

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY ACADEMICIANS' JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Türker BAŞ^(*)

Özet: Bu makalede 56 maddelik Öğretim Üyelerinin İş Tatmini Anketinin (ÖÜİTA) geliştirilmesi ve test edilmesi aşama aşama tartışılmıştır. ÖÜİTA; yönetsel ortam, amirlerin tutum ve davranışları, çalışma arkadaşları ile ilişkiler, işin kendisi, ücret, öğretim ve araştırma, ek görevler, takdir (tanınma), serbestlik, iş güvencesi, üniversitenin prestiji ve fiziksel çalışma şartları olmak üzere toplam on iki iş tatmin boyutunu ölçmektedir. ÖÜİTA'nın uygun bir şekilde geliştirilmesini sağlamak için ayrıntılı bir metodoloji uygulanmıştır. Bu kapsamda, iş tatmini ile ilgili konular geniş bir tarama araştırması ile belirlenmiş, öğretim üyelerinin iş tatminini etkileyen önemli hususlar farklı üniversitelerden çok sayıda öğretim üyesi ile yapılan mülakatlarla tespit edilmiştir. Soru formu bu iki kaynaktan elde edilen maddelerden oluşturularak, cevap seçeneği olarak Likert tipi ölçekten yararlanılmıştır. Taslak anket 26 üniversiteden toplam 841 öğretim üyesine uygulanmış, %41.6 cevaplanma oranı ile 346 geçerli soru formu elde edilmiştir. Bu veriler kullanılarak yapılan güvenilirlik, geçerlilik testleri ve faktör analizi sonucunda 56 soruluk iş tatmin anketi oluşturulmuştur. Sonuçlar ÖÜİTA'nın yüksek öğretimde iş tatminini ölçmek için kullanılabilen geçerli ve güvenilir bir araç olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu çalışmada kullanılan yöntem ve prosedürlerin, kendi anketlerini hazırlamak isteyen araştırmacılar için iyi bir örnek oluşturacağı değerlendirilmektedir.

Abstract: This article discusses the development and testing of the 56-item University Academicians' Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (UAJSQ). The UAJSQ measures twelve facets of job satisfaction in higher education, including satisfaction with managerial environment, supervision/supervisor behavior, co-workers' behavior, job itself, present pay, teaching and research, additional duties, appraisal, freedom, job security, university's prestige and physical conditions/working facilities. Strict methodology was employed to ensure thorough and appropriate development of UAJSQ. An extensive literature review was performed to identify job satisfaction related issues. Semi-structured interviews were then carried out in several universities with academicians to identify the issues, which were most important to them. A questionnaire was devised from the list of issues and Likert type scale was used as response categories. The provisional questionnaire was administered to 841 academics from 26 different universities. With 41.6 % return rate, 346 academicians responded. A review of results obtained in each stage of development resulted in a 56-item satisfaction-specific questionnaire, the UAJSQ, which measures job satisfaction of Turkish academicians. The results show the UAJSQ to be a valid and reliable instrument for measuring job satisfaction in the higher education. The procedures and process used in this study may provide a useful example for researchers seeking to validate measurement scales or questionnaires.

^(*) Dr. Mu. Yzb. Genel Kurmay Personel Daire Başkanlığı, Ankara

I. Introduction

In higher education academics are the key resource. They account for significant component of the budget and have major role to play in achieving the objectives of the institution. Their performance determines, to a large extent, the quality of the student experience of higher education and has a significant impact on student learning and thereby on the contribution that such institutions can make to society. Given the importance of offering a high quality learning experience in the higher education, factors that affect job satisfaction of academicians' need to be identified and empirically measured. It's also accepted that the more accurately managers can answer the question of which factors are important for satisfaction of their employees, the more effective they will be at maximizing productivity, enhancing performance, and advancing notion of organizational accountability (Wright&Crapanzano, 1997: 370; Cheriss& Kane, 1987: 135-136; Wagner&Gooding, 1987: 540-541; Griffin,1981: 191-194; Bridges, 1980: 39-42; Ruch&Heshauer, 1975: 110-112).

