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Abstract

This paper discusses the effect of management and decision-making styles on job satisfaction of academic staff in Malaysian public universities. The sample consisted of 419 respondents. The instruments used in the study were the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Decision Style Inventory. Structural Equation Modelling was used to determine the effect of management and decision-making styles on lecturers’ job satisfaction. The findings showed that universities had adopted the behavioral decision-making style. Communication was the dominant style of management. Direct-effect of decision-making styles on lecturers’ job satisfaction was found. Hygiene factors were the predictors for job satisfaction as perceived by the lecturers at universities.
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1. Introduction & Statement of the Problem

Academic staff are the key of success for educational settings. They are the backbone of good learning outcomes. Their satisfaction within their jobs increases motivation and morale to contribute to the system and their involvement leads to better decisions. The issue of job satisfaction is considered as one of the most widely discussed issues in any organization, human resource and management. Job satisfaction was found to have a strong relationship with leadership and manager styles. It was reported by many researches that, a good management styles lead to high satisfaction of the employees and managerial decision-making styles decides whether the employees will leave or stay. The factors that lead to job satisfaction not only arise from the job, rather from the other factors such: work environment (both physical and social), relationship with supervisors & peers, corporate culture, managerial style (Taskina & Ireen, 2009). Spector (1997) believes that job satisfaction “can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job”.

Malaysia as a case of study, it has been reported by Abu-Bakar (1985) that, academic staff perceive a low satisfaction toward these job facets: achievement interpersonal relations, recognition, responsibility, the work itself, working conditions, advancement, job security, status, job and personal life. Besides, he reported that: job satisfaction, possibility of growth, university’s policy and administration, salary, and supervision are dissatisfying. On this issue, several related newspaper articles show that academic staff have a certain degree of participation in academic decision-making. It happened in the setting-up of the Accreditation Board by the Ministry of National Education (Yee, 1997: quoted by Mfondoun, 1999). Besides, in terms of involvement in educational policies, local academics express their eagerness to work together with the government in terms of the policy-making process for the implementation of total management achieving quality education at local universities (Abubakar, 1997:27; Berita 6-8-997:24, cited by Mfondoun, 1999).
There is a scarcity of research on University management and decision-making styles conducted in Malaysian public Universities using Likert, Rowe Theories and applying all the sixteen factors of Herzberg. Few studies have been conducted on academic staff participation in decision-making regarding school administration not at University level and most of these studies only looked at the teachers level of participation in the decision-making process without investigating the dominance style of school/university leaders in terms of decision-making (Tsang. S.W, 1995; Nagalingam. K, 1997; Tor. S.H, 1997), while some have looked at the relationship between academic staff’s participation in the decision-making process and job satisfaction (Rice and Schnieder, 1994; Ho. B.T, 1997) without considering management styles possessed by the university management. Therefore, this study seeks to fill these gaps by examining and testing empirically the causal-relations of Management and Decision-making styles and their relations to Job Satisfaction of academic staff at University level in Malaysia.

1.1. Research Question
1. Does management and decision-making styles directly effected academic staff job satisfaction?
2. Does management styles directly influenced decision-making styles?
3. What are the best predictors for management; decision-making and job satisfaction factors?

2. Literature
Moreover, the Hygiene Motivation Theory postulated that people have two sets of needs: one for psychological growth (a motivational component) and another to avoid unpleasantness (a state of non-dissatisfaction). Herzberg (1972) identified criteria for meaningful work, including (a) opportunities for growth and achievement, (b) recognition for achievements, (c) increased responsibility for one’s job, and (d) opportunities to advance to higher task levels. A job enrichment model for classroom academic staff that would meet the intrinsic sources defined by Maslow and the four criteria recognized by Herzberg is needed in the University or in any educational setting as well as workplace environment (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992). A research conducted by Fauziah and Anizah (2003), shows that Malaysians who are reportedly as having a collectivist culture (Hofstede, 1980; 1984) have moderate level of job satisfaction in some public universities. Comparing Malaysian private and public universities, a study of Solucis and Syed Shah Alam (2005) on job satisfaction among academic staff in private Universities in Malaysia shows that, pay, promotion, fringe benefit, working condition and others were significan determinants of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the word decision has been defined as “an answer to some question or a choice between two or more alternatives” (Rowe, Boulgarides, & McGrath, 1984). At a very fundamental level, the ability to make a decision relates to making choices within a pool of alternatives (Hammond, 1999). Traditionally, decision making theory has focused on the cognitive process by which an individual makes a decision.

