attachment to the organization and a sense of obligation to stay, but also might recognize that leaving would be very difficult from an economic standpoint. Another employee might experience a considerable degree of desire and need to remain with the current organization. Organizational commitment develops slowly and gradually stabilizes over time as the employee gains experience with the organization. It is assumed that the development of each commitment component is relatively independent of the other two. Each component may develop as the result of quite different antecedents, and the development of one component does not necessarily affect the level of another component.

Although affective, continuance, and normative commitment reflect links between employees and the organization, the nature of the links may be different (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989). Those who have strong affective commitment may be willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, while those who have been compelled to remain in the organization may do little more than the minimum required to retain their employment. Thus, employees with both
affective and continuance commitment components may be less likely to be absent or quit, but the level of their service morale and attitude may be quite different.

Study of the employee-organization linkage in relation to the commitment variable expands understanding of the general psychological processes, underlying the human decision to identify with selected organizations and therefore assists in better understanding of the human life experience (Mowday, et al, 1982). According to Mowday et al (1982, p. 3), a “psychological contract” is created when an individual decides to associate with an organization. Exchange is a reappearing theme common in the literature presenting the conceptual aspects of organizational commitment. Individuals join organizations seeking to find a work situation in which they can apply their abilities in exchange for the opportunity to satisfy various human needs, which might include economic and psychological needs. Organizations receive in return the abilities of the employee applied toward achievement of the organizational goals and objectives (Hanes, 1999). The psychological contract between the employee and organization is strengthened by the nature and quality of the association and therefore the extent to which the employee identifies with and is bonded to the organization.

Organizational commitment is defined as the relative power of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. The definition implies three primary features of the individual highly committed to an organization. These features include (a) strong support of the organization’s value system, (b) the will to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (c) the intention to remain associated with the organization (Mowday, et al, 1982). Commitment is a broader concept than job satisfaction. Satisfaction relates to specific job tasks. Commitment
involves a global set of conditions extending to the organization’s goals and values (Mowday et al, 1982).

The theoretical model of organizational commitment developed by Mowday et al (1982) hypothesized personal characteristics, role related characteristics, structural characteristics and work experiences to be antecedents of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was theorized to result in several hypothesized outcomes to include desire and intent to remain with the organization, attendance, retention, and job effort.

Research studies reported by Mowday et al (1982) indicated that the personal characteristics of age, tenure on the job, educational level attained, and gender are influential variables upon organizational commitment. Studies have, in general, reported commitment to be positively related to age and tenure (Mowday, et al, 1982). One possible explanation is that as an individual’s age and tenure increase, the number of alternative employment opportunities decreases, thus reducing the perceived level of freedom and increasing the psychological attachment to the present organization (Mowday, et al, 1982). Education is generally reported in the literature to be inversely related to commitment (Mowday, et al, 1982). Explanations include the greater difficulty organizations might experience meeting the needs of higher educated individuals and the possibility that higher educated individuals are more committed to a profession or trade (Mowday, et al, 1982). Gender is, in general, related to commitment with women reported as being more committed than men (Mowday, et al, 1982).

Job role characteristics represent additional antecedents of organizational commitment and are reported in the literature to include job scope (challenge) and role
conflict and ambiguity (Mowday, et al, 1982). Role related characteristics of employee jobs were reported to generally have a positive influence on commitment, especially if the employee has clear and personally meaningful job assignments (Mowday, et al, 1982). Role related characteristics become more negatively associated with commitment as job ambiguity, conflict and role stress increase (Mowday, et al, 1982).

Structural correlates of commitment include organization size and span of control, both of which are reported to be unrelated to organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1982). Studies relating the effects of employee ownership on commitment report increased employee ownership investment, whether financial or through participation in decision making, is positively related to organizational commitment. These findings are supported by use of the organizational commitment questionnaire developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; White, Parks, Gallagher & Tetrault, 1995). Mowday et al (1982) researched commitment relative to occupational groupings using the occupational commitment questionnaire. Significant differences in mean commitment levels among the four organizations studied were found (Mowday et al, 1982). However, no significant differences were found in mean commitment levels across occupational groups for the two samples of data studied (Mowday et al, 1982). Top executives exhibited no more organizational commitment than blue collar workers (Mowday et al, 1982).

Work experience correlates of commitment include those work happenings during an employee’s tenure with the organization which function as a socializing variable of the psychological contract and therefore exert influence upon commitment (Mowday, et al., 1982). Organizational dependability, the extent to which the employee perceives his
interest as a matter of organizational concern, was reported to be a significant work experience relating to organizational commitment (Mowday et al, 1982). Employees maintained higher levels of attitudinal commitment when they perceived themselves responsible for performing an important function toward achievement of the organizations overall goal or mission (Mowday, et al, 1982).

Outcomes of organizational commitment reported by Mowday et al (1982) include job performance, tenure with the organization, absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover. Studies have consistently reported a weak relationship between commitment and job performance (Mowday et al, 1982). However, highly significant positive correlations were reported in the literature between increased tenure with the increased organizational commitment (Mowday et al, 1982). Commitment to the organization was reported to be one of several variables motivating employee attendance (Mowday et al, 1982). Organizational commitment was reported to be a very significant variable in reducing employees’ turnover (Mowday et al, 1982).

**Impacts of Participation in Decision Making on Organizations and Individuals**

The business and organizational literatures provide some indication of the effects of employee participation programs on the individual as well as organization. Organizational or workplace democracy has emerged in a variety of settings and forms including gain-sharing, quality circles, teams, and employee managed cooperatives (Baloff and Doherty 1989; Collins 1995; McCaffrey, Faerman, & Hart, 1995). The anticipated individual benefits of such democratic arrangements include increased job
satisfaction, higher motivation, greater skills acquisition, organizational commitment, and anticipated organizational benefits include improved productivity, goal attainment, reduced resistance to change, and more creative problem solving (Baloff and Doherty 1989; Yammarino and Naughton 1992; Daniels and Bailey 1999; Houston, 2001). In focusing on anticipated organizational benefits of participation, advocates of democratic approaches to organizational management claim that participative decision-making systems allow for greater input from employees, having specialized knowledge or expertise, result in participating individuals having a greater commitment to the decisions being made, and increase the likelihood of successful implementation of decisions (McCaffrey, Faerman, and Hart 1995).

The available empirical evidence suggests that participation can have a number of positive impacts on the organization as well as individual. In a review of relevant studies on the impacts of employee participation, Specter (1986) found a significant positive correlation between high levels of participation and positive individual impacts including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, performance, and motivation. In a study utilizing employee questionnaires and interviews, Yammarino and Naughton (1992) found that participating individuals and work groups that reported a high degree of participation in decision-making also indicated comparatively high levels of respect and job satisfaction, and a significant negative relationship between participation and role conflict as well as role ambiguity.

Le Var (1998) explored the level of perceived participation and its impacts among educational staff members at a health care facility in England. The analysis of data obtained with a quantitative survey revealed that the majority participants desired a
greater degree of participation, and that those who were satisfied reported a range of positive impacts including better quality work, increased effectiveness, and a sense of feeling valued. On the other hand, participants who were dissatisfied with their level of participation perceived a number of detrimental effects including a lack of empowerment and a lack of perceived personal value to the organization.

A comprehensive study of participation and its impacts is presented by Heller, et al. (1988) who reported on their detailed long term study of decision-making in seven companies located in three countries; the UK, the Netherlands, and the former Yugoslavia. The authors applied a decision-making model that included participation in decision-making as the independent variable and general satisfaction, effectiveness of participation, satisfaction with participation, and skills utilization as dependent variables, and sets of antecedent and contingent variables including group characteristics. The utilization of multiple research instruments including document analysis, surveys, interviews, meeting attendance, group feedback analysis as well as a longitudinal perspective provided for a very persuasive argument. The results showed that participation by employees consisted of information sharing, joint decision-making and delegation of power, and that the nature of decision-making varied across issues addressed as well as stages of decision-making. The study also suggested a positive relationship between participation and decision acceptance by supervisors.

A number of studies present findings that suggest positive outcomes of participative decision-making in educational settings (Horenstein 1993; Knoop 1995; Jones, 1997). In a survey-based quantitative study involving secondary school administrators, Knoop (1995) found a positive correlation between participation decision-
making and job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment. The participating principals and assistant principals perceived a greater degree of satisfaction with the job components of work, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers when their supervisors, the superintendents, implemented participation decision-making. The author suggested that the findings of his study confirm the value of organizational participatory practices such as teamwork that effect decentralization and potentially contribute to empowerment of lower level employees.