The topic of job satisfaction is also important because of its relevance to the physical and mental well-being of academicians, i.e. job satisfaction has relevance for human health (Dua, 1994: 76). Work is an important aspect of people's lives and most people spend a large part of their working lives at work. An understanding of the factors involved in job satisfaction is relevant to improving the well being of a significant number of people.

Measuring the level of job satisfaction is therefore an important task for managers and it is paramount importance to choose appropriate and well-developed tools to assess the important job satisfaction dimensions. The development of UAJSQ is based on principles of test construction and evaluation (Walsh&Betz, 1995). A common test construction strategy is to generate a large pool of issues from which to drive the most appropriate and sensitive set. The construction and selection of items based on focus group consist of academicians. The aim of this through approach is to ensure that the content and breadth of coverage of questionnaire under development is appropriate for the population under study that it asks relevant questions and does not miss out important issues. This task can be achieved only by careful initial construction of questionnaire, and omissions at this stage cannot be compensated for by statistical analysis at a later stage. In the next stage of development, the questionnaire is administered to a larger group of academicians to collect data to test its psychometric properties. The instrument must demonstrate adequate reliability and validity. In addition questionnaires should be acceptable to academicians and easy to understand and complete.

This paper describes the initial steps of development of an UAJSQ, including the development of items, construction of provisional questionnaire, and initial and field-testing in representative academician groups.

II. Rationale For The Development Of Uajsq

Although some measures of job satisfaction have been developed and appropriate validity and reliability has been demonstrated, no reliable and valid measure of job satisfaction of Turkish academics was found in a review of the literature. In an attempt to conduct a study investigating the factors affecting academics' performance, the researchers needed a valid and reliable measure of job satisfaction appropriate for use in higher education. Current job satisfaction measures (e.g., Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Job Description Index) may lack sensitivity to the unique aspects of a Turkish academic environment, such as; centralized management structure, low and insufficient wages, promotion policies, legal arrangements etc. The combination of these factors forms a very unique work environment that cannot be evaluated adequately without a measure that accounts for the factors. The lack of an appropriate instrument led the develop a measure of job satisfaction for Turkish academics, the University Academics' Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (UAJSQ), and we believe that more studies on job satisfaction of academicians are not only justified, but long overdue. Academicians are worthy of other studies, not only area of job satisfaction, but in other areas as well.

III. Development Of Job Satisfaction Items

The purpose of the first step was to create the initial item pool for the questionnaire and to determine if the items were clear and if they demonstrated content validity as judged by the intended respondents.

For this, related job satisfaction issues relevant to academicians were identified, by conducting literature search on the Ebsco and Emerald databases up to the year 1992. The search headings "university", "academicians", "academics", "education", "teacher" were combined with "job satisfaction" to identify any major studies carried out in the last 5 years.

Interviews with focus groups consist of academicians were also carried out. Seven separate focus groups of 3 to 10 academicians from twelve different universities were asked to describe 10 positive and 10 negative instances, which he experienced during his career. These positive and negative instances used to define good and poor aspects of academic environment. After interviewing 40 people, we obtained approximately 800 statements. But since this list contained instances very similar to each other, they should be grouped together. After forming clusters, we wrote a phrase for each cluster, which reflects the content of its instances. This phrase was called as satisfaction item. Once all instances are categorized into their respective satisfaction items, we repeated this categorization process using the satisfaction items. And we labeled these groups with phrases or world such as job security, pay, co-worker relationship describing the content of satisfaction items.

A list of items, which was compiled by literature review and focus group interviews then presented to several academicians. These academicians

were asked to answer the questions and then discuss any issues of confusion or ambiguity. Each individual evaluated the items and made recommendations for improvement.

The resulting questionnaire consists of 80 items with adequate content validity. Furthermore, this process provides reasonable assurance that the items were clearly understood by the intended participants.

These items incorporate ten different constructs of job satisfaction: satisfaction with academic environment, supervision/supervisor behavior (leadership), co-workers' behavior, job itself, physical conditions/working facilities, present pay, job security, managerial environment, internal communication and prestige of his/her university. In addition to the items regarding job satisfaction, several demographic and work-related items were added. Respondents were asked to report their age, number of years with the company, marital status, gender, position and university.