Over the last two decades, many studies have attempted to identify sources of academic staff satisfaction and dissatisfaction by higher institution academic staff (e.g., Farber, 1991; Friedman and Farber, 1992; Kyriacou, 1987; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Mykletun, 1984). According to the majority of these studies, academic staff satisfaction is clearly related to levels of intrinsic empowerment, i.e., motivation. The main factor found to contribute to the job satisfaction of academic staff is working with the students. Additional factors included developing warm, personal relationships with pupils, the intellectual challenge of teaching and autonomy and independence. In contrast, academic staff viewed job dissatisfaction as principally contributed to by work overload, poor pay and low status. Various studies have shown that employee participation in the decision-making process in any organisation increases the satisfaction and performance of the employees (Moore, 1992; Jones, 1988). Reyes and Shin (1995) found that academic staff job satisfaction is a determinant of academic staff commitment and related to academic staff retention. Job dissatisfaction has implications for job performance and organizational effectiveness. Employees who are dissatisfied may exhibit job avoidance behaviors, such as reducing their level of effort (Reyes & Shin, 1995).

Literature suggests a positive correlation between participative decision-making and staff’s productivity (Dickson, 1982; Driscoll, 1978). Extensively, many theories of job satisfaction have been proposed, but one of the most common and widely utilised in educational settings has been that of Hersberg and his associates (Abu Sad & Isralowits, 1992; Derlin & Schneider, 1994; Dinhm & Scott, 1996; 1998; 2000; Lester, 1987; Mercer, 1997; Scott, Cox & Dinhm, 1999). According to Hersberg’s two-factor theory posits that job satisfaction comes from one set of job variables (called motivator needs or satisfiers) and job dissatisfaction from another set of variables (hygiene factors or dissatisfiers). Academic staff job satisfaction relates positively to participative decision-making, higher
autonomy at work, work environment conditions, and ultimately leads to improved student achievement (Ferguson, 2000; Jacobson, 2005; Mertler, 2002; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Singer, 1995).

A management style is defined as an overall method of leadership used by a manager (Mittler, 2002). In another definition, managerial style has been defined as the ability to use pertinent knowledge and methods of working with people. It includes an understanding of general principles of “human behavior” particularly those that involve an innovative skill approach to leadership and the use of this understanding in day-to-day interaction with others in the work situation (Fenwick and Murlis, 1994). Management Styles exhibited by heads of department and the way in which departments are managed may be significant factors in the levels of stress academic staff report. Lecturers in ambiguous and autocratic departments reported the highest levels of stress, closely followed by those in ‘political’ departments. Staff in subjective and collegial departments reported low levels of stress (Paul, 2003). However, decisions about the curriculum policy in a University or subject area will clearly require a whole staff decision or support for a decision (Harry, 2005).

3. Methodology

3.1 Population

According to gender at Table 1, the results show at university “A”, 51.8% (n=113) of the participants were male lecturers while 48.2% (n=105) were female academic staff and the total is (n=218) academic staff at University “A” participated in this research. In relation to position, 63.8% (n=139) of the respondents were “Lecturers” followed by “Assoc Professors” 16.1% (n=35), 11.9% (n=26) were “Assistant Professor”, 7.8% (n=17) were “Professor” and .5% (n=1) “Senior Lecturers”. All the respondents were from University “A”, 100% (n=218). Regarding to educational level, Table 1 shows that, 36.2% (n=79) of the respondents were Master holders and 63.8% (n=139) were PhD holders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentile (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>57.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>42.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>27.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Academic Staff Population and educational level at University “B”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentile (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>6105</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Academic Staff Population and Educational level at University “A”
Table 2 above presents the demographic data of the respondents at university “B”, it shows that 57.9% (n=117) of the respondents from University “B” were female while 42.1% (n=85) were male and the total is (n=202) academic staff from University “B” participated in this research. Besides, the Table shows that, 86.6% (n=175) of the respondents were “Lecturers” followed by “Doctorate” 5% (n=10), 3% (n=6) were “Professor” and 2.5% (n=5) were “Senior Lecturers”, 2% were Assoc Professor”, and 1% (n=2) were “Assist Professor”. Regarding to educational level, 79.2% (n=160) of the respondents were Master holders and 20.8% (n=42) were Doctorates.

