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ABSTRACT

MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING
PARTICIPATION OF SUBORDINATE-MANAGERS

By
Mohammed Al-Arifi

Managerial decision making is an essential element of management. The complexity of the post industrial society, the growth of education, the speed of technological change, and the twentieth century informational revolution are important factors which increase efforts for participatory decisions. Today's subordinates are more educated, highly skilled, and more experienced than ever before. They cannot be managed by the old authoritarian decision making styles. However, The participative process of making a decision can help to increase subordinates' satisfaction, provide recognition and responsibility and reduce any conflict and ambiguity experienced by the work group.

The approach used in this study is mainly exploratory and descriptive in nature and takes, as a starting point, a number of questions and hypotheses on the current managerial situation of the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. The methodology consists of the use of a survey questionnaire to obtain empirical data from the subject managers. This is to identify their managerial decision-making styles, the degree of participation that might exist in the decision making process and attitudes towards the concept of participation and its techniques. The data were analysed through the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. It was found that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were all utilised by the respondents. The semi-autocratic style (AII) was predominantly employed by the respondents. The non-programmed decisions were most often made by the joint decision-making style (GII). The programmed decisions were most often done by the semi-autocratic style (AII). It was also found that participation of upper-level managers in the total process of making programmed decisions is significantly decreased with each advance stage of the process. The participation of the low-level managers in the stages of the non-programmed decision-making process significantly decreases with each advanced stage of the process. Furthermore, the analysis indicated that the subject managers are more familiar with committee and conference techniques than any other techniques. The respondents were less familiar with the Nominal Group Technique and the Delphi Method technique.

Finally, the study generates a set of recommendations for decision makers about management decisions and relevant styles, skills, and techniques. The managers could utilise the findings of this study to correct, maintain, and/or eliminate any shortcomings in the decision making process of their organisations.
WHOSE JOB IS IT?

There is a story about four people (employees) named Everybody, Somebody, Anybody, and Nobody. There was an important job (decision) to be done and Everybody was asked to do it. Everybody was sure Somebody would do it. Anybody could have done it, but Nobody did it. Somebody got angry about that, because it was Everybody’s job. Everybody thought Anybody could do it but Nobody realised that Everybody wouldn’t do it. It ended up that Everybody blamed Somebody when Nobody did what Anybody could do.  (Anon)
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**DEDICATION**--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- II

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**----------------------------------------------------------------------------- III

**ABSTRACT**---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- IV

**LIST OF TABLES**------------------------------------------------------------------------------------ XI

**LIST OF FIGURES**----------------------------------------------------------------------------------- XIV

## CHAPTER ONE

**AIMS AND ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY**

1.1 INTRODUCTION------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------ 1
1.2 RATIONALE FOR THIS STUDY----------------------------------------------------------------------------- 4
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM-------------------------------------------------------------------------- 9
1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY--------------------------------------------------------------------------- 12
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY------------------------------------------------------------------------- 16
1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY--------------------------------------------------------------------------- 17
1.7 TERMINOLOGY DEFINITIONS--------------------------------------------------------------------------- 19
1.8 ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURES OF THE STUDY-------------------------------------------------------- 27

## CHAPTER TWO

**EVALUATION OF MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING THOUGHT AND PRACTICES**

2.1 INTRODUCTION---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 29
2.2 ANCIENT MANAGERIAL CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES---------- 30
2.2.1 The Near East Civilisations ---------------------- 31
2.2.2 The Far East Civilisation------------------------ 32
2.2.3 The Ancient Egyptian----------------------------- 34
2.2.4 The Ancient Hebrews----------------------------- 35
2.2.5 The Ancient Greece----------------------------- 36
2.2.6 The Ancient Romans and the Catholic Church------ 37
2.2.7 The Ancient Islamic Arab Civilisation----------- 39
2.3 LATER MANAGERIAL THEORIES AND PRACTICES--------- 41
2.3.1 The Classical Management Approach--------------- 43
2.3.1.1 Bureaucracy---------------------------------- 45
2.3.1.2 Scientific Management Theory---------------- 47
2.3.1.3 Administrative Management Theory----------- 50
2.3.2 Neo-classical Management Approach--------------- 53
2.3.3 Modern Management Approach-------------------- 57
3.4 SUMMARY------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 61
CHAPTER SIX
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