IV. Pre-Testing

The aim of this phase is to identify problems relating to the wording and clarity of specific items in the provisional questionnaire and to determine the need for adding or deleting questions. The provisional questionnaire was tested in additional academicians from eight different universities. A total of 41 academicians were interviewed. The interviews consisted of three parts. First academicians were asked to complete UAJSQ. Second, questions were directed to the whole questionnaire and specific items. Academicians were asked if they found any questions annoying, confusing, upsetting or intrusive, and, if so, they were asked to rephrase the question. Finally academicians were asked whether they found any questions, which they found irrelevant or whether there were any additional issues that were relevant to job satisfaction of academicians but not included in the questionnaire.

Table 1: *Background of Respondents*

Characteristics at the time of acedemicians interviewed	No. of academicians		
	Phase I: Generation of issues	Phase II: Pre-testing	Phase V: Field testing
<u>Age</u>			
30-39	31	38	170
40-49	6	2	91
50-59	3	1	62
60-69	-	-	23
<u>Rank</u>			
Assistant Professor	32	37	193
Associate Professor	3	2	79
Professor	5	2	74
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	30	23	269
Female	10	18	77
<u>Length of service in the present university</u>			
Less than 5 years	28	20	132
5-10	6	14	85
11-15	5	7	68
15+	1	-	61
<u>Leadership or management responsibility</u>			
Head, Director, Dean etc.	1	-	53
Holding other managerial	7	4	46
Not currently in charge of any academic unit or group	32	37	247

The results obtained were summarized according to prevalence of item (percentage of academicians experiencing to item to some extent), the severity of each item (mean score, where 'absolutely wrong' is scored as '1' ranging to 'absolutely right' scored as '5'). Items with a low severity (mean score < 1.5), a high severity (mean score > 4.5), a low variability (range < 2 response categories) and a low prevalence (< 15 % of academicians experiencing the issue) were considered for exclusion. The qualitative results extracted from the academicians interviews were used to provide additional information about these items.

Following the interviews with academicians and review of results by panel developers 20 of 80 items was deleted. Seven items were deleted because they were objective in nature (number of published books, articles etc.). It was

felt that if such issues were considered to be important for job satisfaction, they would be better incorporated into the data collection forms.

Three items were deleted because they each had a low severity scores, low variability and low prevalence, and were not rated as a high priority items by the academicians. These items were about “appreciation certificates”, “enhanced promotion” and “substantial rewards”.

The two items, which are about “life pleasure”, were deleted because they were not regarded as satisfaction-specific issues by the panel of questionnaire developers and they did not appear to provide any additional information.

Two items were deleted on the basis that academicians had difficulty answering the questions. The first was about “international conferences” which aimed to determine whether the academicians could attend these activities. Several academicians hadn’t known any foreign language, and so they did not feel in a position to answer the question. It was therefore deleted from the questionnaire. The second item was about “regular meetings”. The pre-testing showed that many academicians who responded incorrectly to the question misunderstood this item. In the view of this, the item was deleted from UAJSQ.

Three items were deleted since they did not yield conclusive data about job satisfaction of academicians. The final three items, which were deleted, were the ones relating to favoritism. Since the academicians’ evaluations about these items contradictory and dispersed, the development group did not feel that these questions adequately covered to important issues regarding to job satisfaction of academicians. So this area is left for future research, and it was decided that the favoritism items would not be included in the questionnaire.

The resulting questionnaire, the UAJSQ, consist of 60 items addressing same ten dimensions of job satisfaction. It’s hypnotized that the field-testing of this provisional questionnaire will demonstrate that these dimensions form ten multi-item scales in the final questionnaire. However if any item does not fit into a multi-item scale it will be treated as single item.

V. Test-Retest Reliability Assessment

In this phase we tested the stability of item responses over a 7-day period by correlating results of two test administrations. For this, the UAJSQ was administered to a group of academics in Turkish Military Academy and Sakarya University (n = 50) after a 7-day period. This is a separate group from those in Step 1. The sample consisted of 70% men and 30% women; the mean age was 32. Respondents’ average tenure with higher education was 6.2 years.