3.2. Sample and Research Instrument

In this study, 422 lecturers were sample-sized from both universities. The samples were taken from all faculties and departments. In this study Decision Style questionnaire developed by Alan Rowe and Richard O. Mason (1987) was used. It was applied to measure the decision styles of the managers of Florida’s state university main libraries. Initially, this inventory (DSI) was used to measure the decision styles of the managers of Florida’s state university main libraries and was designed to obtain descriptive data such as gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, educational major, current position, and administrative experience. Regarding to Management Styles, Likert’s Management Styles Theory Instrument was used.

For job satisfaction, Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) was adapted and slightly modified to suit the research objects and situation in Malaysia such as replacing the word of “teacher to lecturer” and deleting some sentences and items during pilot study. Lester developed the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) specifically for use in various educational settings. The TJSQ 73 incorporated 66 items in 9 subscales. The subscales are defined as: Supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition. Pilot study was conducted to test the reliability of the three instruments (Likert, Rowe and Lester) such as Person and Item with the application of Rasch Analysis and Cronbach Alpha level which all yield a high reliabilities of $\alpha=.80-95$ Alpha.

4. Goodness-of-fit of Decision-making Styles for University “A”

To assess the fit of the measurement model, the analysis relied on a number of descriptive fit indices as it was shown above. Table 4.15 provides ten Fit Indices for Decision-making styles. Comparative fit Index of Bentler (CFI) = .937, adjusted goodness-of-fit Index (AGFI) = .900, goodness-of-fit Index (GFI) = .905, the Normal fit Index (NFI) = .908, the Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) = .909, the Incremental fit Index (IFI) = .938. The chi-square goodness of fit test statistic ($\chi^2$) has value of = 9.76 which with 53 degrees of freedom, indicating that the model fit the data and all these indexes supported the model.

5. Item Indicator for Decision-making Styles at University “A”

5.1. Directive Decision-making Styles

Item 6 was considered the best indicator for Directive Decision-making Styles ($R^2 = .53, y=.73$).
5.11. **Analytic Decision-making Style**

Item 18 was the best indicator for Analytic Decision-making Style ($R^2 = .74, y=.86$).

5.1.1. **Conceptual Decision-making Style**

Item 26 was the best indicator for Conceptual Decision-making Styles ($R^2 = .40, y=.69$) and Item 4 was the lowest ($R^2 = .33, y=.57$).

5.1.1.1. **Behavioral Decision-making Styles**

Item 11 was the best indicator for Behavioral Decision-making Style ($R^2 = .57, y=.75$).

5.1.1.1.1. Determining Best Predictor for Decision-making Styles

Figure 1 also displayed the best predictor for Decision-making. **Analytic** was the best Indicator for Decision-making with the highest Item loading and reliability, followed by **Behavioral**.

---

**Figure 1. Measurement Model of Decision-making Styles at University “A”**

6. **Goodness-of-fit of Management Styles for University “A”**

Table 4. Goodness-of-fit Indicators for Management Styles (n= 218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notice: Management Styles= Leadership, Communication, Motivation, Decision-making, Goals and Control.**

Table 4 presented the Fit Indices for Management Styles. The chi-square of $\chi^2 = 128.204$ was insignificant and the remaining set of fit indices suggested the data were well fit by the model. GFI >.92, TLI >.95, CFI >.96, IFI >.95, AGFI >.90, RMR <.031 and RMSEA <0.045.

