

工作滿意度與參與決策之關係

國立臺灣體育學院副教授 程春美

摘要

本文旨在探討工作之滿意度及參與決策之間的關係。文中亦討論參與決策如何以及為何能提升工作之滿意度，分析工作滿意度的因果關係，也分析工作不滿意度的因果關係，工作滿意度與工作生產力的關係，工作之滿意層面，和參與決策與學校組織效率之關係。最後，本文提出結論：參與決策的過程能提升員工的工作內容品質，由於參與決策，使得工作更具有意義，有挑戰性且具有趣味性。工作內容品質提高，相對的，提升工作動機，工作效率也會提高，則工作滿意度也隨之增加。

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Involvement in Decision-Making

CHENG Chun-Mei, Ph, D., Associate Professor

National Taiwan College of Physical Education

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and involvement in decision-making. The paper also discussed how and why job satisfaction was enhanced by involvement in decision-making. There were many issues related to job satisfaction:

1. The possible causes of job satisfaction,
2. Possible effects of job satisfaction,
3. Possible causes of job dissatisfaction,
4. Possible effects of job dissatisfaction,
5. Job satisfaction and productivity,
6. Job facet satisfaction,
7. Job enrichment, and
8. Involvement in decision-making.

This paper followed a four-chapter format. Chapter One was an introduction to the study. Chapter Two presented a review of literature that related job satisfaction and involvement in decision-making. Chapter Three presented the analysis of the literature, and Chapter Four presented the conclusions.

In this paper the author indicated and concluded that involvement in the decision-making process improved job content for employees. The logical process

was that it did this by making work more meaningful, relevant, challenging, and interesting. Therefore, better job content led to higher levels of motivation and higher levels of motivation led to greater productivity and increased job satisfaction.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Job satisfaction has been a subject of interest to many researchers.

Numerous studies have been undertaken to determine the factors contributing to greater job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Moreover, the outcomes of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction have been explored.

The extensive amount of research and theory about job satisfaction is founded on two primary reasons. The first is that job satisfaction is of value for itself. This is based on a humanitarian concern for the worker. An underlying assumption would be that employers should want their employees to be satisfied. Therefore, if the variables that predict job satisfaction can be determined and if those variables can be controlled, job satisfaction can be achieved.

The second reason is that job satisfaction may be a predictor of some desirable outcomes for the organization. If job satisfaction were shown to be a predictor of outcomes highly valued by organizations, such as increased work production or less absenteeism, it would be in the best interest of the organization to attempt to control any independent variables that predict job satisfaction.

Patchen(1970)suggested that greater job satisfaction is associated with higher work achievement. Porter and Lawler(1968)found the relationship between these two variables to be complex in that satisfaction was found to be closely related to performance, but satisfaction was not found to be a predictor of performance. Kressel(1979)found that good job performance leads to both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which in turn lead to greater job satisfaction.

Researchers and theorists have stated that dissatisfaction can cause a variety of undesirable outcomes for an organization. A lack of commitment to the job, low productivity, labor unrest, sabotage, accidents, and mental health

problems have all been considered as possible outcomes of low levels of job satisfaction. Absenteeism can be costly to an organization, especially if substitute workers must be hired at additional expense. If workers are not replaced, production could be affected. An increase in employee turnover rates can cost an organization additional time and money in retraining program. These increased costs can be viewed as having a negative impact on organizational efficiency.

Longer retention of employees and better attendance are two behavioral outcomes of increased job satisfaction that are well founded in the research (Portugal, 1976). Even if job satisfaction did not result in positive behavioral outcomes, the organization should be interested in the welfare of its employees. Humanitarian reasons alone should motivate management to strive for increased job satisfaction.

The involvement of others in the decision-making process is often associated with job satisfaction. Decision-making has been widely discussed in the literature on leadership styles and leadership theory. The early work of Lewin, Lippit, & White(1937)generated enthusiasm for democratic models of decision-making. Saunders and Phillips made a case for involving others in the decision-making process when they wrote, "Groups are more capable of making adequate decisions which affect the group than is a status leader" (Saunders & Phillips, 1966, p.84). Moreover, they contend that greater support for decisions will follow when there is involvement in the decision-making process. Collaborative decision-making results in creating ownership for those carrying out decisions, according to Harrison, Killian, and Mitchell(1989). Indeed, it is logical that individual would have greater ownership for decisions they help to make.