Positive impacts of participation were also revealed in work of Horenstein (1993) who explored the relationship of job satisfaction to library faculty status as well as to perceived participation in library planning, decision-making, university academic affairs, and professional library activities. Regression analysis of data obtained from participant response to a quantitative survey instrument revealed that perception of participation through consultation, information sharing and decision-making was the best predictor of job satisfaction. The analysis also showed that salary and academic rank had a slightly weaker correlation to job satisfaction, but were still effective predictors of satisfaction. The author suggested that the collegial relationship associated with faculty status, rather than the management style, fosters a sense of participation and involvement that in turn enhance job satisfaction. However, this can only be confirmed though further study on causality of satisfaction.
Faculty Participation in Decision Making

Significant literature in the field of organizational and leadership theory supports the widely held view that decision making in organizations should move from the point of autocracy to a position of democracy (Meyers, 1994). Although limited in educational application, there is increasing recognition that individuals are most committed when they perceive they share in the opportunities to influence their work situation (Meyers, 1994).

Faculty participation in decision making has been used as a synonym for shared authority (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978) and shared governance (Baldridge, 1971a; Riley & Baldridge, 1977; Reitsch, 1995; Gappa 1993). Shared governance has been defined as a governance system in which presidents, boards, and faculty participate in making decisions impacting institutions of higher education (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1996).

Gappa (1993) interprets the basic element of shared governance or participative institutional decision making in higher education to mean that there is a joint effort by all constituents in the management of the institution.

Participative, shared or collegial governance follows the tradition of the very earliest universities of Western civilization created in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Modern day control of faculty over curricula and degrees in colleges and universities is founded in a proclamation issued by Pope Gregory IX in 1231 supporting the professors at the University of Paris in becoming largely self governing (Campbell, et al, 1987).
In the early years of the twentieth century, American higher education faculty became more professional and assumed much authority over curricula and academic personnel issues (Birnbaum, 1988). Many have considered the faculty to be directly associated with the institution because of their status as the community of the learned (Birnbaum, 1988). The American Association of University Professors Committee on Place and Function of Faculties in University Governance and Administration has provided much of the support for research on faculty participation (Sheridan, 1995). Large cross-institutional studies were overseen by committee as well as research pertaining to individual institutions and issues (Sheridan, 1995).

An early study on Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, was published by a joint task force of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the National Education Association (NEA) in 1967 (American Association for Higher Education, 1967). Findings of the study indicated faculty participation in governance resided in three zones of participation with 50 percent of participating institutions in the zone which represented administrative primacy, 25 percent in the zone which represented shared authority, and the remaining 25 percent in the zone which represented administrative dominance (American Association for Higher Education, 1967, p. 16). Combining the task force findings for the administrative dominance zone and the administrative primacy zone, one could conclude that administrators controlled governance in 75 percent of the participating institutions (Haynes, 1999). Gunne and Mortimer (1975) recreated this research with a group of community colleges and four-year state colleges in Pennsylvania. Findings of the study identified two-year colleges as
demonstrating administrative dominance or primacy in decision making and older four-year state colleges by shared authority.

Columbia University’s Institute of Higher Education conducted a study of educational trends during the 1970s and found a sharp decline in faculty participation in governance (Anderson, 1983). Between the 1970s and 1980s, the percentage of faculty who reported their campuses characterized as using shared authority with decisions made by the faculty and administration decreased from 64 percent to 44 percent. Findings varied by type of institution. The response values were stable at public comprehensive colleges and universities while faculty at two-year colleges reported a considerable decline in their participation in decision making.

Floyd (1985) conducted a literature review of faculty participation in which he reported little research found in the field of education related to participation in governance decision making, improved employee satisfaction, and performance. Considerable literature was found in the field of business and industry, which provided a foundation to explaining the direct relationship expressed by human resource theory between participation in decision making, increased employee satisfaction, and performance.

As a result of his educational literature review, Floyd (1985) suggested the need for future research to determine the role of faculty in campus governance and the training of higher education professionals in participation leadership. Floyd reported that faculty expressed an interest, intent and obligation to participate, but found with time constraints
serving on committees became a burden. Floyd’s findings became important as a foundation for studies completed in the late 1980s and 1990s (Haynes, 1999).

College and university governance was studied by Reyes and McCarty (1986) using a sample consisting of 99 institutions of higher education randomly chosen from the Carnegie classification of four-year institutions. Dominant authority for decision making was found to rest with faculty and administrators, although final legal authority was vested with boards of trustees (Reyes & McCarty, 1986). The Carnegie classified institutions reported various combinations of governance models with the research universities and small liberal arts colleges exhibiting more shared or collegial governance and the remaining four year institutions reporting primarily bureaucratic governance structures (Reyes & McCarty, 1986). Two year institutions were described as highly bureaucratic (Reyes & McCarty, 1986).

Meyer (1994) studied faculty in New York community colleges to measure the relationship between participation in governance and faculty satisfaction and commitment. According to Meyers (1994), a positive relationship was found to exist among participation in institutional decision making, faculty satisfaction and faculty concern for learning and classroom innovation. Based on study findings, Meyer (1994) concluded that an important link did exist between faculty member’s satisfaction and the educational excellence of the community colleges studied.

Drummond and Reitsch (1995) studied differences in the perceived levels of participation decision making between faculty and administrator attitudes in 605 colleges and universities. Findings of the study indicated administrators participating in the study
scored faculty participation in decision making considerably higher than did faculty on a four-point scale of participation, increased from level one to level four (Drummond & Reitsch, 1995). Drummond and Reitsch (1995) concluded there existed sufficient literature in support of their research findings to recommend educational leaders would be well served by developing stronger systems of participative decision making in their institutions (Drummond & Reitsch, 1995). The Drummond and Reitsch (1995) study strengthened the findings of previous research which had found a direct association between increased levels of meaningful faculty involvement in decision making and higher levels of positive attitudes concerning the sincerity of leadership (Drummond & Reitsch, 1995). Still further, the Drummond and Reitsch study provided strong supporting evidence for previous research findings that organizations with processes for employee participation in decision making and goal setting have higher overall employee performance and a greater sense of job satisfaction (Drummond & Reitsch, 1995).

In a study conducted by Haynes (1999), it has been found that if there was a relationship between perceived level of participation in shared governance, identified by non academic staff at public colleges and universities and the degree of commitment non-academic staff felt to these institutions. As a second research objective, the study analyzed the relationship between the existence of non-academic staff governance bodies and staff perceptions of increased participation in decision making and organizational commitment as compared to informal governance systems. A third research objective of the study was to determine if enrollment size of institutions was related to either staff participation in decision making or to organizational commitment. Finally, the study
reviewed the relationship between certain personal demographic variables of age, gender, educational level achieved, and tenure to commitment (Haynes, 1999).

Haynes (1999) concluded that there was a relationship between the level of participation in shared governance that no academic staff perceive on their campuses and the degree of commitment they claim to these institutions. Haynes stated, “Employees who worked for colleges and universities that had more participatory shared governance systems reported significantly higher degree of organizational commitment” (Haynes, 1999, p. 107).

Joyce and Teddi (2000) evaluated perceptions relative to authority and responsibility as elements of shared governance held by departmental chairs and academic administrators and evaluated perceptual differences between the two groups in an effort to discern the important communications aspects of shared governance structures. Findings revealed that an open and honest dialogue was considered by departmental chairs and administrators as the most important communication activity for implementing shared governance (Joyce, 2000).

Bingham (2000) conducted a qualitative study to identify and analyze many of the perceptions of faculty, staff and executive administration pertaining to the individual and collective participation of community college faculty in shared governance. Findings of the study emphasized the importance of shared governance in building strong collegial relationships in community colleges where the faculty and administration collectively desire to position their institution for implementing new learning paradigms (Bingham, 2000).
Thaxter and Graham (1999) explored faculty participation at two year colleges in the following decision-making arenas: instruction, students, institutional mission/goals, personnel, and finance. A survey instrument was utilized to elicit the opinions of 100 randomly selected full-time faculty members from community colleges in the Midwest. Analysis of the qualitative comments and quantitative data generated by the survey revealed that participants in the study generally did not perceive a meaningful involvement in decision-making across all five decision categories, although the mean score rating for degree of participation was highest for instructional and student-related matters. The reported lack of involvement in decision-making was consistent across the demographic variables of age, years of experience, type of college, and academic discipline. The authors of the study suggested that the findings are consistent with the top-down, autocratic management reported by participants on the survey instrument in the study.