6.1 INTRODUCTION------------------------------------------------------------- 194
6.2 RESEARCH CENTRAL QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES------------------ 196
6.3 DATA SOURCES------------------------------------------------------------ 199
6.4 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT AND VALIDITY---------------------------------- 201
6.4.1 Design and Structure of the Instrument------------------------------- 204
6.4.2 Format and Measurement of the Survey Instrument--------------------- 208
6.5 POPULATION OF THE STUDY--------------------------------------------- 209
6.6 SAMPLING--------------------------------------------------------------- 212
6.7 DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION PROCESS----------------------------- 217
6.8 DATA ANALYSIS---------------------------------------------------------- 219
6.9 SUMMARY---------------------------------------------------------------- 220

CHAPTER SEVEN
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS I : EXAMINING THE DECISION MAKING STYLES, TECHNIQUES AND PROCESS (STAGES)

7.1 INTRODUCTION------------------------------------------------------------- 223
7.2 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE----------------------------- 224
7.2.1 Sample Distribution According to education level, country and background (field)------------------------------- 225
7.2.2 Sample Distribution According to Age-------------------------------- 227
7.2.3 Sample Distribution According to Managerial Experience----------------- 228
7.2.4 Sample Distribution According to the Span of Management---------- 229
7.2.5 Sample Distribution According to Period and Country of Training---- 230
7.3 MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING STYLES---------------------------------- 232
CHAPTER EIGHT
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS II: EXAMINING THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPATION IN MAKING MANAGERIAL DECISIONS

8.1 INTRODUCTION----------------------------------------------- 297
8.2 AGE, QUALIFICATION, POSITION, SPAN OF MANAGEMENT, EXPERIENCE AND COUNTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION:
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ONE-WAY ANOVA)
AND MANN-WHITNEY---------------------------------------- 299
8.3 AGE AND THE PM AND SATISFACTION ITEMS---------------------- 301
8.3.1 Age and Satisfaction Aspects----------------------------------- 302
8.3.1.1 Age and Satisfaction Items: One-way Analysis of Variance----- 303
8.3.1.2 Age and the Satisfaction Items: Mann-Whitney Procedures----- 307
8.3.2 Age and the Participative Decision Items---------------------- 313
8.3.2.1 Age and the Participative Items: One-Way Analysis of Variance---------------------------------------- 314
8.3.2.2 Age and Participative Items: Mann-Whitney Non-parametric Test---------- 319
8.4 PM ASPECTS AND EDUCATION QUALIFICATION--------------------- 321
8.4.1 Educational Qualification and the Satisfaction Items: One-way Analysis of Variance------------------------- 323
8.4.2 Qualification and the Participate Items: One-way Analysis of Variance-------------------------------------- 328
8.5 PM ASPECTS AND MANAGERIAL POSITION (LOW LEVEL AND HIGH LEVEL): MANN-WHITNEY TEST------------------------ 332
8.5.1 Managerial Position and Satisfaction Items------------------- 333
8.5.2 Regarding Participative Items------------------------------- 339
8.6 PM ASPECTS AND THE SPAN OF MANAGEMENT ( < 15 , 15-50 AND > 50 EMPLOYEES ) : ONE-WAY ANOVA------------------ 341
8.6.1 Management's Span and Satisfaction Items------------------- 343
8.6.2 Participative Decision Items and the Span of Management----------------- 345
8.7 EXPERIENCE AND PM ASPECTS---------------------------------- 350
8.7.1 Experience and Satisfaction Aspects: One-Way Analysis of
Variance (ANOVA)------------------------------------------ 351
8.7.2 Experience and Participative Decision Items: One-way Analysis of Variance---------------------------------- 354
CHAPTER NINE
CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

9.1 INTRODUCTION--------------------------------------------- 384
9.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION------------------------------------- 384
9.2.1 The Evolution Of Participation In The Managerial Decision--------------------------- 394
9.2.2 The Empirical Part Of The Study-------------------------------------------------------- 401
  9.2.2.1 The Respondent' Predominant Decision Making Style----------------------------- 406
  9.2.2.2 The Scientific Method and the Degree Of Subordinate-managers' Involvement In Its Process----------------------------- 410
  9.2.2.3 The Impact Of The Personal Variables------------------------------------------ 414
  9.2.2.4 Respondents' Attitudes Towards The Items Of Job-Satisfaction And Participative Decisions----------------------------- 421
  9.2.2.5 The Respondents' Predominant Participative Techniques------------------------ 430
9.3 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS-------------------------------------- 433
9.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH---------------------------------- 437

