

**Citation:** Iqbal, H. S., Saleem, M., & Akhtar, M. M. S. (2020). Effect of Decision Making Styles of Academic Managers on Faculty Commitment in Public Sector Universities of Punjab. *Global Language Review*, V(I), 270-280. doi:10.31703/glr.2020(V-I).28

Hafiza Sadiya Iqbal \*

Muhammad Saleem †

Mahr Muhammad Saeed Akhtar ‡

p-ISSN: 2663-3299

e-ISSN: 2663-3841

L-ISSN: 2663-3299

Vol. V, No. I (Winter 2020)

Pages: 270 – 280

## Effect of Decision Making Styles of Academic Managers on Faculty Commitment in Public Sector Universities of Punjab

### Abstract:

*The study was aimed to find out the effect of decision-making styles of academic managers on faculty commitment in public sector universities of the Punjab province of Pakistan. The sample of the present study was comprised of 186 academic managers and 940 teachers teaching at the university level. Two instruments were used for data collection named as Decision Making Styles Questionnaire (DMSQ) and Faculty Commitment Questionnaire (FCQ). The decision-making Styles Questionnaire (DMSQ) was developed by the researcher, and the Faculty Commitment Questionnaire (FCQ) was adapted for the study. The data were analyzed by applying the regression analysis technique. The results of the study showed that the decision-making styles of academic managers on the whole, and its all components significantly and positively predicted the outcome variables (faculty commitment). The major implication of the study is to develop a balanced rapport between academic managers and faculty because committed faculty has a high level of enthusiasm to lead the university towards success.*

### Key Words:

Decision-Making Styles, Academic Managers, Faculty Commitment

### Introduction

Educational institutes are working under the leadership, direction and ideas of their academic managers. The main task of academic managers is to make a decision regarding institutional planning, implementing and assessing the routine task. It is necessary for academic managers to create a committed vision, line up curriculum, teaching, and assessment to promote learning among pupils, concentrate on the needs of the workplace environment and staff ([Ahmed & Al-Dhuwaih, 2020](#)). Decision making is the most significant element and primary activity in the functioning of any organization ([Kumar & Gautam, 2018](#)). The success of any organization depends on the ability of its managers ([Bratton, Callinan, Forshaw, & Sawchuk, 2007](#)). Decision making is basically a process of pointing out and selecting the most appropriate action in order to solve a problem. Decision making is an action which shows that how a person defines, think about a problem and select an alternative solution to resolve it ([Aboudahr & Olowoselu, 2018](#)). It is a process of choosing among alternatives in an appropriate manner that fulfils the demands of the situation ([Durai, 2015](#)). In educational institutes, the academic managers continuously involve in decision making regarding how the institute will run smoothly, how departments become organized, how to assess the teachers' performance and set a job rotation schedule. Decision making is a skilful technique of management that leads institutes to success ([Hitt, Miller, & Colella, 2006](#)) and also directly affects the manager's job satisfaction, career opportunities and rewards ([Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004](#)).

Generally, decision making occurs in response to any problem. When management experiences any difference between the current situation and ideal state, then managers highly think about substitute course of action.

([Robbins & Judge, 2009](#)). The effectiveness of any institute generally depends upon the quality of decisions made by its academic managers. The difference in decision-making styles of academic managers arises in an

\* Lecturer, Department of Education, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

† Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Government Islamia College Civil Lines, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.  
Email: [saleemrose25@gmail.com](mailto:saleemrose25@gmail.com)

‡ Professor, Institute of Education and Research, University of Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

institute because of the difference in the institute's culture and personality traits of academic managers ([Jabeen& Akhtar, n.d](#)). It depends on the mentality of academic managers that how they use the information and predict the future of their university. Decision-making styles are affected by the nature of the problem, characteristics of the problem, environment and individual differences of academic managers' personality. Some experts have found that the selection of decision-making styles is exceptionally significant for predicting the quality of decisions and also to emphasize the influence of cultural values of the country on decision-making styles. Logical decisions always generate positive results rather than spontaneous decisions (Dabic, Tipuric, & Podrug, 2013; [Wood, 2012](#)). In [2015, Al-Shari'ah](#) explored that organizational learning may progress and enhance through a flexible and integrated approach to decision making.