The test-retest reliability for the instrument overall was .82 ($p < .001$). Individual dimension correlations of .80 (academic environment), .82 (supervision/supervisor behavior), .75 (co-workers’ behavior), .83 (job itself), .86 (physical conditions/working facilities), .92 (present pay), .88 (job security), .76 (managerial environment), .80 (internal communication) and .80 (prestige of

his/her university) were all well below the .001 confidence level and showed adequate instrument stability (Anastasi 1988). Because of the small sample size, the internal consistency of the instrument and scales was not calculated at this point.

VI. Expert Validity

The results of test-retest reliability assessment indicated that further investigation of the UAJSQ should take place. Since the item pool was found to be reliable, the next step was to determine expert validity. Expert validity can be established by asking about the content of questionnaire to the veterans of the intended subject. For this the name and addresses of 42 Professors of managerial sciences was selected form YOK database.

The provisional UAJSQ was sent by post, with a covering letter and reply paid return envelope to these Professors and they asked to evaluate its content. Twenty-three Professors responded our request. Their comments strongly support the validity of UAJSQ. Only 12 items modified and 1 item added through their recommendations.

VII. Field-Testing

In field testing the provisional questionnaire is administered to 841 academicians from 26 different universities in order to determine UAJSQ's psychometric properties in terms of validity, reliability and sensitivity to differences in academicians' job satisfaction levels. With 41.6 % return rate, 346 academicians responded our questionnaire (Table 4).

The final version of the UAJSQ was used to test the convergent validity and internal consistency. The convergent validity was assessed by correlations between validation item and 10 satisfaction dimensions. The internal consistency of the instrument was calculated using Cronbach's alpha, which is the procedure of choice for investigating the internal consistency of items using a Likert-type scale (Reckase, 1990).

Table 2. *Convergent Validity*

Scale	Correlation coefficient	Significance level (2 tailed)
Job itself	0.574	0.01
University prestige	0.640	0.01
Job security	0.232	0.01
Academic environment	0.561	0.01
Supervision/supervisor behaviour	0.632	0.01
Managerial environment	0.614	0.01
Internal communication	0.578	0.01
Co-workers behavior	0.413	0.01
Current pay	0.349	0.01
Physical working conditions	0.308	0.01

The results of convergent validity are presented in Table 2. The correlation between validation item scores and average job satisfaction scores for each dimension changes between .47 ($p < 0.001$), and .56 ($p < 0.001$). The overall pattern of results seems to support the convergent validity of UAJSQ (Campbell & Fiske, 1959: 86).

Cronbach's alpha for each scale is given in Table 3. The values all reach acceptable levels indicating that the scales can be interpreted as reliable (Cronbach, 1984). These results also indicate that the instrument overall and each of its scales were very homogeneous. This provides evidence that a unitary construct underlies each scale and the instrument overall (Zeithaml *ve diğ.* 1988: 38-39).

The 53 items from the UAJSQ were submitted to a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation to examine the instrument's underlying factor structure. Eight items related with physical conditions/working facilities excluded because of their distinct configuration. The first eleven unrotated factors accounted for the %67.9 of total variance explained. So the varimax procedure was constrained to eleven factors to investigate whether the items would load significantly on the appropriate scale and on no other scale. Significant loadings are generally considered to be .45 or higher (Brown, 1983). The items with poor factor loadings, n_2 , i_2 , v_2 , a_3 , a_8 deleted.

Table 3: Reliability

Scale	Coranbach alpha
Job itself	0.816
University prestige	0.845
Job security	0.677
Academic environment	0.790
Supervision/supervisor behaviour	0.947
Managerial environment	0.935
Internal communication	0.868
Co-workers behavior	0.903
Cuurent pay	0.895
Physical working conditions	0.792

After deleting five items, factor analysis repeated for remaining 48 items and the results this analysis given in Table 4. As the table illustrates, except the items for academic environment, internal communication and university's prestige all items loaded significantly on the intended scale. Items related with academic environment scattered to 5 different dimensions. So, four new dimensions; "teaching and research" (a_1, a_2, a_4), "additional duties" (a_5, a_6, a_7, a_9), "appraisal" (a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}), and "freedom" (a_{13}, a_{14}) formed. Items a_{15}, a_{16} and internal communication dimension combined with managerial environment. Finally since the items about university prestige and job security does not fit multi item scale and loaded more than one factor; they are treated as single item.