6.1. **Leadership - Supervision**

Item 9 (**Communication 2**) was the best indicator ($R^2 = .52, y=.72$) and Item 18 (**Control**) was the lowest ($R^2 = .24, y=.49$).
### 6.1.1. Determining best Indicator for Management Styles (Unobserved variable)

Looking into Figure 2, “Communication” was the best Indicator for Management Styles for its highest loading and reliability. Additionally, Figure 7 also presented the relationship between two factors which shows that there was a good relation between (Management-Self-Development) and (Leadership-Supervision).

### 7. Measurement Model of Job Satisfaction for University “A”

Regarding the Fit Indices, the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data. The CFA is >. 941, GFI >. 967, IFI >. 942, AGFI >. 902, NFI >.921 and RMR=.056 was slight above .05 which is considered as a reasonable. Besides, with the degrees of freedom of = 5 and the insignificance chi square=99 shows a good fit of model. Table 4.

![Measurement Model of Motivators factors for Job Satisfaction at University “A”](image)

**Figure 3. Measurement Model of Motivators factors for Job Satisfaction at University “A”**

For Hygiene, the indices were used to measure the descriptive fit the models were the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)= 0.045, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)= .964, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI)=.938, and the comparative fir index (CFI)= 0.971, IFI =0.972, NFI= 0.904 and insignificant chi square values. This shows that the data was good fit to the model.

### Table 5. Goodness-of-fit Indicators for Motivator Factors for Job Satisfaction (UKM) (n= 218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATOR FACTORS</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1. Motivators

Item 1 and 15 (Work Itself and Advance) were the best indicators for Motivator factors for being the highest loading and reliability ($R^2 = .52$, $y=-.72$) while the Item 17 (Personal Growth) was the lowest indicator ($R^2 = .16$, $y=.40$).

7.1.1. Hygiene

Hygiene factors were presented in Table 7 (Work Condition) was the best indicator ($R^2 = .69$, $y=.83$) and while (Policy) were the lowest indicators ($R^2 = .15$, $y=.39$).

7.1.1.1. Determining best Indicator for Job Satisfaction (Endogenous)

Looking into Figure 4, the section of the best indicator for Job Satisfaction can be derived by considering Hygiene as the best Indicator for Job Satisfaction for its highest loading and reliability, followed by Motivators. Figure 5 shows the fit indices of structural Model. As expected with adequate samples and fitted measurement model, the chi-square-associated $P$-value of Structural Equation Model or Path Analysis of Management and Decision-making Styles with Job Satisfaction was statistically significant ($\chi^2=55.65$, $df=17$, $P<0.01$). Besides, the indices reached the threshold required (>0.90). This shows a good fit of the model and the data. Also, the factor loading of each observed variables were very high, ranging from >.48 to 90.
7.1.1.1. Confirming Herzberg’s Theory

Table 7: Ranking Indicators for Herzberg’s Theory of Job Satisfaction at University “A”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Loading &amp; Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work Condition</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Measurement Model of Decision-making Styles for University “B”

Table 8: Goodness-of-fit Indicator of Decision-making Styles for University “B” (n= 201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING STYLES</td>
<td>283.78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1. Directive

Item 6 was the best indicator for Directive with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .42, y= .65$).

8.1.1. Analytic

Item 3 was the best indicator for Analytic with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .49, y= .70$).

8.1.1.1. Conceptual

According to Figure 17, Item 12 was the best indicator for Conceptual with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .38, y= .62$).

8.1.1.1. Behavioral

Item 20 was the best indicator for Behavioral with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .59, y= .77$).

8.1.1.1.1. Determining Best Predictor for Decision-making Styles

Referring to Figure 6 and with the estimation of the loadings and reliabilities, it shows that, Behavioral Decision-making Style was the highest ranked among the rest styles and considered as the best predictor for
decision-making styles. This means, that, the University management at University “B” is considered as Behavioral decision-makers.