Commitments an ongoing process through which faculty expresses their concerns for the organization and its well being ([Luthans, 2008](#)). Faculty commitment is considered as a faculty emotional attachment with the institute based on the sense of work involvement, loyalty and trust in the standards of the institute. It develops the desire in faculty to remain associated with the institute. In order to develop commitment in faculty, the organizations should involve them in decisions, facilitate them with favorable resources leading to success, giving education and offering valuable rewards ([Daft, 2008](#)). A clear perception of both personal and institutional values develops the highest degree of commitment in a faculty ([Kouzes & Posner, 2010](#)).

In [2010, Wadesango](#) investigated the participation of faculty in decision making within the schools. The study explored the importance of the involvement of faculty in decision making as it wrapped up creative ideas. The results have suggested that heads should give space to faculty to involve them in decision making beyond their classroom level and admire their contribution impartially. The success of an organization, like a school, largely depends on the quality of the decisions made by its leaders. In [2010, Rehman](#) conducted a study on the decision making styles of managers in Pakistan. He found that dependent and rational decision-making styles are the more preferred decision-making styles instead of avoidant decision making styles by managers in organizations in Pakistan. It was concluded that decision-making styles become differed in managers because of their organizational sector and status of managers.

[Kuye and Sulaimon \(2011\)](#) concluded that those employees who were deeply involved in decision making directly affected the performance of the organization. It was suggested in this study that organizations highly involved their employees in the decision-making process for the effectiveness of the organization. [Akdere \(2011\)](#) studied the decision-making process in organizations, and as a result, he found a strong link between decision making and other organizational processes such as systematic planning, quality decision making and organization learning and performance.

In Pakistan, the teaching sector suffers from excessive workload, low income, poor working environment, less appreciation, less involvement in decisions making, low-quality management and lack of financial incentives, which are the main reasons for the lack of competent and committed teachers in the teaching profession ([Ehsan & Naeem, 2011](#)). To deal with these issues, it is of great significance to improve the work settings and encourage the young generation to join this profession with full commitment for the fact that teachers are one of the essential components who can play an important role in the success of institutes in a competitive environment. In this perspective, this research study provides evidence to the university management to understand how better decision-making styles may increase the level of faculty commitment so that the university management can introduce various strategies to generate such an environment that may enhance faculty commitment and competency.

## **Research Objectives**

The objective of the study was to

- investigate the effect of decision-making styles of academic managers on faculty commitment at the university level

## Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested in the study

- H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant effect of overall decision-making styles of academic managers on faculty Commitment.
- H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant effect of autocratic I style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.
- H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant effect of autocratic II style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.
- H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant effect of consultative I style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.
- H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant effect of consultative II style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.
- H<sub>06</sub>:** There is no significant effect of consensus style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

## Research Methodology

This study was quantitative in nature, and a causal-comparative research design was used to conduct this research.

## Participant of the Study

For a present study, the universities of Central Punjab were randomly selected for data collection. All heads and teachers of public sector universities of Punjab constituted the population of the study. A multi-stage random sampling technique was used to select the sample. Overall, 186 heads and 940 teachers (lecturers and assistant professors) from 10 public sector universities were selected as a sample of the study.

## Research Instrumentations

Two Likert type instruments were used for data collection based on self-report questions. One questionnaire was developed for the independent variable (decision-making styles); the other was on faculty commitment was customized with the author's formal approval to measure the faculty committee. A pilot study was conducted to check the reliability of the instruments. Twenty heads and fifty teachers were taken as a sample of the pilot study that was exempted later on in the final research study. The .89 reliability was found for the questionnaire of decision-making styles, and .79 reliability was found for the faculty commitment questionnaire. The instrument validation was done under the guidance of a panel of experts who are having a specialization in educational administration and educational research.