APPENDIX A------------------------------------------------------------- 439
APPENDIX B------------------------------------------------------------- 450
APPENDIX C------------------------------------------------------------- 466
BIBLIOGRAPHY----------------------------------------------------------- 478
LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1  The Evolution of Managerial Thought---------------------------------------- 62
Table 3.1  McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y Assumptions-------------------------- 74
Table 3.2  Subordinates' Characteristics and Their Preferable Leadership
and Decision Styles------------------------------------------------------------- 96
Table 3.3  Comparison Between Leadership Theories and Decision-Making
Styles----------------------------------------------------------------------------- 103
Table 4.1  Types of Management Decisions------------------------------------------ 107
Table 4.2  A Comparison Between Programmed and Non-programmed
Decisions-------------------------------------------------------------------------- 109
Table 4.3  The Relationship Between the Type of Management Decision
and Its Elements--------------------------------------------------------------- 114
Table 6.1  Population Size by Institution------------------------------------------ 212
Table 6.2  The Target Sample Size by Institution---------------------------------- 213
Table 6.3  Distribution of the Sample According to the Characteristics of
the Respondents--------------------------------------------------------------- 215
Table 6.4  Number of Questionnaire Distributed and Number Returned as
Complete by Institution--------------------------------------------------------- 218
Table 7.1  The Sample Distribution According to Management Position---------- 225
Table 7.2  Current Position by Educational Qualifications----------------------- 226
Table 7.3  Current Position by Country of High Education Cross
Tabulation-------------------------------------------------------------------------- 226
Table 7.4  Cross Tabulation of Current Position by Educational Field
Study-------------------------------------------------------------------------- 227
Table 7.5  Current position and Age Cross Tabulation----------------------------- 228
Table 7.6  Current Position and Current Experience Cross Tabulation------------ 229
Table 7.7  Current Position by Span of Management--------------------------------- 230
Table 7.8  Current Position by Periods of Training Cross Tabulation------------- 230
Table 7.9  Current Position by Country of Training------------------------------ 231
Table 7.10 Summary of the total participation of all the non-programmed
decisions (Q. 12- Q.16)------------------------------------------------------ 241
Table 7.11 Summary of the total participation of all the programmed
decisions (Q. 17 - Q. 21) as one category--------------------------------------- 246
Table 7.12 Comparison Between Programmed and Non-Programmed
Decisions------------------------------------------------------------------------- 247
Table 7.13 Distribution of Managerial Decision Making Style
According to the Decision Type (N = 202)-------------------------------------- 249
Table 7.14 Distribution of the Superior's Decision-Making Styles According
to Their Subordinates' Judgement (Q.22)--------------------------------------- 251
Table 7.15 Mean Scores of Subordinates' Participation Divided
by Types of Decision----------------------------------------------------------- 256
Table 7.16 Mean Score of Managers' Power Sharing Degree According
to Their Managerial Position (N = 201)-------------------------------------- 260
Table 7.17 Mean Score of Managers' Power-Sharing Degree According
to their Level of Education (N = 202)-------------------------------------- 262
Table 8.10  Re-test of the Items that have been listed in Table 8.8
Relating to Young and Mature Managers-----------------------------321
Table 8.11  Distribution of Respondents According to Educational Level-----322
Table 8.12  Satisfaction Items by Level of Education---------------------323
Table 8.13  Significance of Educational Qualifications-------------------324
Table 8.14  Participative Items by Level of Qualification-----------------329
Table 8.15  Significance of Educational Qualifications-------------------330
Table 8.16  Managerial Satisfaction by Position--------------------------334
Table 8.17  Managers having the Opportunity to use their Judgement
and develop their skills (Q52)---------------------------------------------335
Table 8.18  Superior willing to Listen, by Current Position(Q49 by Q7)----338
Table 8.19  Superior and Subordinate understood each other,
by Current Position (Q63 by Q7)---------------------------------------------338
Table 8.20  Superior Backing up Subordinate, by Current Position
(Q64 by Q7)---------------------------------------------------------------339
Table 8.21  Managerial Attitudes Differences, by Managerial Position------339
Table 8.22  Participative Decision does not Decrease the Role of
the Manager (Q42)----------------------------------------------------------340
Table 8.23  Sample Distribution According to the Span of Management------342
Table 8.24  Satisfaction Aspects, by Management's Span-------------------343
Table 8.25  Significant Variation of the Span of Management Groups-------344
Table 8.26  Managerial Thinking Differences by Management's Span--------346
Table 8.27  Statement Significant for the Size of Management's Span-------346
Table 8.28  Sample Distribution According to Years of Experience---------350
Table 8.29  Managerial Thinking Differences by Experience-----------------351
Table 8.30  Means Variations by Experience--------------------------352
Table 8.31  Managerial Thinking Differences by Experience-----------------354
Table 8.32  Mean Variation by Experience-------------------------------355
Table 8.33  Differences between Respondents According to the
Country of their Higher Educational Degrees--------------------------------360
Table 8.34  Differences Between Respondents According to the Country
of Higher Education--------------------------------------------------------363
Table 8.35  Additional Aspects of Participative Management----------------367
Table 8.36  Item Q49 by High Age Group, Highly Education and Highly
Positioned Managers----------------------------------------------------------370
Table 8.37  Item Q56 by High Age Group, Highly Educated, and Highly
Positioned Managers----------------------------------------------------------371
Table 8.38  Justification for and Advantages of Involving Subordinates in
Management Decisions as Mentioned by the Respondents
Ranked According to the Number of Times Mentioned--------------------------374
Table 8.39  Barriers to and Disadvantages of Involving Subordinates in
Management Decisions as Mentioned by the Respondents
Ranked According to the Number of Times Mentioned--------------------------377
Table 9.1  Summary of Hypotheses’ Findings-------------------------------405
### LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1</td>
<td>Evolution of Employees' Participation in Managerial Decision Making</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1</td>
<td>Decision-Making Continuum</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.2</td>
<td>The Vroom-Yetton-Jago Decision Tree Model (Time-Driven Group Problems)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.3</td>
<td>Leadership Decision Skills at Various Levels of Management</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.1</td>
<td>The Decision-Making Process</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.1</td>
<td>Scale of Subordinate's Participation</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.2</td>
<td>Steps in Nominal Group Technique</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.3</td>
<td>Steps in the Delphi Technique</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.1</td>
<td>Scale of Subordinate Participation in Managerial Decision</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.2</td>
<td>The Sample's Decision Making Style</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.3</td>
<td>The Sample's Decision-Making Styles According to Decision Type</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.4</td>
<td>Managers' participation in the stages of the programmed decision process</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.5</td>
<td>Managers' participation in the stages of the non-programmed decision process</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8.1</td>
<td>Factors affecting span of management</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8.2</td>
<td>Management Circles</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
AIMS AND ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Managerial decision making is an essential element of management. It is applicable to all levels of management in any kind of organisation or activity throughout the world.\(^1\) Knootz (1969) said, "It does not really matter what is being managed, whether business, government, charitable or religious organisation, or even universities, the task of every manager at every level is to [decide] so as to accomplish group purposes with the least expenditure of material or human resources".\(^2\)