Frymier(1987)argued that failure to empower teachers results in their perceptions that they are viewed in negative ways, and people with this

perception tend not to work hard. Further, he contended that "decentralizing significant decisions maximize participants "motivation" (p.14). Barth(1986) said that successful principals not only involve teachers in decision-making, they are ready to relinquish decision-making authority to teachers. In addition, effective principals are ready to share the responsibilities for failures, while attributing successes to the teachers. Bradley(1990)wrote that good managers have always provided for shared involvement in decision-making.

Increased satisfaction is another reason cited for involving teachers in decision-making. Stimson and Appelbaum(1988)discussed the difference between the use of personal power and positional power. Teachers are more satisfied when principals use personal power, opposed to positional power.

Teachers are also more satisfied when they believe principals care about teacher opinions, yet most teachers' lack the opportunity to make decisions, according to Stimson and Appelbaum.

Much of the literature on administrative theory has emphasized the value of involving others in the decision-making process. The role of the principal can be viewed as a facilitator of the decision-making process, rather than the one who makes all the decisions. "It is not the function of the chief executive to make decisions, it is his function to monitor the decision-making process, to make certain that it performs at the optimum level" (Griffiths, 1959, p.89).

Among the possible reasons discussed for promoting a model of shared decision-making are generating greater support for decisions made, better quality decisions, increased effectiveness, and creating greater job satisfaction. These reasons are likely to be interrelate.

It is recognized that there may be many factors contributing to the overall level of job satisfaction for teachers. When principals strive to improve job satisfaction among teachers, they must find variables that are within their area of

influence. This study has attempted to show that involvement in the decision-making process is one variable that positively impacts job satisfaction.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

There are many variables presented in the literature as predictors of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. On the other hand, the literature includes variables, which could be outcomes of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. They are: absentee rates, level of job conflict, mental health, morale, physical health, productivity, and turnover rates.

Possible Causes of Job Satisfaction

Organizational factors associated with reward affect job satisfaction (Baron and Greenberg, 1990). In the opinion of the authors, the issue is that satisfaction is positively related to the fairness of the reward systems used. Peskin (1973) stated that money is a mixed motivator and is unpredictable as a satisfier. It is Peskin's opinion that money may induce a person to take a job or remain longer at a given position, but money cannot guarantee job satisfaction.

The quality of supervision is associated with job satisfaction. In reporting other research findings, Hoy and Miskel(1987)wrote that the quality of leadership correlates highly with teacher morale. Moreover, the authors state that the quality of communication in an organization relates to overall teacher job satisfaction. Daily(1988)wrote that considerate supervision leads to greater job satisfaction. In discussing considerate supervision, the author also stated his belief that meaningful participation in decision making is a method of improving satisfaction. Bass(1990)reported that favorable employee attitudes toward their supervisors contribute to increased job satisfaction. Bass cited several sources

to substantiate that leadership makes a difference in the satisfaction levels of employees. He also reported the positive relationship between role clarity and job satisfaction, and how this relates to the quality of supervision.

The work itself is often as an important source of job satisfaction. Lee(1965)notes that enhanced satisfaction occurs when employees can exercise initiative in carrying out assignments. He reports that increased involvement in goal setting is associated with increased satisfaction. Peskin(1973)reported that it is the job content that provides a foundation for satisfaction. Johns(1988) reported that challenging work contributes to greater job satisfaction as long as the work does not generate frustration of failure. There are certain characteristics of jobs that seem to contribute to greater job satisfaction such as variety, challenge, a reasonable workload, and social interaction(Baron and Greenberg, 1990).

Personal characteristics also affect job satisfaction. High self-esteem, high ability to handle stress, the belief that one has influence or control over outcomes, high status, greater seniority, and high levels of general life satisfaction are all associated with greater job satisfaction(Baron & Greenberg 1990). The authors recognized that cause and effect relationships between these characteristics and job satisfaction are unclear.

Sergiovanni(1967)found that achievement recognition and the responsibility associated with work account for teacher satisfaction.

Possible Effects of Job Satisfaction

Daily(1988)also lists the following as key consequences of job satisfaction better physical health for employees, better mental health for employees, lower rates of employee turnover, and fewer occurrences of unexcused absence. These consequences are generally accepted in the literature.

Possible Causes of Job Dissatisfaction

The causes of dissatisfaction are in some cases the absence of the very factors that can lead to satisfaction. Peskin(1973)reported that many workers feel discontent when deprived of control, decision-making, or problem-solving opportunities. These feelings of discontent are most common among college graduates, skilled technicians, and achievement-oriented workers. And it is the opinion of Peskin that these are the workers most likely to respond by quitting.