## Data Analysis

Data analysis was done by using inferential statistics, and regression analysis was used to see the effect of independent variable (decision-making styles) on dependent variables (faculty commitment).

## Results

In order to study the effect of the overall decision making styles of academic managers on faculty commitment, null hypotheses were formulated as under (at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

- H<sub>0</sub> 1:** There is no significant effect of overall decision-making styles of academic managers on faculty

## Commitment

### Step 1: Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 1 below) was explained in the model. The value .124 pointed out that the model illustrated .124% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a minor difference that was the adjusted value .119 (by comparing to R Square = .0124). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that overall decision making styles significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment) i.e. Adjusted R Square = .119,  $F = 26.024$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .000).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by overall decision-making styles. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that ‘*There is no significant effect of overall decision making styles on faculty Commitment*’ was rejected.

**Table 1.** *Model Summary* ( $n = 186$ )

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.352 <sup>a</sup>	.124	.119	7.01769	26.024	.000

Predictors: (Constant), Decision Making Styles\_Total  
Dependent Variable: FC\_Total

### Step 2: Constructing the Regression Equation

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 2

**Table 2.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup> ( $n = 186$ )

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	66.423	5.653		11.750	.000
DMS_Total	.207	.041	.352	5.101	.000

Dependent Variable: FCS\_Total

Table 2 presents the data from decision-making styles necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that decision-making styles contribute significantly and positively to the model (Sig .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is  
Faculty Commitment =  $66.423 + (.207)$  (Decision Making Styles)

**H<sub>0</sub> 2:** There is no significant effect of autocratic I style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

### Step 1: Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 3 below) was explained in the model. The value 0.139 pointed out that the model illustrated 0.139% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a difference that was the adjusted value of 0.135 (by comparing to R Square = 0.139). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that autocratic I style of decision making significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment) i.e. Adjusted R Square = .135,  $F = 29.763$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .002).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by the autocratic I style of decision making. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that ‘*There is no significant effect of autocratic I style of decision making on faculty commitment*’ was rejected.

**Table 3.** Model Summary (n = 186)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.373 <sup>a</sup>	.139	.135	6.95605	29.763	.002 <sup>a</sup>

Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic I\_Total Dependent Variable: FC

**Step 2:** Constructing the Regression Equation

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 4

**Table 4.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(n = 186)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	74.413	3.834		19.411	.000
AI_Total	.598	.110	.373	5.456	.000

Dependent Variable: FC

Table 4 presents the data from the autocratic I style of decision making necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that the autocratic I style of decision making contributes significantly and positively to the model (Sig. .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is Faculty Commitment = 74.413+ (.598) (Autocratic I)

**H<sub>0</sub> 3:** There is no significant effect of autocratic II style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

**Step 1:** Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 5 below) was explained in the model. The value 0.060 pointed out that the model illustrated 0.060% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a minor difference that was the adjusted value of 0.055 (by comparing to R Square = 0.060). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that the autocratic II style of decision making significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment), i.e. Adjusted R Square = 0.055,  $F = 11.787$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .000).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by the autocratic II style of decision making. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that ‘There is no significant effect of autocratic II style of decision making on faculty commitment’ was rejected.

**Table 5.** Model Summary (n = 186)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.245 <sup>a</sup>	.060	.055	7.26836	11.787	.001 <sup>a</sup>

Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic II\_Total Dependent Variable: FC\_Total

**Step 2:** Constructing the Regression Equation

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 6

**Table 6.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(n = 186)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	80.724	4.233		19.071	.000
AI	.639	.186	.245	3.433	.001

Dependent Variable: FC\_Total

The Table 6 presents the data from autocratic II style of decision making necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that autocratic II style of decision making contribute significantly and positively to the model (Sig .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is Faculty Commitment = 80.724+ (.639) (Autocratic II)

**H<sub>0</sub> 4:** There is no significant effect of consultative I style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

#### Step 1: Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 7 below) was explained in the model. The value 0.046 pointed out that the model illustrated 0.046% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a minor difference that was the adjusted value of 0.041 (by comparing to R Square = 0.046). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that the consultative I style of decision making significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment), i.e. Adjusted R Square = .0041,  $F = 8.887$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .003).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by consultative I style of decision making. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that 'There is no significant effect of consultative I style of decision making on faculty commitment' was rejected.