The study of decision-making has produced much literature, some of which has enriched the subject and has led to many approaches, models, and theories of managerial decision-making. The concept that decision making is both an essential and central element of management has motivated researchers from a variety of social science disciplines to study this phenomenon. Therefore, these studies constitute a school of thought that treats decision making as a process synonymous with the process of management.\(^3\) Herbert A. Simon (1960), in his classic work on the science of management decision making, suggested that decision making is synonymous with management.\(^4\) Cyert and Welsch (1970) said, "We view decision making as synonymous with managing".\(^5\) Simon (1977) stated, "But to understand what is involved in decision making that term has to be interpreted broadly - so broadly as to become almost synonymous with managing".\(^6\) Harrison (1987) said, "I agree with Simon that good management and effective decision making are synonymous".\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) Harrison, E.F., 1987, pp. 1, 6, 25.
\(^3\) Harrison, E.F., 1987, p.5.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 2,7.
However, in regard to the participation of subordinate-managers in the decision-making process there are insufficient complete studies. There are some ideas and some brief discussions about it but these are scattered and spread amongst other subjects in various fields of knowledge. The complexity of the post industrial society, the growth of education, the speed of technological change, and the twentieth century informational revolution are important factors which increase efforts for participatory decisions and encourage both managers and subordinates to be involved in the decision making process.