A similar study with substantially different findings was reported by Piland and Bublitz (1998) who investigated faculty involvement in governance in community colleges California. A total of 250 faculty members from 25 randomly selected community colleges were involved in a quantitative, exploratory study. Analysis of survey data revealed that the participants believe in a strong faculty role in all aspects of institutional decision-making, reflecting the spirit of participation democracy. In addition, the study participants expressed the view that decision-making is a responsibility that needs to be shared with the administration, except for matters involving curriculum and faculty personnel practices that faculty participants felt should be the sole domain of the faculty. As in the study of Thaxter and Graham (1999), the findings of Piland and Bublits
(1998) revealed no significant differences in opinions across the variables of gender, years of experience, academic discipline, institutional size and location.

A major weakness in the study of Thaxter and Graham (1999) was the lack of information on the desired levels of participation as expressed by individual faculty members in decision making. With information on both actual (existing) and desired levels of participation, it is possible to categorize participation decisional deprivation, decisional equilibrium, or decisional saturation as originally proposed and defined by Allutto and Belasco (1972). Decision deprivation is defined as the condition in which the actual participation is less than the desired level of participation; decision equilibrium is the conditions in which the actual and desired levels are the same; and decision occurs when actual participation exceeds the desired level of participation (Allutto and Belasco 1972). The inclusion of both desired and actual levels of participation provides a measure of control over variability due to differences in desired and actual levels. As demonstrated in the work of Williams et al. (1987), the desired levels of participation may vary substantially among faculty members. In addition, information on actual levels of participation may be insufficient in studies on faculty satisfaction and organizational effectiveness because faculty members may be satisfied with a low level of participation if that is the desired level (decision equilibrium).

At attempt to include faculty perceptions about existing and ideal level of participation in the study design was evident in the work of Miller, Vacik and Benton (1998). In this study, faculty participant from three community colleges with similar mission were asked to rate their own actual involvement in campus governance, to evaluate the existing governance structure and process. Analysis of the survey based
quantitative data from 110 faculty members at the three community colleges revealed no significant statistical differences in perceptions about the existing governance processes and ideal governance when comparing groups of faculty self-described as “very involved”, “somewhat involved” and “not involved”.

Factors Affecting Faculty Participation in Decision-Making

A number of factors may be related to the degree of participation of faculty members in governance and decision-making at colleges and universities. Guffey, Rampp, and Masters (1999) suggested that low faculty involvement in governance at colleges and universities in general is possibly due to a lack of a well-defined and understood model of governance, unrealistic expectation by faculty, poor communication, and lack of trust between faculty members and administration. Comparatively high teaching loads, competing demands on time, and an autocratic organizational structures are seen as additional factors inhibiting governance participation by faculty in colleges and universities in general (Johnston, 2003) and more specifically at the community college level (Thaxter and Graham, 1999).

Johnston (2003) suggested that the lack of sufficient rewards for participation may be a casual factor of comparatively low levels of faculty participation in decision-making. However, Miller, et al. (1996) found in their study that faculty members at community colleges identified trust and respect for involvement as a greater incentive to participation than a reward structure. Morphew (1999) indicated that an increased
reliance on adjunct faculty across the broad collegiate landscape may increase the opportunity for governance participation by full-time faculty members.

Gender has been suggested as a possible influencing factor on faculty participation in decision-making in colleges and universities (Williams et. al., 1987; Denton and Zeytinoglu 1993; Twale and Shannon 1996). The limited research on gender impacts has not identified a definitive pattern. Denton and Zeytinoglu (1993) found that female faculty members at a comprehensive university in Canada perceived a lower degree of participation in institutional decision-making than did the male faculty members. In the substantive interpretation of their survey-based date, Denton and Zeytinoglu (1993, p. 328) concluded that “female faculty were less likely than male faculty to perceive their work environment as providing them an opportunity either to influence important decisions or to acquire an administrative role”.

Slightly different effects were observed by Twale and Shannon (1996) who explored the impact of gender on faculty participation in campus and departmental governance at research universities in the United States. The sample of participating faculty members was purposefully restricted to educational administration department with the states rationalization that “this group of faculty understood the structure and function of the collegiate organization, leadership theory, power and authority, management, policy formulation, and decision-making” (Twale and Shannon 1996, p. 13). Analysis of the survey-based data of quantitative and qualitative nature revealed that female faculty measured by overall committee involvement. However, a finer-grain analysis suggested that female faculty has less influence on key decisions involving
personnel, tenure, promotion, planning, and grievance due to a substantially lower membership than male faculty in committees addressing these issues.

Two studies reported in the literature address the effect of gender on faculty participation in governance at community colleges, and in each case no gender impact was evident. Thaxter and Graham (1999) found no significant impact of gender on self reported faculty participation in decision-making in the areas of instruction, personnel, institutional goals and mission, finance and student-related issues. Piland and Bublitz (1998) reported that gender did not have a significant impact on the desired scope of decision participation at 25 community colleges in California. Desired participation was conceptualized in the study as the decision domains identified by the participants as those in which the faculty collectively should have full decision-making authority.

Research has shown that structural characteristics such as size, level, complexity and type of institution may have an influence on decision processes and participation by faculty (Miller and Monge 1986; Imber, Neidt, and Reyes 1990; Connor 1992). The six common decisions approached used in educational organizations are “collegial” based on consensus; rational, based on supporting data; bureaucratic, based on structured administrative patterns; political, based on self-interest and power; organized anarchy, based on serendipity; and autocratic, based on the preference of a singly, powerful individual” (Smart, Kuh, and Tierney 1997, p. 263). There is some indication in the literature that the mix of decision approached may vary when comparing types of colleges or universities. Scheutz (1999) claims that, of the six approached, the bureaucratic, political and collegial are the most common forms in community colleges. Cohen and Brawer (1996, 103) suggested that “the bureaucratic and political models
seem most applicable to community colleges”. Waugh (2003) suggested that comparatively heavy teaching loads in community colleges leave little time for faculty participation in governance when compared to that at other types of institutions and thus that the collegial model is less prevalent in community colleges than in institutions offering baccalaureate and graduate programs. Thaxter and Graham (1999) likewise posited that teaching responsibilities may leave insufficient time for involvement in decision-making activities.

The general contention that there is a comparatively lower degree of faculty involvement in decision-making at community colleges is countered by empirical evidence of Piland and Bublitz (1998) presented earlier, and by Miller (1999) that suggested a substantial level of involvement by faculty in decision-making. Miller (1999) relies on the chair perspective in a quantitative, exploratory study in an attempt to determine the preferred decision-making approach in academic department of community colleges. The author utilized a survey of a random sample of department chairs at two-year colleges to assess participating chair views on the faculty role in the decision-making process. The results of the study indicated that the chairs placed a high priority on faculty involvement in departmental and campus-wide decision-making in critical areas such as budgetary and curricular matters. The author indicated that his research results suggested a commitment among chairs to participation, consensual decision-making approach with the chair serving in a facilitating role for which he used the metaphor “speaker of the house”. Although the sampling, analytical and interpretive methods were clearly stated, nothing was mentioned about demographic information in study participants such as age or gender. Also, the relevancy of the findings could be
questioned since faculty members might report differently on their role in decision-making than department chairs. Although the reliance on one measuring instrument constrains the explanatory leverage of the findings and dampens the persuasiveness of the argument, the board-scoping sampling of 100 department chairs from 10 institutions in the study facilitates generalizability of the findings.

The differing views and observations regarding faculty decision participation at community colleges may reflect the supposition offered by Pope and Miller (2000) that a diversity of faculty involvement levels and forms likely coincides with differing governance structures and management strategies utilized in these institutions. Variability in participation may exist within the same type of institution as well as across different types of institutions. This study was designed in part to ascertain whether such variability in participation exists within the institution of interest, community colleges.

There is some evidence in the literature that differences in faculty participation, related to specific structural features of the academic department. The size and type of department are two features for which some empirical evidence exists. Both features were considered in the work of Ryan (1972) who explored the relationships among department structure, decision-making, and faculty participation at one university. Although the study is rather dated, it is still relevant to the current environment of higher education since the structure of academic departments, particularly with regard to their discipline-orientation, has not changed substantially within the time frame since the study was completed (Edwards 2000). Qualitative and quantitative data for the model developed by Ryan (1972) were obtained from organizational records and interviews with randomly selected department chairs and faculty from fifteen academic departments.
at Ohio state University. The random selection of departments and the stratified sampling of faculty members for interviews helped reduce the potential for systematic and procedural bias. The analysis of interview data included aggregation of responses by department, producing evidence of distinct categories that were labeled as authoritarian dictatorships, oligarchies, and collegial groupings. The results revealed that department chairs dominate decision-making in a dictatorship, a cohesive power group has substantial decision-making influence on the chair in oligarchies, and collective decision-making without domination by the chair characterizes collegial groupings. In addition, the findings revealed that in the departments of a collegial nature and pluralistic decision-making processes, senior professors exerted greater influence on decision making than less experienced professors. The data also revealed that among departments involved in the study, oligarchic power structures tended to be more common in smaller departments and that participation decision-making processes were more visible and collegial in larger departments.