**Table 7.** Model Summary (n = 186)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.215 <sup>a</sup>	.046	.041	7.32280	8.887	.003 <sup>a</sup>

Predictors: (Constant), Consultative I\_ Total Dependent Variable: FC\_ Total

#### Step 2: Constructing the Regression Equation.

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 8

**Table 8.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup> (n = 186)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	84.793	3.513		24.140	.000
CI_ Total	.645	.217	.215	2.981	.003

Table 8 presents the data from the consultative I style of decision making necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that the consultative I style of decision making contributes significantly and positively to the model (Sig .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is Faculty Commitment = 84.793 + (.645) (Consultative I)

**H<sub>0</sub> 5:** There is no significant effect of consultative II style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

#### Step 1: Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 9 below) was explained in the model. The value .064 pointed out that the model illustrated 0.064% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a minor difference that was the adjusted value of 0.059 (by comparing to R Square = 0.064). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that the consultative II style of decision

making significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment), i.e. Adjusted R Square = 0.059,  $F = 12.617$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .000).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by consultative II style of decision making. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that ‘*There is no significant effect of consultative II style of decision making on faculty commitment*’ was rejected.

**Table 9.** Model Summary (n = 186)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.253 <sup>a</sup>	.064	.059	7.25300	12.617	.000 <sup>a</sup>

Predictors: (Constant), Consultative II\_ Total Dependent Variable: FC\_ Total

### Step 2: Constructing the Regression Equation

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 10

**Table 10.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(n = 186)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	77.169	5.087		15.169	.000
CII	.548	.154	.253	3.552	.000

Dependent Variable: FC\_ Total

Table 10 presents the data from the consultative II style of decision making necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that the consultative II style of decision making contributes significantly and positively to the model (Sig .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is

Faculty Commitment = 77.169 + (.548) (Consultative II)

**H<sub>0</sub> 6:** There is no significant effect of consensus style of decision making of academic managers on faculty commitment.

### Step 1: Evaluating the model

The variance in the dependent variable (faculty commitment) showed in the *Model Summary* (see Table 11 below) was explained in the model. The value 0.026 pointed out that the model illustrated 0.026% of the variance in the faculty committee. This showed a minor difference that was the adjusted value of 0.021 (by comparing to R Square = 0.026). So, it was revealed by the linear regression analysis that consensus style of decision making significantly predicted the outcome variable (faculty commitment) i.e. Adjusted R Square = .021,  $F = 4.891$ ,  $p < .0005$  (Sig. = .028).

It is concluded with strong evidence that higher predictions of faculty commitment are lead by a consensus style of decision making. The statistical significance is  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so the null hypothesis that ‘*There is no significant effect of consensus style of decision making on faculty commitment*’ was rejected.

**Table 11.** Model Summary (n = 186)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error	F	Sig
1	.161 <sup>a</sup>	.026	.021	7.39985	4.891	.028 <sup>a</sup>

Predictors: (Constant), Consensus\_ Total Dependent Variable: FC\_ Total

### Step 2: Constructing the Regression Equation

The regression equation used to predict the faculty commitment, shown in Table 12



**Table 12.** Regression Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(n = 186)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	84.885	4.669		18.180	.000
G_Total	.317	.143	.161	2.212	.028

Dependent Variable: FC\_Total

Table 12 presents the data from the consensus style of decision making necessary to predict faculty commitment. It shows that the consensus style of decision making contributes significantly and positively to the model (Sig .000). The regression equation by applying the Unstandardized Coefficients is  
 Faculty Commitment = 84.885 + (.317) (Consensus)

## Discussion

The results of the present study support the proposition that decision-making styles have a positive relationship with faculty commitment. Teachers' commitment is affected by the decision making styles being practised by academic managers. Results of the present study have highlighted the significance of the decision-making behavior of academic managers holding a mediator position between the faculty and upper management in any institute. The success of an institute highly depends on its management, so it is important for academic managers to understand their decision-making styles and choose them properly.