The decision-making process is affected seriously by the size of the decision body. If the decision is taken by a single-decision-maker decision body, an autocratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will not participate effectively in the decision-making process. On the other hand, if the decision is taken by a multi-decision-maker decision body, a democratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Therefore, it is obvious that the decision body plays an important part on the decision-making process. Cooke and Slack (1991) said, “It is through the decision body that the organisation's objectives are interpreted and translated into operational criteria. This means that the individuals within the decision body not only make the choice itself, but can also play an important part in deciding to what end the decision should be contributing. Furthermore, the decision body can, in effect, control which options are considered, what information is considered as relevant and how each option is evaluated. Because of this, the decision body is the single most important element in any decision”.\(^8\) In respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction. Such participation

---

\(^8\) Cooke, S. and N. Slack, 1991, p. 11.
will generate more ideas and more interests and help to accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives. Wren (1994) noted that modern management had to be based upon rational ways of making decisions; no longer could the decisions be made on the basis of a few individuals and their sudden ideas, wishes, or whims.9 However, despite the relative cost of implementing the participative approaches in managerial decision making, the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. Halal and Brown (1981) supported this argument by concluding that, "Participation may be complex, time consuming, and risky, but the subsequent ease of implementing decisions, the avoidance of costly mistakes, the reduced employee resistance, improved performance, enhanced flexibility and higher morale should provide an attractive return on the initial investment in time and effort."10

As a result of the growing importance of the participative decision making approaches, several techniques and models have been developed which enable subordinates to participate in the process of creating alternatives and making decisions. The literature is rich in this area and covers many techniques which can overcome some of the problems and barriers of participation in managerial decision making.

In short, this study will provide a survey and review of the relevant literature which addresses the main concerns of the subject-matter of this study. The review will report on current research from a human behavioural perspective and any related studies which have been associated with managerial decision-making in general and with the subordinate's participation in the decision-making process in particular. The literature review will cover the following areas:

---

management theories and practices throughout the ancient and more recent history with the main emphasis on how decision-making and the concept of participation in the decision-making process was viewed;

(2) schools and theories of leadership;

(3) styles and skills of making managerial decisions;

(4) types of decisions;

(5) techniques and methods for practising participative approaches and decisions;

(6) stages in the decision-making process;

(7) the problems of the managerial decision-making process; and

(8) participation in the decision process and some other approaches to participative management.

The present chapter (Chapter 1) describes the rationale for this study, advances a statement of the research problem, and defines the purpose and objectives that are the central focus of the research. A set of managerial terminology and limitations that are important for a better understanding of the subject matters of this research is also provided by this chapter.

1.2 RATIONALE FOR THIS STUDY

In most organisations there are too many functions and duties required for any one manager to do them all by himself, but without the participation of his subordinates, it is difficult to achieve such tasks effectively and successfully. Subordinates' participation in managerial decision making has frequently been recognised by many writers as an important motivating factor. To some, it is the answer to most human problems in decision making\(^\text{11}\). Generally, managerial decisions as a human activity are more likely to be effective if both managers and subordinates interact with each

\[^{11}\text{Elbing, A., 1978, pp. 135-136.}\]
other, share the decision-making process, and understand the reasons for the final course of action.

However, researchers in this field of study argue that subordinates involvement in the decision making process often results in the most effective decisions.\(^1\) When subordinates feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the decision, then they are more likely to accept the decision and to execute it more effectively because it is developed by them rather than being imposed upon them by the manager. Elbing (1978) pointed out that, "One way of creating or increasing the acceptability of a solution is to allow the key persons involved in the problem situation to participate in choosing among the alternative solutions available".\(^1\)

Moreover, it is generally accepted that today's subordinates are more educated, highly skilled, and more experienced than ever before. They cannot be managed by the old authoritarian decision making styles. Today's subordinates want to participate in all matters affecting them. They want to have some say in what they do at work, how and when; they want to get meaningful feedback on their efforts; they want to be informed about and be involved in decisions and activities affecting their current jobs and future. Armstrong (1993) supported this view. He said, "It recognises the reality of life today, in which traditional authoritarian patterns of behaviour are being steadily eroded."\(^1\) Furthermore, Cressey et al (1988) pointed out that, "The growth of education and diffusion of information in the society are other factors which will enhance the capacity and desire of larger sectors of the working population to be involved and will consequently increase the chances of participation."\(^1\)