Levitt(1991)wrote about the dangers of the routinization of work, in that it deadens alertness, imagination, and energy. Levitt stated that the great task of leadership is to be innovative.

Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn(1986)replicated a 1964 study on job satisfaction for teachers in Dade County, Florida. They found some decline over this 20-year period in overall job satisfaction for teachers and a greater decline in the level of satisfaction with their schools. Lortie(1986), who conducted the original research in 1964, discussed the research of Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn. Lortie suggested that a significant increase in the number of teachers that receive no satisfaction from status-related rewards is among the reasons for these declines in satisfaction.

The lack of opportunity to participate in decision making, for example, is the greatest source of teacher dissatisfaction(Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Busching and Rowls(1985) argued that failure to utilize teacher expertise would result in increased teacher militancy and greater job-related dissatisfaction.

Possible Effects of Job Dissatisfaction

Interest in improving job satisfaction generally stems from perceptions about the effects of dissatisfaction, and the interest in avoiding those outcomes.

Dissatisfaction may result in inconsistent efforts to achieve, complaints, formal grievances, disputes, absences, lack of punctuality, reduced commitment to work, lower production, and social concerns(Barbash, 1976). Understandably, all of these potential results of dissatisfaction are undesirable, and management has a vested interest in minimizing them.

Goodlad(1984)reported increased turnover due to dissatisfaction. Portigal (1976)reported a strong relationship between turnover and dissatisfaction and a weaker relationship between dissatisfaction and absenteeism. The author felt that dissatisfaction might result in more grievances and collective bargaining difficulties, and might increase the probability of strikes. Portigal also reported that there is evidence linking dissatisfaction to poorer mental health and declines in longevity. Jaffe and Scott(1988)reported tht “personal health, burnout, and work satisfaction are intimately connected” (p.22). Johns(1988) also discussed the results of job dissatisfaction. Negative effects on physical health, life span, and mental health are viewed as outcomes. Off-the-job dissatisfaction, absence from work, increased turnover, and poorer performance were also examined as outcomes. Johns pointed out that the cause and effect relationships between these variables and job satisfaction are often unclear.

Performance is more often seen as a predictor of satisfaction, rather than one of the outcomes of satisfaction. Howarth(1984)noted that the dissatisfied employee might demand more money for other than financial reasons. He also argued that lower production rates and higher rates of absence, tardiness, and sabotage are ways for workers to establish unofficial controls.

Job Satisfaction and Productivity

The relationship between job satisfaction and productivity has been of special interest to researchers. Early interest in job satisfaction arose from the

belief that satisfied people would perform better in organizations (Porter, Lawler, and Hackman, 1975). In the Hawthorn studies Elton Mayo (1933) concluded that the most significant factor affecting organizational productivity was interpersonal relationships. That is, higher productivity is more likely to occur when the social and psychological needs of the workers have been satisfied. An implication of this conclusion is that satisfaction with at least one aspect of the job, interpersonal relationships, results in greater productivity. The research of Kressel (1979) indicated a positive relationship between satisfaction and performance.

Srivastva and others (1977) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. The authors reported that autonomy is positively related to both job satisfaction and performance. A democratic supervisory style is also positively related to both job satisfaction and productivity. These findings supported Herzberg's theory that job satisfaction and productivity are related outcomes triggered by other independent variables. The findings further showed a positive correlation between job challenge and job satisfaction, and between job challenge and performance outcomes. The strongest relationships were those between autonomy and job satisfaction, and between intrinsic work factors (job content) and job satisfaction.

Daily (1988) outlined the three most commonly held views concerning the relationship between satisfaction and performance:

1. Satisfaction causes performance.
2. Performance causes satisfaction.
3. Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards govern the performance-satisfaction relationship.

Daily found the third view the most plausible. Under his theory there is no direct relationship between satisfaction and performance. An indirect relation-

ship does seem to exist between the two dependent variables. It is the equitable distribution of both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that connect the two variables. Job satisfaction remains an important indicator of an organization's ability to meet the needs of its employees in the workplace.

Job Facet Satisfaction

Johns(1988)contrasted job facet satisfaction with overall satisfaction. The work itself, pay, promotion, recognition, benefits, working conditions, supervision, co-workers, and organizational policy are considered the most relevant facets.