The key finding relating department size and participation in the study of Ryan (1972) also emerged in the study by Whitson and Hubert (1982). A survey instrument was used to measure department chairs’ perceptions of influence exerted by key internal and external stakeholders on selected managerial tasks associated with the chair position. The specific stakeholders and tasks were selected after a review of the relevant literature and though recommendations made by an expert panel. A sample of department chairs stratified by department type, department size, institution size, and geographic region was selected from 58 large public universities in the United States. Participants were asked to provide a rating of stakeholder influence using a six-point Likert scale. The data were
statistically analyzed using a general linear model to test for significance of main and interactive effects among independent variables. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was utilized to test for significant differences between means. The results showed that accrediting agencies had a significantly greater influence on department goals and objectives as well as on the evaluation of program in smaller institutions than in larger institutions, and had greater influence on the same areas in professional departments than in departments of the academic disciplines. Smaller departments were reported to have greater administrative control and less faculty control of decisions involving faculty salary, faculty dismissal, or non-reappointment, promotion, tenure, and hiring of faculty. The findings of Whitson and Hubert (1982) suggested that faculty influence in decision making varies across types and size of department and across size of institution for the colleges involved in the study. The sampling protocol utilized in the study helped minimize the potential for systematic and procedural bias, and the broad-ranging sampling frame provided for good generalizability of findings. One weakness in the study as reported is the lack of information on instrument validation.

The relationship between faculty participation and department type revealed in the work of Whitson and Hubert (1982) is similar to that identified by Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (1970) who found that among the ten universities included in their study, professional departments such as medical, engineering, and business tended to be less participatory than departments of the scholarly disciplines such as sociology, chemistry, and history. Using a stratified random sample of eighty university departments across four-year institutions and limited to physics, chemistry, sociology, and political science, Neumann (1979) found that the physical science department were more democratic in
their decision-making on key issues than were the social science departments. The faculty members in physical science departments were seen by chairs and faculty members involved in the study as having greater influence on teaching and research related decisions than faculty in social science departments.

The factors with a potential influence on faculty participation that have been discussed in this section are in most cases internal to the college, university or department. However, it may be external factors in the institutional environment that can have a potential impact on faculty participation in governance. Using a broad-brush approach in discussing the impacts of external and internal factors, Pope (2004, p. 83) offers a rather pessimistic outlook on participation decision-making in colleges and universities by stating that “greater levels of accountability, decreased funding, the increased cost of higher education, the increasing decentralization and departmentalization of academic areas, as well as other factors have made it increasingly impossible to maintain an effective system of shared decision-making in higher education.” No empirical evidence is provided by the author to support this contention and some very limited empirical evidence may support a counter argument with regard to the impacts of shrinking resources on faculty participation in governance. For example, in focusing on the impact of funding support for institutions offering baccalaureate and graduate degrees, Kissler (1997) found that faculty influence and participation did not decrease during periods of financial stress when budgets were reduced and academic programs were eliminated.

Howell (1997, pp. 673) explains that the “shared governance requirements meant that the academic senates would have formal, specific rights in formulating and executing
policy, selecting new faculty, grant tenure, formulating budgets, carrying out peer review, setting academic and professional standards, selecting course requirements and curricula, and addressing other issues concerning operation of the colleges”. Based on a study of 30 community colleges, utilizing a survey instrument and interviews with college presidents, academic senate presidents, heads of the faculty bargaining units, and faculty members, Howell (1997) found with some exceptions that the academic senates were functioning effectively, but also that full implementation of the policy had not been achieved across the state.

**Faculty Job Satisfaction**

In the case of faculty, the study of job satisfaction is relevant to understanding and improving higher education institutions and their core functions of teaching, research and service. Moreover, by studying faculty job satisfaction it is also possible to improve our knowledge of the academic profession in general and to generate, with the help of such knowledge, more effective programs for the recruitment, retention and improvement of its members. Given the centrality of academics for the higher education enterprise (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Perkin, 1987) and, for that matter, for society in general, this type of effort is considered mandatory and essential in their implications (Hagedom, 2000b).

For Iran in particular, where relatively little information is available about how academics perceive their work, the relevance of studying job satisfaction is accentuated.
Faculty experience the nuts and bolts of higher education functioning and, because of it, are in an advantageous position to provide a perspective that no other actor can produce. Taking into account academics’ perspective thereby increases the possibility of detecting problematic areas and finding out appropriate solutions.

Moreover, studies of job satisfaction among community college faculty members has been conducted since the early 1990’s (Digest, 1988), using a variety of theoretical constructs and measuring widely different dimensions of satisfaction. These tended to be measures of psychological satisfaction and included intrinsic and extrinsic variables as sources of satisfaction. One group of studies have looked at the effects of personality variables and personal characteristics of job satisfaction, while another group has investigated working conditions and specific work activities as cause of teacher burn-out and job dissatisfaction.

Friedlander (1978), in a review of five national and regional studies of job satisfaction, concluded that measures of general job satisfaction were more accurate predictors of faculty members desire to remain at their job than measures of attitudes toward working conditions. Ratings of global or general facets (Friedlander, 1978) of working conditions such as relations with colleagues, students and administrators have also been used. Research on the effects of working conditions on faculty attitudes has shown consistently that these measures have demonstrated that faculty at community colleges are generally quite satisfied with their careers.
Riday, Bingham and Harvey (1985) found that community college faculty in Los Angeles Country found their work more satisfying than high school instructors or four-year college faculty.

On the other hand, studies of faculty satisfaction with specific instructional and non-instructional responsibilities and working condition have shown some consistent and widespread patterns of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Filan, Okun, and Witter (1986) stated that intrinsic work motivations (self-management), financial rewards, good supervision, and opportunities for skill enhancement were all positively correlated with job satisfaction. Less satisfying features of the workplace have been identified as lack of time to adequately prepare for class, or keep up to date in the fields to develop innovative teaching methods, or to do a proper job with individual students. Hutton and Jobe (1985) added that the lack of recognition, reward, or support for professional growth through writing, advanced study, recognition, release time for professional development, and having little voice in the college decision making process predicated job dissatisfaction. As an accepted dictum, low salaries, high levels of bureaucracy, and red tapism, working with unappreciative unmotivated or under prepared students, and teacher evaluation processes have had a depressive effect on job satisfaction.

Subsequently in a synthesis of research findings of job satisfaction in educational organizations, Thompson (1997) synthesized empirical findings on job satisfaction from the first 26 volumes of “Educational Administrative Quarterly”. They discovered 330 job satisfaction research hypotheses and 613 relational effects. Thompson (1997) performed meta-analysis for six hypotheses, finding the largest mean effected sized for relationships
between overall job satisfaction and both role ambiguity and role conflict. These findings supported the idea that job satisfaction advocated a situational model.

The National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (1997, Washington, D.C.) has surveyed over 10,000 community college faculty, staff and administrators from 1993 to 1997. While most people felt they were underpaid, the survey results supported the need for recognition opportunities, increased participation in teams, and increased participation in the decision making process as the best opportunity for change to a more satisfied work force.

Interestingly, there were no questions directed at the need for participation in the decision making process as a source of job satisfaction, yet, at the end of the TIAA-CREF study, when a sample of the population was interviewed by telephone and asked to express their concerns, there was a strong sentiment of “them vs. us”, when it came to their own college administrators. Some also faulted college administrators for being out-of-touch, insistent on accountability by relying on simple numerical measures of performance to determine reward (or punishment) rather than basing reward (or punishment) on excellence (The American Faculty Poll, 2000). It appeared faculty participation in the decision making process was non-existent and there seemed to be dissatisfaction with the actions of their administrators.

Research suggested that job satisfaction related to the individual, the work setting, and the situation. Also, behavior was a function of the person, both psychological and physiological and the environment (Mulcahy, 1997).
Because various approaches may be assessing different dimensions of satisfaction, individual responses to one set of questions may lead to very different conclusions than the same individual’s responses to another set of questions. It appeared in many studies that decision makers needed to be particularly cautious about the questions they asked their relationship to the variables they wished to predict, and the changes they desired to effect.