The findings of the previous studies have supported to present study that decision-making styles with all their dimensions (AI, AII, CI, CII, G) have a significant positive contribution in predicting the faculty commitment (dependent variables). The data have revealed with reference to the first dependent variable that all components of decision-making styles significantly and positively predict the outcome variables (faculty commitment). This showed that decision making styles with their entire dimensions lead towards faculty commitment. This study was also supported by ([Appelbaum et al., 2013](#)), who's confirmed that the participation of faculty in the decision-making process developed their trust in the organization. Furthermore, the findings of the study are in line with the study of ([Johnson 1978](#)); ([Coscarelli, 1983](#); Drucker, 2003), who emphasized that manager should choose a systematic approach to arrive at one logical solution of selecting a combination of decision-making styles. [Vroom \(2003\)](#) asserted that when managers took important decisions, they should have discussed these decisions with others in the organization being taken as a good sign by the workforce as it was recommended by [Amazt and Idris \(2011\)](#) that academic managers who adopted the autocratic style in order to put things in order and became behavioral decision-makers at the same time when things got aligned. Academic managers may not be too strict and not be too lenient. They should adopt a mixed approach and should be balanced. [Rehman \(2010\)](#) stated that managers changed their decision making styles according to the status and type of organization.

Results of different studies indicate that principals involve teachers regarding curricular decisions and pedagogical practices and such kind of involvement makes teachers more committed that is ultimately in the benefits of students' academic achievement ([Brezicha, Ikoma, Park & LeTendre, 2020](#)) and decision-making styles, as well as work environment, jointly contribute or related to employee functioning ([Ngussa & Gabriel, 2017](#)).

The academic manager is the main contributors to influence faculty commitment in the universities. It is important for academic managers to understand that faculty perception about their work environment has a considerable impact on their performance, commitment and productivity. The negative perception of their workplace environment makes them ineffective in achieving organizational goals and objectives. It was portrayed in literature such as ([Loveren, 2007](#); [Rana & Reid, 2008](#)) stated that a positive perception of employee about the environment was helping them to achieve organizational goals rather than an ineffective



environment. A positive organizational environment enhances faculty commitment which is essential to do quality work in an institute. It is the responsibility of academic managers to create such an environment that is reciprocal, fair sharing of ideas and fulfils the expectations of faculty. The academic managers could change their decision-making styles and become more participative so that the faculty feels that they have a voice at top management, and their opinions do matter for their academic managers. A balanced rapport between academic managers and faculty is essential because enhancing the fair exchange of ideas for decision making may positively strengthen their level of trust in the institute, and teachers become more committed to the long-term growth and success of the institute.

### **Recommendations**

On the basis of research findings and literature, some recommendations were made by the researcher.

- The findings of the present study showed a significant effect of decision making styles on generating faculty commitment. Therefore, academic managers may change their decision-making styles, focusing on a more collaborative approach and in return, faculty should cooperate with management in obeying and implementing all rules and regulation of the university to lead it towards the quality oriented institute.