Daily(1988)broke down job satisfaction into five components. They are satisfaction with work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers. A teacher may be very satisfied in one area and not in another. This is very similar to the thinking of victor Vroom(1964). He examined the concept of job satisfaction as a set of dimensions rather than a single dimension. That is, a worker may be very satisfied with one particular dimension of his job, and very dissatisfied with another dimension. He reported that these different dimensions are positively interrelated and that additional research is needed to determine why this interrelationship exists.

Job Involvement, Success, and Job Enrichment

Gruneberg(1979)found a positive correlation between job involvement and job satisfaction. He further reported that job success leads to greater job satisfaction, "presumably because success enhances an individual's self-esteem." (p.52) These findings are supportive of the idea that productivity is a predictor of satisfaction rather than the converse.

The research of Locke(1965 & 1967)establishes a relationship between satisfaction and task success. Subsequent research of Locke and Bryan(1967) shows a relationship between performance goals and the level of performance.

The research of Locke helps clarify the relationship between the productivity and satisfaction, relating both to the work itself.

Job enrichment programs are designed to reduce boredom and increase job satisfaction by making work more meaningful. Job enrichment gives the worker responsibility for a whole product or service. Howarth(1984)stated that job enrichment increases motivation and efficiency that result in greater job satisfaction. He reported that many companies using job enrichment programs claim the following benefits: increased sales, greater productivity per person, better quality, greater flexibility of the work force, higher levels of satisfaction, greater commitment to the job, decreased supervisory needs, and decreased rates of absence, turnover, and sabotage. Yorks(1979)discusses job enrichment and job redesign as ways to involve workers in decision-making and team production.

Involvement in Decision Making

The benefits of involving employees in the decision-making process have been examined by a considerable number of researchers. Studies have been directed primarily at the relationship between participatory management and satisfaction, but many other reasons are discussed in the literature. Bass(1990) pointed out decision acceptance, decision quality, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction among the possible benefits of participation. Kimbrough and Burkett(1990)indicated improved human relations, human development, collegiality, enhanced commitment, and better communication as some of the benefits of participatory management.

Locke and Schweiger(1979)examined the use of participative decision making against organizational effectiveness. The possible benefits from participation in decision-making were categorized into two groups. The first group included improved morale, greater job satisfaction, reduced turnover, less absen-

teeism, and reduced conflict. The authors believed that participation in decision-making generally improves satisfaction, but this may depend on what the employee wants to obtain from the process and whether or not it is obtained.

The second group of possible benefits included higher production, better decision quality, better production quality, and reduced conflict and costs. They argued that the interests of employees, stockholders, and customers are fundamentally the same. Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik(1961)suggested that participation in decision-making might lead to improvements in productivity and improvements in decision quality. Locke and Schweiger maintained that the use of participation in decision making and efforts to improve job satisfaction must be considered as means to an end, and that end is a more successful organization.

Involvement and School Effectiveness

Goodlad(1984)found that schools are perceived by teachers to be more effective when teachers are more satisfied, and that teachers are more satisfied when they are able to participate in decision making. Effective school principals are able to secure faculty involvement when making instructional decisions, and they are able to develop and maintain the motivation for improving instruction, according to Taylor and Levine,(1991). Miskel(1987)found that teachers describe schools as organizationally effective when decision making is shared.

Shedd and Bacharach(1991)wrote that the involvement of teachers in the decision-making process leads to greater organizational commitment, enhanced morale, improved satisfaction, greater motivation, increased cooperation, and reduced conflict. An example is the use of collaborative decision making in schools in Gorham, Maine. Teachers helped to develop strategies for the more efficient usage of limited resources, which they believed, improved the effec-

tiveness of their schools(Goldman and O'Shea, 1990).

Duttweiler(1986)advocated involving teachers in the decision-making process as a way of motivating them. He contended that principals of effective schools use a participatory leadership style. A case was made by Kinder(1978) for developing a teacher team to facilitate involvement in the decision-making process. He argued that the lack of teacher participation will result in less successful schools. He wrote, "it is one thing to make a decision and another to carry it out" (p.87). Kinder was obviously inferring that decisions would be implemented more effectively when decision ownership exists with those responsible for implementation. He stated that teacher involvement results in more correct decisions, and that group leaders are helped by this involvement.

CHAPTER THREE

Analysis of the Literature

The research of Morse and Reimer(1956)examined the effects of involvement in decision-making on job satisfaction. In order to conduct this study, experimental programs in shared decision-making were created. While satisfaction increased for those groups, production increased in all groups.