Job satisfaction can be labeled as “global” or overall when its referent is the job as a whole, or “facet” if the referent is a particular aspect of the work, as the nature of the component tasks required by the job or its pay. Usually overall job satisfaction is measured by one or more items that probe the respondents’ reaction to general statements about their work. However, it is also possible for overall job satisfaction to be calculated by averaging a particular set of facet satisfactions, but then this index is referred to as a composite measure of overall job satisfaction (Brief, 1998; Cook et al., 1981; Gruneberg, 1979; Ironson et al., 1989; Spector, 1997). While it might seem a naive position to measure overall job satisfaction by way of one item, it has been empirically shown that such type of question is more inclusive than a composite measure to the extent that it implies the consideration of work aspects, like the congruence between work and life off the job, that are not necessarily listed in a “comprehensive” list of facet satisfactions (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). So, although all three measures are interrelated, they are not equivalent, and so many particular measures have been devised for various specific purposes. Twenty years ago, Cook et al (1981) listed 17 measures of overall job satisfaction and 29 scales for measuring specific facet job satisfactions.
Despite the abundance of job satisfaction measures, there is no general acceptance of one “best” measurement instrument. Instead, there is a consensus that the appropriate instrument is determined by the goals of the study (Gruneberg, 1979). Furthermore, there is always the possibility of developing a scale for a particular setting (Spector, 1997). Nevertheless, scales such as the Job Descriptive Index, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Job Diagnostic Survey, and the Job in General Scale have been among the most frequently used by researchers (Spector, 1997). In a parallel fashion, various question formats have been used and, while the Likert-type question is probably the most frequently used, there is no generally accepted best question type to be used in a job satisfaction measurement instrument (Cook et al., 1981; Rambo, 1982).

In measuring faculty job satisfaction, researchers, though taking into consideration scales already developed, have usually constructed their own instruments (Locke, Fitzpatrick & White, 1983; Olsen, 1993). On the other hand, some researchers performing secondary analysis of large faculty surveys have used specific questions of the survey questionnaire as indicators of global or facet job satisfaction, accepting their validity at face value (Finkelstein, Seal & Schuster, 1998). However, others have built scales on the basis of particular items available (Ethington, Smart & Zeltmann, 1989). Despite the consistent use of a relatively small set of questions pertaining to job satisfaction in national faculty surveys (Sella et al., 1997), those items are usually dealt with individually, without any major concern regarding the possibility for building, through the usual scale development procedures (DeVellis, 1991), a job satisfaction scale as such. So, in contrast with what happens in the field of organizational behavior, where several job satisfaction measures predominate (Spector, 1997), no particular “scale” for
measuring faculty job satisfaction can be seen as dominant. The development of one would surely help make research in this area more comparable.

Whether considered a consequence or an antecedent, the study of job satisfaction has been seen as pragmatically productive, as common sense would predict a direct relationship between job satisfaction and work performance. Such a simple relationship, however, has been difficult to validate empirically. First, the expected association between job satisfaction and output job performance has been found to be negligible (Brief, 1996; Laffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Pinder, 1984; Rambo, 1982; Spector, 1997). Second, despite particular studies reporting no impact of job satisfaction on turnover behavior (Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978), job satisfaction has been found to be consistently associated with turnover (Pinder, 1984; Rambo, 1982; Spector, 1997), especially in times of high employment (Carsten & Spector, 1987, quoted in Schneider, Gunnarson & Wheeler, 1992, p. 63). And third, job satisfaction’s relationship with absenteeism is no longer seen as high nor simple as once thought (Cheloha & Farr, 1980), as such relationship is apparently embedded within a set of other variables that are more strongly associated with it, like job involvement, reason for absence, primary child care responsibilities, and organizational absence policies and culture (Cheloha & Farr, 1980; Spector, 1997).

In discussing the absence of an expected direct relationship between job satisfaction and work performance, Fisher and Locke (1992) have pointed out that while job satisfaction is usually an attitudinal aggregate measure, work performance is generally a quite specific behavioral index, and that strong correlations between such types of measures have a good possibility for occurring only when their level of
aggregation is similar and, at the same time, when both measures can vary freely, at least up to a certain point. The implication of such an argument is that it might be more reasonable to expect high correlations between job satisfaction and aggregate performance measures that are not dependent upon fixed productivity schemes, something that is also defended by those that argue that a more valid dependent variable than productivity would be organizational citizenship behavior.

Recently, organizational citizenship behavior has been found to be related to job satisfaction (Brief, 1998). Organizational citizenship behavior has to do with those conducts that are thought to lubricate the social machinery of organizations (Bateman & Organ, 1983), but are not usually prescribed nor captured by quantitative output measures (e.g., collaborating with colleagues, keeping the work area clean, careful use of resources, etc.). From this new perspective, job satisfaction correlates more meaningfully with out-of-role performance, or pro-social or citizenship behavior, as opposed to productivity or in-role performance (Organ, 1988).

In relation to faculty, it has been reported that job satisfaction is not consistently related to overall performance (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Research productivity has been more systematically studied than teaching productivity, and, in general, the models most useful in its prediction do not include job satisfaction as a predictor, although it has been argued that highly productive scholars pay less attention to context-related factors and are more involved in the intrinsic aspects of academic work, research in particular (Creswell, 1985). Beyond the possibility that highly productive faculty are also highly satisfied with their activities, but also acknowledging that not all highly satisfied faculty are equally productive, it appears more logical to
expect that low levels of job satisfaction would diminish productivity to the extent that it would lead to disengagement with the institution or an unwillingness to cooperate with it (Organ, 1990), to organize unions in order to look after collective bargaining (Feulle & Blandin, 1974) and, at the extreme, to turnover (Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993).

The effects of Job Satisfaction

Brayfield and Crockett (1995), Vroom (1964) and Hulin (1976) all concluded that a dissatisfied worker is more likely to leave his/her job than a satisfied worker is. Hulin (1976), however, pointed that factors other than dissatisfaction may affect the decision to leave a job, for example the availability of suitable alternatives. Metzner and Mann (1976) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism, and found that for different groups, there were different relationships between the two variables. There was a significant relationship for white collar men working at low levels of skill and for blue-collar men, but not for women white-collar workers at low levels of skill, or white-collar men at higher-level jobs.

With regard to work performance, Herzberg et al (1957) concluded in their review of literature that high satisfaction and high performance went together while Katzell (1957), using a more stringent criterion of statistical significance contended that the published studies did not reveal such a relationship. Vroom (1964) tended to support the position of Katzell. On the other hand, Lawler and Porter (1976) found significant positive relationship between the job satisfaction and productivity in their study of 148 middle and lower level managers in five organizations. They, however, argued that the
relationship was complex and depended on the aspects of jobs. Lydon and Chevalier
(2001) found significant positive relationship between the job satisfaction and several
variables of job match quality in their study of over 15,000 graduates of higher
educational institutions in the United Kingdom. On the contrary, in their study of 1,200
employees in four organizations, Katzell, et al (1992) described that job satisfaction and
job performance had little direct impact on each other, but were each determined by a
number of factors, some of which were common to both and furnished indirect links
between them.

All together, the studies of relationships between job satisfaction and employee
turnover, absenteeism and performance have partly seemed to support significant
associations. Their results suggest that careful considerations should be given for
interpretations of the relationships between job satisfaction and its behavioral outcomes.
In addition, understanding the satisfaction behavior relationship may be improved by
investigating these relationships under various conditions.

In general, two practical strategies have been used to measure job satisfaction. A
number of researchers (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983) supported the first strategy to obtain
overall satisfaction scores through a single item or multiple item scales. These global
measures of job satisfaction provide an overall indication of satisfaction toward the job
by combining all aspects of the job. The second strategy was to consider job satisfaction
as a multidimensional construct; here researchers had developed instruments to measure
different facets of job satisfaction (Smith et al., 1976; Vroom, 1964). The basis for the
facet approach to measuring job satisfaction is that a job is not a single dimensional
concept; rather, it consists of a set of complicated tasks, roles, relationships and rewards
that are all interrelated (Locke, 1976). Thus, it is possible to have different attitudes of satisfaction towards the various components of the job. Facet measures of job satisfaction overcome the problem of vagueness in overall satisfaction measures by measuring, feeling, or affective responses to different facets of the job.

Many researchers have tried to understand the nature of participation in the decision making in universities and its relationship to faculty and administrator job satisfaction (Belasco & Alutto, 1972; Maloney, 2003; Schneider, 1985; Woodruff, 1992). Early studies of job satisfaction focused on the work environment but were conducted primarily in industrial settings. In one study of job satisfaction and productivity, Morse and Reimer (1956) found that job satisfaction increased significantly for rank and file employees who were involved in the decision making process.

In a comprehensive review of the literature, Katzell and Yankelovich (1975) cited a number of studies that confirmed the significant relationship between decision involvement and job satisfaction. The findings of these studies indicted that:

1. Work groups whose members have more say over the groups’ production goals, work and working conditions usually have higher average job satisfaction than those having less control.