\(^{12}\) Mondy, R.W. et al., 1990, p. 197.
Participation appears to have a direct effect on improving the level of subordinates' morale, satisfaction, willingness and relationship. The participative process of making a decision, implementing it, and then seeing the positive results can help to increase subordinates satisfaction, provide recognition and responsibility and reduce any conflict and ambiguity experienced by the work group. However, most studies and research in this field of management indicate positive correlation between subordinates' morale and the degree of participation in the decision making process. By involving subordinates in the decision process, co-operation among task force members could be maximised, resistance to the new decision could be minimised, and satisfaction and better feeling could be increased within the organisational members. Furthermore, the cost of implementing a new decision in terms of turnover, absenteeism, complaints, grievances, conflict, ambiguity, and re-learning skills could be reduced by applying such participative approach in making managerial decisions.

Participation may also work as a means of developing the training and learning aspects of the participants. It develops subordinates' skills, experience, and knowledge. It develops also their understanding both by learning about the organisation in which they work and by discovering themselves through this activity. A justification for this view is offered by Pateman (1970), who said, "the major function of participation in the theory of participatory democracy is therefore an educative one, educative in the very widest sense, including both the psychological aspect and the gaining of practice in democratic skills and problems." She added also that, "Participation develops and fosters the very qualities necessary for it; the more individuals participate the better able they are to do so". In general, participation is seen as a means of giving subordinates the opportunity to develop
their responsible attitudes and confidence both by discovering themselves through the participative process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their current jobs and organisation.\textsuperscript{22} If subordinates are enabled to participate in making decisions and if they feel that they have contributed to those decisions, then their managerial skills, confidence, and commitment to organisational goals are more likely to be increased. In turn, participation will prepare subordinates to a higher level of management occupations.\textsuperscript{23}

Participation encourages the openness of communication channels to all employees. Management decisions may fail or have little result or influence if they cannot be communicated effectively to the internal and external environment. Open communication is an important factor in managing resistance to the new decisions and overcoming information and control conflicts during the implementation stage. Open communication channels help to provide information and to close the gap between managers and subordinates. In the absence of information, the gap will increase and may be filled with rumours, inappropriate or false information, which may constrain the decision process. Effective communication channels supply the decision process with the needed information at the right time. It enables employees, both subordinates and managers, to discuss problems, exchange ideas and suggestions, and therefore to make better quality decisions.\textsuperscript{24}

Participation means better use of the subordinates' skills, experience, and knowledge that may be available in the organisation. In organisations of a non-participative climate (autocratic), subordinates' initiative, knowledge, and skills may not be applied to their maximum extent. In contrast, participative organisation enables management


and subordinates to use and benefit from all the skills and knowledge that is available in the organisation.  

The organisation also gains from the combined knowledge of the superior and his subordinates. Participation provides management with a great deal of information and knowledge. It enables managers to receive valuable feedback from their subordinates which may help them to make successful decisions. In this regard, Mondy et al (1990) said, "When a group makes a decision, additional knowledge and skills are brought into play, which tends to result in higher quality decisions."  

However, this is a real situation with which managers, especially those in developing countries, have to deal with. Therefore, it is better for the managers to develop and implement the participative decision making approach in an orderly and planned way by themselves rather than for it to be imposed upon them by government legislation or because of the pressure of environment and society.  

However, interest in doing this research developed as a result of the researcher's educational background and his own experience as an employee for more than 17 years with one of the main Saudi security educational institutes and centres; namely King Fahad Security College. This experience exposed him to the day-to-day managerial activities and also provided an opportunity to observe the difficulties of the decision-making process in the college and in the other security institutes as well. Such experience and observations led the researcher to believe that an empirical study of the decision making styles, the managerial processes associated with these styles, and managers' attitudes toward these styles and processes could serve not only as a useful description of Saudi management at these institutes and centres, but that such  