The resulting questionnaire consists of 56 items incorporating twelve different construct of job satisfaction; satisfaction with managerial environment, supervision/supervisor behavior, co-workers' behavior, job itself, present pay, teaching and research, additional duties, appraisal, freedom, job security, university's prestige and physical conditions/ working facilities.

VIII. Conclusion

The content of UAJSQ has been determined by an extensive literature research and by interviews in several universities with academicians, which will aid the content validity of the questionnaire. The detailed interviews with academicians provided an in-dept systematic description of the problems experienced by academicians effecting their job satisfaction.

The intensive procedure identified several dimensions of academicians' job satisfaction. The process of selecting items for inclusion in the questionnaire was guided by an aim to include issues likely to effect job satisfaction of academicians and which cannot be measured by managerial interviews. This resulted in a questionnaire, UJSQA, which includes items about the most

frequent issues experienced by academicians.

For researchers desiring to empirically investigate the higher education, the UAJSQ seems like a valuable tool. It is a self-report measure requiring 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Perhaps the existence of such a tool will encourage further studies on job satisfaction of academics. Certainly, the higher education is in need of such investigation, given its unique and complex nature and the dearth of empirical literature.

Although it recognized that the academicians from different universities could have specific problems affecting their job satisfaction, it was felt that the inclusion of those items might more adversely affect the validity of questionnaire. This is why the questionnaire focused on common factors experienced by most academicians. Studies with specific questions not covered by UAJSQ have the option to add relevant questions. This ensures that important university-specific issues are addressed, whilst enabling cross-study comparisons of job satisfaction through the use of standardized instrument. So the UAJSQ can be used as a tool for benchmarking with other universities and tracking academics satisfaction with various dimensions. The UAJSQ can also be used as a measure of the effectiveness of university policies.

Kaynaklar

- Anastasi, A. (1988), *Psychological Testing*, Macmillan, New York.
- Bridges, E. M. and Hallinan, M. T. (1978) "Subunit size, work system interdependence, and employee absenteeism", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14(2), 24-42.
- Brown, F.G. (1983), *Principles of Educational and Psychological Testing*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Campbell, D.T and Fiske, D.W. (1959) "Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix", *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
- Cherniss, C. and Kane, J. (1987) "Public sector professionals: Job characteristics, satisfaction, end aspiration for intrinsic fulfillment through work", *Human Relations*, 40(3), 125-136.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1984), *Essentials of Psychological Testing*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Dua, J. K. (1994) "Job stressors and their effects on physical health, emotional health, and job satisfaction in a university" *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1), 59-78.
- Griffin, R. W. (1981) "Task attributes and long-term employee productivity", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 176-194.
- Hayes, Bob, H. (1996), *Measuring Customer Satisfaction*, ASQC, Wisconsin.
- Reckase, M.D. (1990) "Scaling techniques", in Goldstein, G. and Herson M. (eds.) *Handbook of Psychological Assessment*. Pergamon Press, New York.

- Ruch, W. A. and Heshhauer, J. C. (1975) "Operative worker productivity: demographic and attitudinal correlates", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 98-112.
- Wagner, J. A. and Gooding, R. Z. (1987) "Shared influence and organizational behavior: a meta-analysis of situational variables expected to moderate participation-outcome relationships", *Academy of Management Journal*, 30 (3), 524-541.
- Walsh, W. B. and Betz N. E. (1995) *Tests and Assessments*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Wright, T. A. and Cropanzano, R. (1997) "Well-being, satisfaction and job performance: another look at the happy/productive worker thesis", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 364-371.
- Zeithamal, V. A., Parasuraman A. L. and Bery L. (1988) "SERVQUAL: A Multiple - Item Score for Measuring Customer Perceptions of Quality", *Journal of Retailing*, Spring, 12-40.