2. Members of participative groups have stronger work motivation.

3. Productivity is usually, but not always, higher in groups having more control.
4. Productivity through changed control patterns occurs when groups are given a greater say in goal setting and when groups are involved in determining modes of pay for performance (pp. 265-266).

The literature emphasized the complexity of decision involvement and job satisfaction and reflected the interdependence of organizational, personal and situational variables in the process. Allutto and Belasco (1972) sought to clarify this issue by investigating the relationship between the extent of decision involvement and job satisfaction. They developed a discrepancy measure to indicate the difference between teachers’ actual and desired levels of decision involvement. They represented the discrepancy in teachers’ desires for decisional involvement on a continuum exemplified by the following three conditions:

1. Decisional deprivation: Teachers in this category are involved less than they desire. They want less administrative control and more direct say in running the school; these teachers tend to be more professionally oriented, to experience more role conflict and to be more dissatisfied than their less militant colleagues. Conway (1976) believed that the largest proportion of teachers fall into this category.

2. Decisional equilibrium: this category includes teachers who are satisfied with the status quo. They experience less tension on the job, display more trust and are the most satisfied group of teachers.

3. Decisional saturation: Teachers in this category are involved more than they want to be. Decisional saturation most often occurs among older female
teachers who think they are being asked to participate in more decisions than they can handle.

Alutto and Belasco (1972) regarded job satisfaction as a willingness to remain within an organization despite inducements to leave. In their study, they found that teachers who desired greater involvement reflected low levels of job satisfaction. The teachers in the decision condition of saturation scored higher in their perceptions of the system than did those in the condition of deprivation, but not as high as those in equilibrium. These findings suggested the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between decision involvement and job satisfaction.

Researchers have determined that there is a significant relationship between faculty members’ decision condition and their level of job satisfaction (Maloney, 2003; Woodruff, 1992). Some researchers have found that it is possible to over-involve individuals in decision making and that decisional saturation often results in decreased job satisfaction (Alutto & Belasco, 1972, 1974; Conway, 1976; Mohrman et al., 1978). Woodruff (1992) examined the relationship among university faculty members’ participation in the decision making, and their job satisfaction in Connecticut’s four private universities. A little more than a decade later, Maloney (2003) replicated Woodruff’s study in Connecticut’s twelve community colleges.

These studies were based on the assumption that faculty participation in the decision making process is associated with increased job satisfaction and found significant relationships between faculty participation in the decision making process and their job satisfaction. Maloney (2003) and Woodruff (1992) drew upon the Alutto and
Belasco study by investigating the relationship between decision condition and job satisfaction. They found a significant relationship between decision condition, determined through the use of a measure of discrepancy between actual and desired involvement, and job satisfaction. Their findings also indicated that faculty members’ perceived levels of influence in the decision making process were positively related to their levels of job satisfaction; this relationship was statistically significant. As faculty become more involved in collaborative decision making, the organizational structure evolves from one with a hierarchical, stratified structure to one that recognizes input of human interaction and operates systematically as a social system. However, a review of the relationships concerning decision making and job satisfaction found in the literature revealed that it is very difficult to explain simply and clearly.

**Demographic Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction**

In attempting to identify the factors that have an impact on employee job satisfaction, considerable attention has been devoted to the characteristics of the individual (Reiner, 1998). Demographic variables often examined include age, gender, marital status, and length of employment.

**Age:** Many studies of age-related effects on employee job satisfaction have been reported (Rhodes, 1983; Warr, 1990, 1992). It is generally believed that older employees tend to report higher satisfaction than younger ones (Doering, Rhodes, & Schuster, 1983; Warr, 1992). Some arguments have been presented to account for this tendency for older employees to report greater job satisfaction than younger ones. First, prestige and
confidence are likely to increase with age, so older employees are likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992). Second, older workers might lower their expectations of the job through their experience, compared to younger people who might have higher expectations and standards. As the perceived gap between actual and ideal work conditions becomes smaller, it is likely to generate more positive work attitudes (Oswald & Warr, 1996).

**Gender:** The finding of the research on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction in various occupations have been contradictory. No conclusive evidence with regard to the levels of satisfaction among men and women has been reported from several studies (Brief & Oliver, 1976; Brief, Rose, & Aldag, 1977; D’Arcy, Syrotuik, & Siddique, 1984; Goh, Koh, & Low, 1991; Shapiro & Stern, 1975). However, research on psychologists found that female employees tend to be less satisfied than their male colleagues regarding salary, promotion, opportunities, and overall respect for them as professional (Black & Holden, 1998). Research on both public- and private-sector employees of different occupations and work positions indicated that females are significantly less satisfied than males in relation to pay and satisfaction with the physical environment (Reyhan, 1998). Research on teachers found that female teachers are significantly more satisfied with their professional role as a teacher than their male counterparts (Ma & MacMillan, 1999). One study found that the satisfaction of men is linked to the level of supervision, autonomy, and position, while the satisfaction of women is linked to the level of complexity, cleanliness, and income (Miller, 1980). Yet, it appears that gender alone is not a direct determinant of job satisfaction. The differences
in satisfaction among employees seem to depend on different occupations and job characteristics.

**Marital Status**; a large number of studies have found that married workers are more satisfied than single workers (Bersof & Crosby, 1984; Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). However, some studies have found no significant differences in job satisfaction between married and unmarried individuals (Lottinville & Scherman, 1998). Similar to gender, the correlation between marital status and job satisfaction cannot be generally applies across different occupations or the same occupation in different localities. Marital status alone does not appear to be a direct determinant of job satisfaction. Any differences discovered seem to be situational and are linked to other environmental and societal factors.

**Length of employment**; in general, the effects of length of employment would be expected to be highly correlated with the effects of age. A positive linear relationship has been found between tenure and job satisfaction (Hunt & Saul, 1975). Similar to the U-shaped curve sometimes reported in studies of age and job satisfaction, one study found that employees with little experience have high levels of satisfaction, then this level drops gradually until 16 years of service. After that point, the level of satisfaction rises again gradually (Burke, 1989). The explanation is that the new employees may find the job challenging and have the motivation to work hard to seek promotions. As the experience increases, they may be stabilizing in the organization and sense that there is little or no challenge or promotion opportunities left in the job. They may become skeptical about finding fulfillment in their careers. Their levels of job satisfaction may be reduced until they reach the stage of preparing for retirement.
**Academic rank;** Facility attitudes toward their job change as they “progress through the faculty ranks and as their careers place different demands on them” (Baldwin, 1990, p. 20). A change in rank brings different expectations, a change in responsibility, academic reputations, and salary. Tack and Patitu (1992) found academic rank to be a powerful variable in the satisfaction of faculty, with full professors expressing more job satisfaction than assistant or associate professors. Promotions in rank alter faculty’s focus, concerns, and subsequent goals, and thus, influence their effective attitudes toward their jobs.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment has received considerable research attention as an employee-organization relation and has been identified as an essential factor in understanding employee behavior in organizations. Organizational commitment goes beyond “passive loyalty” to an organization, due to the fact that it involves an “active relationship”, where the individual is willing to offer some personal contribution to enhance organizational well being (Mowday et al, 1982, p. 27).

The concept of organizational commitment refers to the natures of the linking of a member to the organization. Definitions of commitment can vary a great deal. Organizational commitment can be categorized into attitudinal and behavior approaches (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reichers, 1985).
Attitudinal Commitment; attitudinal commitment reflects the individual’s mindset process in determining his or her relationship with the organization. Through the mindset process, an individual develops one’s willingness to work with the organization and one’s level of affective attachment to an organization. Mowday et al. (1982) defined attitudinal organizational commitment as the individual’s identification with organizational goals and willingness to work towards the goals. One of the most popular measures of attitudinal commitment is the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Porter et al. (1974). The OCQ is designed to assess an individual’s desire to maintain organized membership. In the attitudinal commitment research, most studies focus on identification of the antecedent conditions that contribute to the development of commitment and on behavioral consequences of this commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Williams & Hazer, 1986).

Behavioral commitment; the behavioral approach involves the process of an individual becoming bound by his or her actions in the organization. Through these actions, an individual develops the belief that he or she must sustain the activities and be involved in the organization (Salancik, 1977). Behavioral commitment is the measurement of an individual’s intention to stay in an organization (Mowday et al., 1982). Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory about behavioral commitment indicates that individuals attach themselves to organizations through investments, such as time and efforts that make it too costly to leave. Behavioral commitment is the process by which individuals become locked into certain organizational and how they deal with the situation through behavioral acts (Mowday, et al. 1982). In research on behavioral commitment, the studies focus on identifications of conditions under which a behavior
that, once exhibited, tends to be repeated, as well as on the effects on such behavior on attitudinal change (O’Reilly & Caldwell, 1980).