9. Measurement Model of Management Styles for University “B”

Table 9. Goodness-of-fit Indicator of Decision-making Styles for University “B” (n= 201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT STYLES</td>
<td>75.56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Item Indicator for University “B”

9.1. Motivation & Communication

Item 9 (Communication 1) was the best indicator for “Motivation and Communication” with the highest loading and reliability ($R^2 = .57, y=.76$).

9.1.1. Leadership

Item 2 (Leadership 1) was the best indicator with the highest loading and reliability ($R^2 = .45, y=.67$).

9.1.1.1. Goals-Control & Decision-making

Item 15 (Goals) was the best indicator with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .35, y=.59$).

9.1.1.1.1. Best indicator for Management Styles

In this study, Communication is considered as the best indicator for Management Styles was with the highest factor loading and reliability ($R^2 = .57, y=.76$), followed by Leadership ($R^2 = .45, y=.67$) and Motivation was considered as the lowest indicator for Management Styles as it was shown in Figure 7 above.

![Figure 7. Measurement Model of Management Styles at University “B”](image)

10. Goodness-of-fit of Job Satisfaction for University “B”

To assess the fit of the measurement model for both motivator factors and hygiene, numbers of descriptive fit indices were computed such as: Comparative fit Index of Bentler (CFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit Index (AGFI), goodness-of-fit Index (GFI), the Normal fit Index (NFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Incremental fit Index (IFI) including the ratio of chi-square ($\chi^2$) to degree of freedom. The indices for motivator factors an hygiene were grater than .090 or reached the Threshold requirement and values. The RMR were below .042 and below .05. With the estimation, the result shows that, the model fit the data of motivator factors and hygiene.
Motivators

- Work Itself 1: $e_2$ (R² = .82, y = .83)
- Work Itself 2: $e_3$ (R² = .47, y = .69)
- Achievement: $e_4$ (R² = .58, y = .68)
- Responsibility: $e_5$ (R² = .46, y = .83)

10.1. Motivators

Item 1 (Advance) was the best indicator for Motivator Factors with the highest Item loading and reliability ($R^2 = .69, y = .83$) followed by Item 15 (Work Itself 1) ($R^2 = .68, y = .82$), while Item 6 also (Work Itself 2) was the lowest ($R^2 = .12, y = .35$).

10.1.1. Hygiene Factors

Item 13 (Subordinate) ($R^2 = .83, y = .91$) with the highest loading and considered as the best indicator or predictor for Hygiene followed by Item 11 (Peers 1) ($R^2 = .79, y = .89$) from Hygiene 1, Item 22 (Supervisor) ($R^2 = .63, y = .80$) from Hygiene 3, while Item 5 and 21 were (Peers 3 and Salary) were the lowest ($R^2 = .26, y = .51$) from Hygiene 2.

10.1.1.1. Determining best Indicator for Job Satisfaction (Endogenous)

According to Figure 9, “Subordinate” was the best indicators for factors Followed by “Peers” and “Hygiene” is the best predictor for Job Satisfaction.
11. Path Coefficient Beta (β) Analysis of Management & Decision-making Styles and Job Satisfaction at University “A and B”

Several test indices are provided to make judgement about the fit of the whole Path analysis mode the Bentler indices (CFI and NFI), the Bollen index (IFI), the Tucker-Lewis (TLI) and (GFI & AGFI) all were higher than >.90 and Root-mean was at the acceptance range=.85. This suggested a fit structural model (Figure 10).


Findings

For the purpose of ascertaining whether management and decision-making styles have effects on Job Satisfaction, the Path Analysis was necessary to be performed to infer their causality. As the results of path analysis illustrated in Figure 5 & 10, “Decision-making Styles” had significant positive direct-effect on “Job Satisfaction” (β= -.66, p<0.01), while there is no significant effect-directive of “Management Styles” on “Job Satisfaction” (β=0.04, p<.001).

11.1.1 Indirect-effect of Management Styles on Job Satisfaction

Findings

Unfortunately, there was no direct-effect of management styles on job satisfaction on indirect-effect through decision-making styles. This could be interpreted as; University management styles predict or determine decision-making styles of the management and management styles (Leadership-motivation-decision-making-control) positively affected lecturers’ job satisfaction through their styles in making decisions. Hence, if management applied good management styles, their decisions will be positive and will passively affect lecturers’ job satisfaction.