Bullock(1984)reported that 43 of 60 studies found a positive relationship between participative decision-making and job satisfaction. He found a weak link between satisfaction and performance. Studies involving the use of performance-based pay demonstrated a positive relationship between performance-based pay and higher levels of performance. These same studies also found a negative relationship between performance-based pay and job satisfaction. Bullock also reported a positive correlation between satisfaction and team building when there are opportunities for employees to exert influence on

the decision process.

The research of Vroom(1964)on the effects of participation in decision-making on satisfaction suggested that the personality of the participant is an important dimension in the equation. Participation is most positively related to satisfaction among persons high in need of independence and low in need of authoritarianism. Vroom reported there was no evidence that participation had any negative effects on either satisfaction or performance.

Later work by Vroom and Jago(1988)suggested two reasons why job satisfaction is enhanced by involvement in decision-making. First, by being involved, participants are better able to see that decisions reflect their own interests. Secondly, the value participants place on involvement in decision-making for its own sake is increasing. The authors found that this involvement enables people to use their talents in meaningful ways and be part of a group process.

Reyes(1989)examined organizational commitment, autonomy in decision-making, and job satisfaction for public school teachers and mid-level school administrators. The administrators were more satisfied with their jobs, more committed to school, and were more autonomous in decision making than were teachers. While both groups showed relatively high involvement in decision making, levels of involvement for administrators was higher than corresponding levels for teachers. Belasco and Alutto found significantly lower levels of satisfaction among teachers who were "decisionally deprived" (1972,p.51).

They also found that teachers with high levels of satisfaction have less job tension and less militant attitudes. Schmuck(1977)found that both the teachers' perception of their extent in involvement in decision making and the perceptions of their satisfaction with decision making were positively related to teacher job satisfaction.

Bass(1990)stated that it is not so much the act of participation that is satisfying, but the feeling and knowledge that genuine opportunities exist for participation if desired. He pointed out that only about 50 percent of that eligible to vote actually vote in general elections. He argued that this is a satisfying state to those not voting, but if the right to vote were abridged, a great outcry would arise. If this logic is sound, the implication is that opportunities for teacher involvement in decision making ought to be provided, but involvement should be voluntary.

CHAPTER FOUR

Conclusions

The relationship between job content and job satisfaction has been well established. Herzberg, et al. (1959),Lee,(1965),Sergiovanni, (1967),and Srivastva, et al:(1977)are among those who have established this connection. The relationship between job content and the motivation to work likewise has been established by the same sources. Moreover, motivation and productivity are positively correlated.

The relationship between involvement in decision making and employee perceptions about job content is less clear. Lawler(1986)established an indirect link between participation in decision making and motivation. Moreover, he found a connection between participation in goal setting and motivation.

Much of the literature is also proved that involvement in the decision-making process improves job content for employees. The logic is that involvement in decision making improves job content by making work more meaningful, relevant, challenging and interesting. Better job content leads to higher levels of motivation. Higher levels of motivation lead to greater productivity and increased job satisfaction.

References

1. Barbash, J.(1976).Job satisfaction attitudes surveys. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
2. Baron, R. A., & Greenberg, J.(1990). Behavior in organization: Understanding and managing the human side of work. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
3. Baron, R. S.(1986). The principal and the profession of teaching. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(4), 471-492.
4. Bass, B. M.(1990).Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications(3rd ed.)London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.
5. Berkowitz, L., Fraser, C., Treasure, F. P., & Cochran, S.(1987). Pay equity, job gratifications, and comparisons in pay satisfactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 27, 544-551.
6. Bradley, A.(1990, February). Who's in charge here? *Teacher*, pp. 22-24.
7. Bullock, R. J.(1984). Improving job satisfaction. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
8. Busching, B. A., & Rowls, M.D.(1985). Teacher roles in transition:Emerging professional responsibilities for teacher leaders. Dever, CO: Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 759)
9. Daily, R.C.(1988). Understanding people in organizations. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
10. Duttweiler, P.C.(1986).Educational excellence and motivating teachers. *Clearing House*, 59(8), 371-74.
11. Frymier, J.(1987).Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(1), 9-14.
12. Goldman, C., & O'Shea, C.(1990). A culture for change. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 41-43.
13. Goodlad, J.I.(1984)A place called school:Prospects for the future. New York:

- McGraw-Hill Book Company.
14. Griffiths, D. E. (1959). *Administrative theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
 15. Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
 16. Haji-Hashim, A. B. (1985). *An analysis of job satisfaction among academic staff of universities in Malaysia*.
 17. Harrison, C. R., Killion, J. P., & Mitchell, J.E. (1989). Site-based management: The realities of implementation. *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 55-58.
 18. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959) *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
 19. Howarth, C. (1984). *The way people work: Job satisfaction and the challenge of change*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
 20. Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research, practice* (3rd ed.) New York: Random House.
 21. Jaffe, D.T., & Scott, C.D. (1988). *Take this job and love it*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
 22. Johns, G. (1988). *Organizational behavior: Understanding life at work* (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
 23. Kimbrough, R.B., & Burkett, C. W. (1990). *The principalship Concepts and practices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
 24. Kinder, J.A. (1978). *Decision making in public education*. Tuscon, AZ: MESA.
 25. Kottkamp, R.B., Provenzo, E.F. Jr., & Cohn, M.M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teachers' attitudes, 1964-1984. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(8), 559-67.
 26. Kressel S.S. (1979). Satisfaction and performance: A theoretical examination of information processing, reward contingency, and the moderating effect of self-esteem.
 27. Lawler, E.E. (1986) *High-Involvement Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
-

28. Lee, H.C.(1965). Do workers really want flexibility on the job? *Personnel*, 43 (2), 4-77.
29. Levitt, T.(1991). *Thinking about management*. New York: The Free Press.
30. Likert, R.(1961). *New patterns in management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
31. Locke E.A.(1965). The relationship of task success to task liking and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(5), 379-385.
32. Locke E.A.(1967). Further data on the relationship of task to liking and satisfaction. *Psychological reports*, 20(1), 246.
33. Locke, E.A., & Bryan J.F.(1967). Performance goals as determinants of level of performance and boredom. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51(2), 120-130.
34. Locke, E.A., & Schweiger, D.M.(1979). Participation in decision-making: One more look. In Straw, B.M.(Ed.), *Research in Organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews*.(pp.265-340). Greenwich, CT:Jai Press Inc.
35. Maslow, A.H.(1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(6), 370-396.
36. Mayo, E.,(1933)*The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
37. Miskel, C.(1987). Bureaucratic structure, organizational processes, and three dimensions of school effectiveness. New York: Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 422)
38. Morse, N.C., & Reimer, E.(1956). The experimental change of a major organizational variable. In Vroom, V.H., & Deci, E.L.(Eds), *Management and motivation:Selected readings*(pp. 192-213).Baltimore, MD:Penguin Books, Ltd.
39. Patchen, M.(1970). *Participation, achievement, and involvement on the job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall.
40. Peskin, D.B.(1973). *The doomsday job: The behavioral anatomy of turnover*.

- New York: AMACOM.
41. Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E.(1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL:Irwin.
 42. Porter, L.W., Lawler, E.E., & Hackman, J.R.(1975). *Behavior in Organizations*. New York:McGraw-Hill Book Company.
 43. Portigal, A.H.(1976). *Towards the measurement of work satisfaction*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
 44. Reyes, P.(1989). The relationship of autonomy in decision making to commitment to schools and job satisfaction: A comparison between public school teachers and mid-level administrators. *Journal of Research and Development in Educational*, 22(2), 62-69.
 45. Satnders, R.L., & Phillips, R.C.(1966). *A theory of educational leadership*. Columbus, OH:Merrill.
 46. Schmuck, P.(1977). Management implications of team teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 906)
 47. Sergiovanni, T.J.(1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5(1), 66-82.
 48. Shedd, J.D., & Bacharach, S.B.(1991) *Tangled hierarchies: Teachers as professionals and the management of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
 49. Srivastva, S., Salipante, P.F., Jr., Cummings, t. G., Notz, W.W., Bigelow, J.D., & Waters, J.A.(1977). *Job satisfaction and productivity*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
 50. Stimson, T.D., & Appelbaum, R.P.(1988). Empowering teachers: Do principals have the power? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(4), 313-316.
 51. Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I.R., & Massarik, F.(1961) *Leadership and organization: A behavioral science approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
 52. Taylor, B.O., & Levine, D.U.(1991). Effective schools projects and school based management. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(5), 394-397.
-

- 53. Vroom, V.(1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- 54. Vroom, V.H., & Jago A.G.(1988). The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 55. Yorks, L.(1979). Job enrichment revisites. New York: AMACOM.