Attitudinal and behavioral commitments are not independent. Many researchers argue that there is a cyclical relationship between these two types of commitment. That is, commitment attitudes lead to commitment behaviors, which in turn reinforce commitment attitudes.

March and Simon (1958) suggested that commitment varies relative to employees’ decision to participate and to produce in an organization. Applying March and Simon’s definition, one major component of organizational commitment is participation or involvement in the organization. McMahon and Lawler (1995) suggested that employee involvement refers to the degree that employees take part or share in decision making. Involvement includes the power to influence organizational decisions. According to March and Simon (1958), participation or involvement depends upon the inducements offered by the employer in return for employee contributions of the organization. When deciding to participate, employees compare the effort required against the value they place on the inducements offered by the organization.

Astin (1984) researched student involvement, defined as “the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects” (P. 298). Involvement includes devoting time and energy to work and participating in organizations and activities. Increased student involvement produces several outcomes including increased institutional and goal commitment. Similarly, involvement of faculty in work activities and decision making processes can facilitate commitment.
Fjortoft (1993) suggested that faculty perceptions of involvement in policy decision making is the most important and powerful factor in predicting organizational commitment. Fjortoft’s study considered participation in meetings (including department, faculty senate, campus wide, budget and administrative advisory meetings) and perceived influence on policy. The findings suggest that faculty involvement in decision making fosters feelings of personal importance; however, the decision making process actually must influence policy and decisions. Meetings and committees that do not influence or are not perceived as influencing decision making do not foster commitment. Opportunities for faculty to serve on committees with real authority to influence decisions and effect change provide a means of involvement that facilitates organizational commitment.

The degree to which employees identify with organizational goals and values also influences the decision to produce (March & Simon, 1958). Productivity, in its simplest form, is defined as output per unit of input (Salter, 1966). This concept includes the idea of inputs transformed into outputs by some identifiable process (Toombs, 1973).

Faculty productivity refers to what faculty do, in terms of teaching, research, public service and administrative functions and how much time they spend doing it. Middaugh (2001) explains that developing a more precise definition and understanding of faculty productivity is difficult. The difficulty found when defining the typical work week and how faculties spend their time makes it difficult to define faculty productivity. The number of hours worked varies by institutional type and control and the way in which faculty distribute time among various faculty duties often reflects the mission of the institution. In 1992, faculty at public research institutions averaged a 57.6-hour work-
week and devoted 40.4 percent of time to teaching whereas faculty at comprehensive institutions averaged a 52.4-hour work-week and taught 60.2 percent of their work time (Middaugh, 2001). Fairweather (1997) indicated that the distribution of faculty time varies by discipline, gender and rank. For example, women, minority faculty and instructors spend a greater percentage of time teaching.

The various types of faculty duties, such as teaching productivity and research productivity, distinguish faculty productivity. Measures of teaching productivity include number of contact hours generated, number of students taught and percent of time spent teaching (Fairweather, 1997; Middaugh, Trusheim & Bauer, 1994). Measures of research productivity include number of publications (e.g., referred publications, text books, edited volumes and conference papers) and number of externally funded contracts and grants received. Fairweather (1997) suggested that productive teachers are above average in total instructional productivity and time spent on teaching compared to other faculty in their discipline and type of institution. Productive researchers are above average on referred publications over a two year period compared to other faculty in their discipline and type of institution. Using data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93), productive faculty at comprehensive universities produce more than 2.05 publications, generate more than 328.55 credit hours and spend more than 61.55 percent time teaching.

Researches in higher education suggest that personal attributes and work environments influence productivity (Johnsrud, 2002; Chan & Burton, 1993; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Blackburn & Bentley, 1993; Perry, Clifton, Menec, Struthers, & Menges, 2000). Personal variables affecting productivity include individual perceptions
of self-competence, control over outcomes, and expected effort required. Johnsrud (2002) asserts that faculty productivity has a stronger relationship to personal variables than to the environmental variables, such as institutional expectations, institutional mission and institutional support.

Clark and Corcoran (1985) defined vital faculty as those who demonstrate sustained productivity in their teaching, research and professional services. A study of full time faculty at a comprehensive university suggested that both tangible correlates (e.g. compensation and work load) and intangible correlates (e.g. sense of community, sense of well being, morale and career development) of faculty satisfaction served as measures of faculty vitality (Chan, & Burton, 1993). Chan and Burton (1993) concluded that intangible correlates play the central role in determining faculty vitality. Comprehensive universities should use a balanced approach to teaching and research, which tenure and promotion policies should reflect. The policies will facilitate faculty vitality to the extent that they closely assimilate faculty perception of reasonable criteria for tenure and promotion decisions at a comprehensive university.

**Organizational Commitment in Higher Education**

While there are many studies addressing organizational commitment in the business sector, there are far fewer resources addressing organizational commitment in higher education. The researches suggest that modern faculty identify with their discipline and less frequently demonstrate allegiance to their institution (Fjortoft, 1993). The lack of attention to organizational commitment in higher education has become the
focus of significant concern (Ormsby & Watts, 1989). In commenting on the lack of such researches and the clear need for meaningful work in this area, Hershberger (1988) stated that “higher education has much to gain from the enhancement of institutional commitment on the part of faculty members” (p. 6).

Perhaps the first use of the terms “locals” and “cosmopolitans” to designate faculty commitment was the work of Gouldner (1957). Gouldner designated the term “locals” for faculty who were primarily identified with their own work in the organization. Those faculties who identified primarily with a national network of colleagues within their discipline were designated as “cosmopolitans.” Gouldner held that cosmopolitans tend to have low degrees of loyalty to their employer and high commitment to their discipline. The reverse, Gouldner held, is to be true for locals. Gouldner posited that both types of faculty are necessary to the institution, for he believed that the cosmopolitans brought the expertise, while the locals provided loyalty and commitment.

Dressel, Johnson and Marcus (1970) found that faculty who identify primarily with the institution rather than with the discipline or department tend to be the driving force in fostering the institution’s social or public service role, as well as force instilling and emphasizing on undergraduate teaching and curricular reform.

Fjortoft (1993) differentiated organizational commitment from career commitment in that organizational commitment links employees to the goals and values of the organization, not the profession. Fjortoft (1993) further clarified that organizational commitment differs from job satisfaction in that organizational commitment is more
global and encompasses attitudes towards the organization as a whole, and that these are attitudes that develop over time. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, can fluctuate over time and incorporates both extrinsic and intrinsic factors. While research has established the relationship between job satisfaction and performance (Angle & Perry, 1981; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989; Porte, et al, 1974), it is important to highlight the possibility that one may be highly committed both to the profession and to the organization yet have low job satisfaction at a given moment in time. An individual may also have high job satisfaction and high commitment to the profession, but a lesser commitment to the organization.

Researchers have traditionally focused on the employees’ attachment to the institution (Mowday et al., 1982). In several more recent studies, researchers have shifted the focus to the employees’ perception of the institutions commitment to them (Wiesenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Hutchison, 1997). This view is based on social exchange theory or the notion that the individual employee’s organizational commitment is based on the employee’s perception of the institutions commitment to the employee. Etzioni (1961), Becker (1960) and Kanter (1968) all set forth similar concepts positing that favors or positive treatment from the organization resulted in a type of reciprocity. In these theories, the employees’ perception of the institutional commitment to them is viewed as an antecedent to their commitment to the organization.

Salanik (1977) described organizational commitment as a result of the constraints on an individual’s ability to leave an organization, and the extent to which the individual has made a definite and committing choice. In this view, the emphasis is on behavior.
The literature also describes commitment as attitudinal. Mowday et al (1982) attempted to reconcile attitudinal and behavioral forms of commitment.

The organizational structure of a college or university, as compared to a corporation, is an inherent obstacle that ultimately limits the usefulness of a corporate or business model (Brock & Harvey, 1993). Despite differences between corporations and colleges and universities, there are basic principles common to both types of organizational structures. These include the need for strong leadership and vision that inspire organizational wide commitment (Chan, 1988). Yet these same qualities were found to be less effective in the academy than in corporate settings (Bing & Dye, 1992; Mason, 1972), because the concept of shared governance in higher education is fundamentally different than organizational structures found in corporations.