	Component									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
N1	,431	,262	,154	,432	,139	,114	,119	-,246	-,123	-8,08E-02
N3	9,092E-02	,201	,146	,731	7,926E-03	-9,54E-02	,104	,170	8,501E-03	-2,87E-02
N4	,136	6,494E-02	9,432E-02	,736	-2,93E-02	-6,48E-03	-5,22E-03	8,351E-02	,168	9,079E-02
N5	5,592E-02	3,300E-02	-6,28E-02	,526	,202	,122	,220	-5,37E-02	,192	,202
N6	3,839E-02	,102	,166	,740	9,089E-04	-2,80E-02	,164	,216	,124	5,114E-03
N7	,403	,120	6,586E-02	,607	,250	,241	2,040E-02	-4,69E-02	-7,42E-03	-3,51E-02
N8	,371	9,578E-02	,137	,651	8,527E-02	,167	-2,20E-02	-9,52E-02	-2,42E-02	-,102
N9	,401	,234	9,889E-02	,517	,201	6,363E-02	-7,11E-02	5,563E-02	-,130	-,124
V1	-,340	-,259	-,127	-3,25E-02	-3,64E-02	7,708E-02	,141	-,124	-7,94E-02	,462
A1	7,938E-02	8,418E-02	-2,46E-02	,236	,188	6,034E-02	,549	,212	-2,35E-02	,282
A2	,273	,312	4,563E-02	,180	,213	4,028E-02	,533	,116	,131	-,211
A4	-4,71E-02	6,274E-02	,179	4,252E-02	-7,93E-03	,185	,710	6,866E-02	-4,45E-02	-2,88E-02
A5	-3,66E-02	5,419E-02	,143	5,959E-02	8,882E-02	,555	9,544E-02	,249	,170	-,371
A6	7,268E-03	,227	9,840E-02	5,570E-02	,134	,716	-4,29E-02	4,815E-02	-4,27E-03	,185
A7	,306	2,585E-02	,140	6,053E-02	-1,54E-02	,701	,175	3,330E-02	7,979E-03	-,145
A9	,138	8,252E-02	2,071E-02	2,882E-02	,197	,624	,188	,155	8,900E-02	,390
A10	,138	9,441E-02	-8,78E-02	,130	,140	,242	,145	-,114	,670	7,757E-02
A11	,134	,286	,244	,132	-4,90E-02	9,085E-02	-,192	,185	,662	-7,45E-03
A12	,331	-3,77E-02	,209	4,581E-02	2,714E-03	-,210	-1,72E-02	-5,80E-02	,580	-,188
A13	,285	1,195E-02	-8,29E-02	,157	3,484E-02	,110	,112	,684	-8,90E-02	1,674E-02
A14	,158	,184	,110	8,510E-02	3,097E-02	,165	,154	,643	2,784E-02	-1,40E-02
A15	,509	,331	,146	,121	,154	-4,52E-03	-,114	,219	1,786E-02	,333
A18	,448	,197	,151	7,817E-02	,188	8,007E-02	-,161	,254	-2,14E-02	,448
L1	,428	,779	,179	,113	2,962E-02	4,945E-02	6,386E-02	4,526E-02	8,897E-03	7,296E-02
L2	,438	,755	,172	,158	4,830E-02	6,080E-02	,138	-8,59E-03	4,317E-02	6,635E-02
L3	,391	,802	,201	,146	7,128E-02	5,748E-02	6,370E-02	1,412E-02	6,946E-02	2,807E-02
L4	,332	,787	,193	9,106E-02	6,857E-02	4,643E-02	2,853E-02	5,447E-02	,188	-1,59E-02
L5	,146	,719	,144	,116	,150	,119	5,566E-02	9,573E-02	7,192E-02	-,156
L6	,413	,715	,207	,106	7,929E-02	6,660E-02	1,833E-02	6,705E-02	5,415E-02	4,178E-02
L7	,286	,703	,126	,159	8,809E-02	,140	6,477E-02	6,881E-02	-1,21E-02	2,771E-03
Y1	,722	,177	,121	,120	,258	,173	2,698E-02	1,288E-02	7,733E-03	-2,51E-03
Y2	,754	,248	5,962E-02	,158	8,295E-02	,106	1,143E-03	9,922E-02	,136	-2,35E-02
Y3	,753	,283	6,392E-02	,191	,131	6,957E-02	-2,12E-02	,234	4,915E-02	-6,28E-02
Y4	,772	,239	,135	,169	,248	4,676E-02	-4,75E-03	,162	5,040E-02	-3,30E-03
Y5	,788	,268	,144	8,539E-02	,109	2,647E-02	2,959E-02	,179	,101	8,116E-02
Y6	,706	,325	,166	,138	8,344E-02	2,956E-02	,103	7,660E-02	6,702E-02	,129
H1	,695	,360	,176	,119	-2,58E-02	4,424E-02	4,798E-02	4,196E-02	,186	-3,75E-02
H2	,765	,221	-,173	,148	4,168E-02	1,521E-02	7,631E-02	5,388E-02	,153	-4,27E-02
H3	,662	,291	,251	,173	4,633E-02	7,873E-02	,129	-,101	,126	-,107
R1	,197	4,998E-02	,773	7,421E-02	-,111	,123	1,524E-02	5,012E-02	,147	6,371E-02
R2	,199	,179	,838	,154	4,395E-02	7,201E-02	6,165E-02	-3,22E-02	8,214E-02	-3,50E-02
R3	,266	,183	,791	,151	4,496E-02	,115	6,579E-02	-2,77E-02	7,800E-02	-4,24E-02
R4	7,951E-02	,249	,830	6,373E-02	9,320E-02	-9,08E-03	4,130E-02	,107	3,454E-03	-8,62E-04
R5	,185	,338	,702	,170	,139	7,392E-02	6,013E-02	4,036E-02	-6,98E-02	-6,26E-02
P1	,167	,123	4,505E-02	8,119E-02	,773	,183	-8,85E-02	-2,78E-02	5,859E-03	,187
P2	,226	,120	3,103E-02	,113	,886	4,650E-02	,117	6,774E-02	1,239E-02	-4,87E-02
P3	,181	8,081E-02	5,000E-02	9,367E-02	,877	5,353E-02	,163	4,949E-02	7,381E-02	-3,99E-02
I1	,390	,289	,122	,324	,180	6,130E-02	-,246	,225	5,814E-03	-,117