11. 1.1. Interpretation

The direct-effect of directive decision-making style on job satisfaction could be interpreted as; the more positive decision-making styles of the University, the higher satisfaction of the academic staff. Hence, whether University management or directive, analytic, conceptual and behavioral decision-making styles, the lecturers are still motivated and satisfied. Besides, any decisions made by the University management on things related to motivator factors such as advancement, achievement, work itself and on hygiene such as work security, salary, work condition, and supervision predicts lecturers’ job satisfaction and seemed to have an impact on their motivation. In addition, University decision-making styles play huge role on academic staff happiness about their job.

12. Confirming Herzberg’s Theory

Table 12. Ranking Indicators for Herzberg’s Theory of Job Satisfaction at University “B”
13. Summary and Conclusion

13.1. Decision-making Styles in both universities

In terms of decision-making styles both universities management are “behavioural-decision-makers and according Rowe Boulgarides (1992), behavioural decision-makers are” people-oriented” and “right-brain decision-makers”. Behavioural decision-makers focus on the feelings and welfare of group members and other social aspects of work. They look to others for information, both explicit information in what others say and implicit information sensed during interactions with them. They evaluate information emotionally and intuitively. For People oriented leaders or management, they tend to show concern for subordinates, warm and supportive and more hand-off with regard to tasks. Besides, people-orientated are considered as interaction-oriented which reflects the extent of concern with maintaining happy, harmonious personal relationships. They are interest in group activities and having a happy time with others. Moreover, “right-brain decision-makers” are achievement-oriented, having broad outlook, creative, humanistic, initiatives new ideas and future-oriented. They are more rational in their decision-making but not analytic and good problem solvers.

13.1.1. Management Styles

The findings show that, communication was the dominant of the management styles followed decision-making and leadership. This means, there was a big emphasis from the academic staff on communication between staff and management and involvement or decisions made by the management. It seemed the communication was not that effective enough and believed that, the decisions were made mostly on top.

13.1.1.1. Job Satisfaction

According to the findings, Hygiene factors (status, security, subordinate, personal life, peers, salary, work condition, supervisor, policy and supervision) were ranked and considered as the predictors for job satisfaction in both universities. It is related to lecturers’ status, their job security, their relationship with their students, their own personal growth as an individual, their relationship with their colleagues, salary to compensate their efforts, their work condition such as things related to their works, their relationship with the management, academic policies and management supervision and leadership. All these factors are considered as extrinsic motivation that all the lecturers or workers should received from the management or employee in order to do well in their jobs and performance effectively and efficiently in their working place.

13.1.1.1.1. Area of concerns

- Communication between lecturers and management
- Behavioral decision-making (It should be mixed of behavioural and analytic and people and task-oriented)
- University supervision and subordinates as well in general as all “hygiene” factors (status, security, subordinate, personal life, peers, salary, work conditions, supervisor, policy and supervision).

14. Conclusion

Putting into consideration, every educational management and administration should take into account that, academic staff plays a huge roles any educational. Management/decision making styles of supervisor, level of role clearness, autonomy, participation in decision-making, incentives, staff’s motivation, communication, and
University management relationship with the academic staff are the main determinants of job satisfaction. In terms of decision-making styles should be contiguous and situational whereby the University management or leaders should be task and the people oriented, avoiding one dominance decision-making style. Management could be task-oriented if the situations and things are chaotic, the management or leaders need to me autocratic to put things in orders and at the same time, the management should be behavioral decision-makers when the situation permitted them to do so. Therefore, university management should put lecturers’ job satisfaction into consideration as it has relationship with teaching and learning as well as effectiveness of the university and performance.

Lecturers are happy when they are satisfied with the decisions made by the university and type of management styles applied by the university management. Management should create a good rapport with the staff for management to know their problems and concerns. Management should not be too strict and at the same time, they shouldn’t be too lenient. It should be balanced and mixed.
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