---

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Some subordinates avoid any responsibility and therefore do not want to be involved in the decision making process. To many of them participation makes work harder and leads to more responsibility. They feel that it is so much easier to let decisions be made by others and criticise management for its failure rather than to participate in making the decision and taking the responsibility for it. Such feeling, however, is one of the problems that may weaken the effective implementation of the participative decision approach. Moreover, participation is sometimes initiated on the assumption that subordinates have a participative enthusiasm and spirit. Certainly that is not necessarily the case, since the environment of organisations and the degree of interest in participation are not the same for all subordinates. If subordinates do not have the interest of participation or if they work in an autocratic environment for a long time, they may resist the practice of participation and therefore be seen as a barrier to its effectiveness. In fact, subordinates in any organisation are not equally in favour of participation. Managers must face the fact that some subordinates may not be capable of or interested in contributing to decision making or working without close supervision. This group of subordinates do not want increased participation, either because they are apathetic or because they do not have the interest to do so. Therefore, they will try to constrain the practice of participation inside their organisation.

---

Subordinates' participation in managerial decision making might also interfere with manager prerogatives and authority. This makes some managers, especially in developing countries, not willing to welcome the practice of participation in their organisations. They believe that participation will reduce their power and authority and will impair their administrative position. Bowditch and Buono (1994) said that, "The notion of participative management is often perceived by supervisors as a loss of control from managers to workers."  

The employee's skills, knowledge, and interest in the subject are very important factors which seriously affect the enthusiasm for participation in the managerial decision making process. The absence of some of these factors, which is the case in most of the developing countries, works as a road block to the development and implementation of a participative decision making approach. Mondy et al (1990) summarised the argument thus: "Whether or not greater involvement in decision making can be developed depends largely upon the ability and interest of the participants, both of the subordinates and the managers. This is not an easy concept to implement. Obviously, if the subordinate has neither knowledge of, nor interest in a subject, there is little need to consult that person."  

Misunderstanding of participation is another major problem that faces the implementation of the participative decision making approaches in the developing countries. This is true for both managers and subordinates. In this situation, some managers introduce participation to their organisation in a relatively superficial and selective way. They might not take participation seriously and may adopt short-sighted and selfish perspectives. In contrast, some managers take the opposite side of the argument. They think of participation as a magical remedy to all managerial and

---

32 Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 404
organisational problems. Therefore, they impose the participative approach upon the organisation and direct subordinates to use it. That is certainly another facet of misunderstanding participation. Participation by imposition often creates negative reactions, develops stress, and increases subordinates' suspicions about management and its objectives. These types of consequences may encourage subordinates to resist the implementation of this approach. On the other hand, misunderstanding of participation may also lead subordinates to an expectation that cannot be fulfilled, so causing resistance and frustration rather than co-operation and satisfaction. For example, if the ideas participated by subordinates turn out to be inadequate and are finally rejected, those subordinates may become alienated and more resistance will result than if they had not been involved from the beginning.33

However some managers, especially in developing countries may tend to misuse the application of the confidentiality concept by classifying an extensive range of information and decisions as confidential matters. This is done to avoid their subordinates' participation in these matters. When this is the case, confidentiality becomes a serious and destructive problem to the participation process.

A major difficulty facing the Saudi researcher is the scarcity of reliable data on the participative decision-making approaches of the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. However, there are just a few studies about decision-making styles of Saudi managers and the degree to which they involve their subordinates in the decision-making process. For instance, Alshalan (1991) in his study about Saudi public managers concluded that the consultative decision-making style was the actual and the ideal predominantly style of the Saudi public managers. By contrast, Malaika (1993) conducted a study about Management Characteristics And Organisation Content In Saudi Arabia in which he found that Saudi managers are highly authoritarian in their decision making style. His findings show that

authoritarian style in decision-making is high/very high among Saudi managers in the government organisations. He also stated that, "Those who are not authoritarian in their decision-making in the non-government organisations are not necessarily team players. They may be 1,1 leaders in terms, of the Blake and Mouton typology (a minimum concern for both productivity and people)." However, these two studies were about government (the first one) or government and business organisations (the later one) rather than police organisations and they present contradictory findings. Thus, as no comparative study on the issue of Participative Management (PM) in the Saudi police sector has come to the researcher's knowledge, the approach used in this study is mainly exploratory and descriptive in nature and takes, as a starting point, a number of questions and hypotheses on the current managerial situation of the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. Therefore, it is worthwhile to identify the managers' decision-making styles in the Saudi security educational organisations as well as to learn about their attitudes towards participative decision making since they have frequently been criticised for having a bureaucratised decision-making process. High-level managers were accused of centralising management decisions and avoiding the involvement of their subordinates in the decision-making process. This study should prove whether this criticism is justified or not.