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Appendix 2. Questionnaire

Job itself

- n1. I can use my full potential in my job.
- n2. My job fits my abilities and knowledge.
- n3. My job contributes to my personal development.
- n4. I am only dealing with activities necessitated by my own job.
- n5. I am doing my job willingly.
- n6. My job meets my expectations.
- n7. I can use my creativity in my job.
- n8. I can see the contribution of my job to my university.

Prestige

- i1. My university is prestigious for me.

Job security

- v1. I don't worry about losing my job.

Teaching and research

- t1. Non-academic activities are taking so much time.
- t2. Lots of activities contribute to personal objectives of my supervisors.
- t3. I am doing an administrative job that I don't want to.

Additional duties

- d1. I am giving the lessons of my supervisors instead of them.
- d2. My lesson schedule is very hard
- d3. I have to give the lessons, which are out of my expertise.
- d4. I have no time for my academic studies.

Freedom

- s1. I'm free except for my lesson schedule.
- s2. I can get permission whenever I need.
- s3. I can give lessons in other universities

Appraisal

- f1. The behaviors and manners of students dispirit my teaching.
- f2. My teaching performance isn't appreciated.

Supervision/supervisor behavior

- 11. I believe that my supervisor has enough worth to do his job sufficiently.
- 12. I think that my supervisor is performing his duties exactly.
- 13. I believe that my supervisor is judicious.
- 14. I believe that my supervisor is honest.

15. I believe that my supervisor is selfish.
16. I have no doubt that my supervisor is going to support me in every condition.
17. My supervisors' behaviors and manners annoy me.

Managerial environment

- y1. All academicians benefit the sources of the university equally.
- y2. There is a merit promotion system in my university.
- y3. New thoughts are given opportunity in my university.
- y4. The problems of the academicians are solved immediately in my university.
- y5. The job related suggestions of the academicians are taken into consideration in my university.
- y6. The activities are executed as planned in my university.
- y7. I can easily transmit my problems to the upper offices.
- y8. I am given information about the all subjects, which are relevant to me.
- y9. I am conferred with the all activities that might affect me.
- y10. My university encourages attending scientific congresses and symposiums.
- y11. My university gives support for my scientific researches.