## References

- Aboudahr, S. M. F. M., & Olowoselu, A. (2018). Analysis of principals' decision making styles on teachers' performance in selected secondary schools of Gharbia Governorate, Egypt. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4(4), 91-95.
- Ahmed, E. I., & Al-Dhuwaili, A. (2020). Early experience of first-time principals in Saudi Arabia. *School Leadership & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2020.1806812
- Akdere, M. (2011). An analysis of decision-making process in organizations: Implications for quality management and systematic practice. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 22(12), 1317-1330.
- Al-Shra'ah, A. E. (2015). The impact of decision making styles on organizational learning: An empirical study on the public manufacturing companies in Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(4), 55-62.
- Amazt, I. H., & Idris, A. R. (2011). Lecturers' satisfaction towards university management & decision-making styles in some Malaysian public universities. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 3957-3970. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.400
- Appelbaum, S. H., Louis, D., Makarenko, D., Saluja, J., Meleshko, O., & Kulbashian, S. (2013). Participation in decision making: A case study of job satisfaction and commitment. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 45(7), 412 - 419.
- Bratton, J., Callinan, M., Forshaw, C., & Sawchuk, P. (2007). *Work and organizational behavior: Understanding the workplace*. Unite States, NY: *Palgrave Macmillan*.
- Brezicha, K. F., Ikoma, S., Park, H., & LeTendre, G. K. (2020). The ownership perception gap: Exploring teacher job satisfaction and its relationship to teachers' and principals' perception of decision-making opportunities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(4), 428-456.
- Coscarella, W. C. (1983). Decision making styles and the group process. *Performance Improvement*, 22(7), 22-25. doi:10.1002/pfi.415022070
- Dabić, M., Tipurić, D., & Podrug, N. (2015). Cultural differences affecting decision-making style: A comparative study between four countries. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*. 16(2), 275-289.
- Daft, R. L. (2008). *New era of management*. China: *Thomson South-Western*.
- Drucker, P. F. (2003). *Peter Drucker on the profession of management*. United State, NY: *Harvard Business School Press*.
- Durai, P. (2015). *Principles of management*. India: *Pearson India Education Services Ltd*.
- Ehsan, M., & Naeem, B. (2011). Impact of perceived organizational justice on organizational commitment of faculty: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1, 92 - 98.
- Hitt, M. A., Miller, C. C., & Colella, A. (2006). *Organizational behavior: A strategic approach*. America, NJ: *John Wiley & Sons, Inc*.
- Jabeen, S., & Akhtar, M. M. S. (n.d). Decision making styles of university leadership. *The Diaigue*, 8(3), 273-284.
- Johnson, R. H. (1978). Individual styles of decision making: A theoretical model for counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 56(9), 530-536.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). *The Leadership Challenge*. United States, NY: *Wiley & Sons*.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2004). *Organizational behavior*. United States, NY: *McGraw-Hill*.
- Kumar, S., & Gautam, N. (2018). Decision making styles among professor in central university of Bihar - An empirical study of predictors. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 1(2), 84-91.
- Kuye, O. L., & Sulaimon, A. H. A. (2011). Employee involvement in decision making and firms performance in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 6(1), 1-15.

- Loveren, V. R. K. (2007). *The effects of decision making and leadership styles on relationships and perceived effectiveness in the university development context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). *University of South Florida, USA*.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. United States, NJ: *McGraw Hill*.
- Ngussa, B. M., & Gabriel, L. (2017). Participation in decision making and teachers' commitment: a comparative study between public and private secondary schools in Arusha Municipality, Tanzania. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5( 7), 801-807.
- Rana, R. A, & Reid, N. (2008). *Dimensions of quality assurance in higher education: Challenges for future*. Lahore: *University of the Punjab*.
- Rehman, R. R. (2010). Decision making styles of managers in Pakistan: Role of management status and organization sector. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(7), 182-192.
- Robbins, S, P., & Judge, T. A. (2009). *Organizational behavior*. United States, NJ: *Prentice-Hall, Inc*.
- Rowe, A. J., &Boulgarides, J. D. (1992). *Managerial decision making*. United States, NY: *Macmillan Publishing Company*.
- Vroom, V. H. &Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh: *University of Pittsburgh Press*.
- Vroom, V. H. (2003).Educating managers for decision making and leadership. *Management Decision*, 41(10), 968-978. doi:10.1108/00251740310509490
- Wadesango, N. (2010). The extent of teacher participation in decision-making in secondary schools in Zimbabwe. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(3), 265-284.
- Wood, N. L. (2012). *Individual differences in decision-making styles as predictors of good decision making* (Unpublished master's thesis). *Bowling Green State University, Ohio*.