Ormsby and Watts (1989) conducted a longitudinal study of the effect of unionization on organizational commitment and concluded that collective bargaining has no impact on the level of faculty commitment. Ormsby and Watts (1989) concluded that union members have dual commitments to the union and to the organization, and that union membership had no effect on organizational commitment. This study was limited to one college, and the results may or may not pertain to all institutions. However, their findings do bolster the opinion of Reichers (1985) who believed that employees could have multiple commitments. The presence of a union is simply one more commitment, and is not necessarily in conflict with the mission and vision of the leaders of the institution.
Personal characteristics

Hershberger (1989) studied personal characteristics of faculty and found that faculty rank served as the only personal characteristic that significantly influenced organizational commitment. While full and assistant professors displayed the greatest commitment, associate professors exhibited the smallest commitment. Similarly, in a national study of faculty, Fjortoft (1993) indicted that full professors exhibited the greatest commitment, and at a level that was higher than any other rank classification. She asserted that faculty in transitional stages in their careers possess lower levels of commitment than those faculty, typically full professors, who are not in transition.

Neumann and Finaly-Neuman (1990) found that rewards and institutional support affect faculty commitment; however, they observed differences across disciplines. Faculty members in applied fields tend to demonstrate greater organizational commitment than faculty members in pure fields.

Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Although it is not clear whether enhanced job satisfaction leads to commitment, or whether increased commitment leads to greater job satisfaction, researches indicate that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are associated with organizational outcomes such as turnover intentions, turnover, absenteeism, and job performance (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Testa, 2001). Job satisfaction could have a transitory effect as an effective reaction to a certain job. However, job satisfaction is not always viewed as a
sufficient condition to terminated employment. Job satisfaction may be viewed as a
determinant or organizational commitment when considering a job outcome. Then,
turnover could be conceptualized as a result of lower levels of commitment. Although
contradiction exists as to the causal sequence between organizational commitment and
job satisfaction, it is clear that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are
associated variables that effect organizational outcomes.

Many investigators have determined that job satisfaction casually precedes
commitment (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Williams & Hazer,
1986). Porter et al (1974) suggested that job satisfaction represents a rather unstable and
immediate affective reaction to the work environment, as compared to organizational
commitment, which they considered to be a rather long-term slower developing attitude
towards the organization. Thus, there does appear to be some research suggesting that job
satisfaction leads to organizational commitment.

There have been a few studies relevant to establishing the satisfaction-
commitment relationship. A model developed by Steers (1977) described the antecedents
and outcomes of commitment. According to this model, there are three main categories of
variables that influence commitment. Personal characteristics included variable such as a
need for achievement, age, and education. Work experiences, the second category of
influences, described socializing forces that have an impact on attachments formed within
the organization. This category included experiences related to group attitudes toward the
organization and perceptions of personal investment in and worth to the organization.
The third category, job characteristics, included job challenges, opportunities for social
interaction, and feedback. Although Steers did not specifically include job satisfaction as
an antecedent, he did propose that it would probably influence commitment more than would job characteristics.

Jiang (1996) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of government accounts in Taiwan. He found that among the demographic variables, gender and age were significantly related to organizational commitment. He has also reported a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Similar results were also reported in Chung’s (2001) research on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. More specifically, the results of her study indicated that normative commitment has the highest positive correlation with job satisfaction followed by continuance commitment.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) investigated a multivariate predictive model of organizational commitment. They grouped several correlates of organizational commitment together and labeled them personal characteristics and situational attributes including organizationally-mediated variables such as the organizational structure, organizational climate, and human resource processes. Support for the satisfaction commitment relationship was reported in their study. The results showed that each of the facets of job satisfaction was significantly and strongly associated with commitment. Job satisfaction and commitment were linked with voluntary turnover. Moreover, commitment was found to be predictive of individual motivation and objective job performance.

Williams and Hazer (1986) developed a turnover model to describe the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment. They proposed that
personal and work characteristics have no direct effect on turnover intentions. Their impact was only through their effect on satisfaction and commitment. They indicated that the primary mechanism through which these factors have been assumed to influence that commitment was an exchange process. That is, “through a process of the evaluation of costs of benefits, individual’s needs and desires are satisfied, and the resulting affective state becomes associated with the organization, which has provided the job and its associated characteristics and environment” (Williams & Hazer, p. 230). They proposed that organizational commitment resulted from this association. William’s and Hazer’s model argued that satisfaction was a determinant of organizational commitment and that other personal and organizational characteristics influenced commitment indirectly through their impact on job satisfaction. The result of William’s and Hazer’s study showed that there was less support for a causal link from commitment to satisfaction than for a path in the reverse direction. From this perspective, job satisfaction may be considered a causal factor contributing to organizational commitment.

Job satisfaction is an emotional state resulting from the measurement of difference between what one thinks he or she should receive and what one feels he or she actually receives in a given job. Job satisfaction is an employee’s perception of his or her work experience in the context of personal background and environmental factors. Because job satisfaction is a subjective and personal attribute, it is not easy to measure.

There are two major approaches that measure job satisfaction. A method to assess the overall attitudes of an employee toward work is called global satisfaction. However, it seems that the measurement of various facets of job satisfaction is more appropriate for
measuring the overall job satisfaction and measuring the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

From the perspectives of different theoretical approaches, researchers are able to identify different key attributes of a job that may contribute to the satisfaction of human needs. Many of the attributes of the work environment that are thought to be related to job satisfaction are those which meet the higher-order needs of self-esteem and self-actualization. The core dimensions of the work environment that are critical to the fulfillment of higher-order needs include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job itself, achievement, recognition, advancement, and responsibility. The studies of demographic variables on job satisfaction were also reviewed. These variables included age, gender, marital status, length of employment and academic rank. However, it seems that in studies using demographics alone to predict job satisfaction, the results are inconsistent and inconclusive.

Organizational commitment is a critical element for work behavior and performance, because employees who experience strong organizational commitment identify with organizational goals, accept and support organizational decisions, and actively engage in organizational activities. The theoretical approaches to examining organizational commitment include attitudinal and behavioral factors. Attitudinal commitment points to the exchange approach, psychological approach, and normative or moral approach. Allen and Meyer (1990) conducted a three-component model of organizational commitment using the attitudinal approach and defined the three types of organizational commitment as affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Since
1990, Allen and Meyer’s model of organizational commitment has become the most commonly studied.

Moreover, the antecedent variables were recognized as personal characteristics, work experience, job characteristics, and role-related factors. Some research found that the influence of several variables on commitment was mediated by employees’ job satisfaction.

Demographic Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment

Age and Tenure; two somewhat related variables, age and tenure, have been discussed together by many researchers. Most investigations have demonstrated support for a positive correlation between employee’s age and tenure and their organizational commitment (Bedeian, Pizzolatto, Long, & Griffeth, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Reyes, 1989). In research done by Reyes dealing with school administrators, age and total years experiences were positively related to organizational commitment. The more years of experience that an administrator had, the more committed he or she was to the school, and the older the administrator, the more committed he or she was.

Gender; there appears to be no consistent relationship between gender and organizational commitment, although some researchers have proposed that males are more committed than females (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Reyes, 1989). However, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reported that women tend to be more committed than men. Women may become more committed to an organization because they may have had to overcome more barriers than men to gain membership. This tendency is especially prominent when the
female employee is married (Mathieu & Zajac). The costs associated with job mobility may be perceived as higher for a married woman, because leaving employment for another organization may mean leaving the community in which she lives (Steinhaus, 1992).

**Marital Status;** it has been demonstrated that married employees are more likely to be committed to the organization than are single employees (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). It seems reasonable to predict that marital status may be more related to continuance commitment, because married employees are likely to have greater financial burdens. Married employees apparently perceive greater losses associated with job mobility; whereas, single employees see less risk in seeking employment alternatives. For dual career couples, as they attempt to maintain stability in their family life, they may not be able to afford the risk of job mobility.

**Academic rank and administrative duty;** no literature has been found to support the influence of these two variables no organizational commitment.

**Work Experiences; Relationship with co-workers;** The extent to which coworkers are perceived as possessing positive attitudes toward the organization has been shown to enhance individual commitment. Even if individuals initially hold values or beliefs different from those of the group as a whole, they behave according to group expectations and eventually adopt group attitudes as their own (Miller & Wagner, 1971). Thus employees may be socialized to act in a committed manner, begin to believe that they are, and eventually adopt the attitude of being committed to the organization.
**Relationship with leader:** A second interaction involves that of a group leader’s behavior towards subordinates. Supervisory feedback is an important component in clarifying an employee’s achievement for his or her work behaviors. A meta-analysis of antecedents of organizational commitment has reported moderately positive correlations for both leader initiating structure and consideration behaviors (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

**Feedback:** The knowledge of results is viewed as most closely linked to intrinsic motivation and positive work attitudes among specific populations. Monitoring and feedback give employees the benefit of knowing their outcomes. Feedback also gives employees awareness that their job performance is known by others. Feedback also gives employees awareness that their job performance is known by others. As a consequence, employees feel more responsible for their actions, which, in turn, may influence their organizational commitment (Salancik, 1977).