Co-workers' behavior

- c1. I can do collective work with my co-workers.
- c2. My co-workers help me when I have a problem.
- c3. My co-workers esteem my thoughts.
- c4. I have good relations with my co-workers.
- c5. All my co-workers are experts in their job.

Present pay

- p1. I am paid less than I deserve.
- p2. Economical problems keep my mind.
- p3. I have the struggle to make my living.

Physical conditions/working facilities

- z1. Catering
- z2. Medical services
- z3. Transportation
- z4. Library
- z5. Internet access
- z6. Photocopy and printer amenities
- z7. Your office
- z8. Sports centers

Note: For all constructs except "Physical conditions/working facilities" response category 1 = Very Bad, 5 = Very Good were used. For "Physical conditions/working facilities" response category 1 = Absolutely Wrong, 5 = Absolutely Right was used.

PERSONELİ GÜÇLENDİRME: DAVRANIŞSAL VE BİLİŞSEL BOYUTTA İNCELENMESİ VE BENZER YÖNETİM KAVRAMLARI İLE KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Tamer BOLAT^(*)

Özet: Uluslararası rekabet, küreselleşme, müşteri beklentilerindeki değişim vb. pek çok gelişme; örgütlerde insan kaynaklarının önemini giderek artırmaktadır. Bu gelişmeler karşısında örgütler, işgörenleri güçlü kılmak için yollarını aramakta; böylece onların örgüt içi girişimciliğinden ve yaratıcılığından yararlanmaya çalışmaktadırlar. Bu noktada, personeli güçlendirme kavramı, modern yönetim ve örgüt uygulamaları arasında üzerinde en çok ilgi toplayan konulardan biri olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Gerek akademisyenler gerekse uygulamacılar arasında ilgiyle karşılanmasına rağmen bu yeni yönetim kavramının çerçevesinin henüz tam olarak çizilemediği ve çeşitli açılardan kavram kargaşasının (yetki devri, iş zenginleştirme ve yönetime katılma vb. kavramlarla) yaşandığı görülmektedir. Yapılan bu çalışma ile yaşanan bu kavram kargaşasına bir ölçüde çözüm getirilmeye çalışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Personel Güçlendirme, Yetki Devri, İş Zenginleştirme, Yönetime Katılma.

Abstract: Many developments such as international competition, globalization, changes in customer expectations and etc. make human resources more and more important in organizations. With respect to these developments, organizations look for the ways to empower their employee; and so they try to benefit from their internal initiative and innovative capacity. At that point, it is seen that the term "empowerment" is one of the topics attracting attention on the highest level between modern administration and organizational practices. Although it is accepted with great interest by both academicians and technicians, it is observed that the frame of this new management concept couldn't be completely defined yet and a confusion of concept (authority delegation, job enrichment, participation and etc.) is experienced in various aspects. With this study carried out, there is tried to find solutions for this concept confusion to a certain degree.

Key Words: Employee Empowerment, Authority Delegation, Job Enrichment, Participation

I. Giriş

1980'ler ve özellikle 1990'lardan itibaren, gerek akademik çevrelerde gerekse iş dünyasında üzerinde en çok tartışılan yönetim kavramlarından biri "güçlendirme" kavramı olmuştur (Conger ve Kanungo, 1988: 471; Luthans, 1995: 36; Appelbaum ve Honegger, 1998: 29; Johnson ve Thuston, 1997: 64). Bu ilginin temel nedeni, uluslararası rekabetin ve sürekli değişimin, işgörenlerin örgüt içi girişimciliğini ve yaratıcılığını gerektiriyor olmasıdır (Spreitzer, 1995: 1442; Cacioppe, 1998: 264; Minett ve Ellis, 1997: 80; Koçel, 2001: 339-340).

^(*)Doç.Dr. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Balıkesir Meslek Yüksek Okulu Öğretim Üyesi