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This is a descriptive as well as an empirical study about the participative decision making styles, process and techniques in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. It intends to explore and discuss the current practices and patterns of the participative decision making approaches within these organisations. The intention is to go on to analyse and explain the research findings, and to discuss the concept of

---

participation in the managerial decision-making process as is presented by data of this study.

Therefore, from a human behavioural perspective, the literature review of this study will comprise of brief discussion of managerial development thought rather than a detailed description of the whole development in this field. And it will highlight the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making process together with how the ancient and then the more recent civilisations viewed this concept and how it was developed. So, the concentration will be on the managerial ideas and principles that related most particularly to the decision-making process and how these civilisations viewed and practised the decision process, together with the participative management principles. This is to determine how this development may help managers and subordinates to analyse managerial problems, how to make perfect decisions, and also to indicate how each theory has contributed to the development of the managerial decision-making process in general and the subordinate's participation in the decision-making process in particular.

In order to answer the question of whether or not there are real demands and proper justifications for subordinate-managers' participation in making managerial decisions, a survey questionnaire has been conducted in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres in the Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia. This is to identify their managerial decision-making styles, the degree of participation they may have in the decision making process and their understanding and attitudes towards the concept of participation. This study provides insight into what is required before an organisation implements the managerial participative decision making approach based on a review of published literature and empirical data.

However, the data for this study was collected and analysed for the purpose of achieving the following objectives:
1. To examine the development of the concept of participation in managerial decisions through the human civilisations' history. This study aims to survey the development and the importance of management decision-making styles in general and the participative decision-making approaches in particular with special emphasis made on the implementation of these approaches in Saudi managerial practices.

2. To investigate the major decision-making methods, styles, skills and techniques that may be implemented by the decision makers when making their managerial decisions. However, there is no universal agreement between researchers as to the one best style of making a decision. Also there is no universally accepted approach to the manager's choice about how much and in what stages to involve subordinates in the decision making process. Thus, managers are required to know that complex decisions cannot be made by the use of a fixed formula or by ignoring the influence of human factors, technological inventions, resources available in the workplace, and environmental variables.\(^{35}\)

3. To examine the degree of subordinates participation in the decision-making process for each type of decisions (programmed and non-programmed). Therefore, it is worthwhile to identify the managers' decision-making styles in the Saudi security educational organisations as well as to learn about their attitudes towards participative decision making since they have frequently been criticised for having a bureaucratised decision-making process. This study should prove whether this criticism is justified or not.

4. To examine the relationship between the types of managerial decisions and the styles of making these decisions. The study will then suggest decision-making styles and practices that may be appropriate for the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular.

5. To examine the effect of the level of education, training, experience, age, position, managerial span, Western education and field of study on the managers' decision-making styles. The intention here is to find out how much of the variance in the managers decision styles can be explained, and to which variable(s) it can be attributed. This is to help management in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres to implement PM policies and procedures to prepare for future development. PM is very important to the success of management and plays an essential role in the overall decisions of organisation. This will not be achieved unless these institutes create a participative environment and motivate and practise programmes that assist employees to develop their skills and enable the organisation to attract, retain and recruit highly qualified managers.

6. To compare managers' differences of Job-satisfaction and to measure their actual attitudes and opinions towards participative decisions based on age, qualification, position, experience, span of management, and country of the respondents' higher -degree. Therefore, this study tends to continue the efforts to discover and diagnose the work environment of the Saudi security educational institutes by highlighting the items of both job satisfaction and participative decision making. Therefore, it is very important to describe and understand the degree of satisfaction the employees have towards their current jobs and how they perceive PM and respond to its fundamental statements or items. This is to explore any barriers or justifications of PM,
establish new basis for successful participation and prepare Saudi managers to work in participative and effective environment.

7. To investigate the justifications for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making styles in general and in the Saudi context in particular.

8. To provide information to Saudi managers desirous of implementing the participative decision making approach and to assist them in preparing their organisations and manpower for future development. This research aims to provide management with the necessary tools to be useful in changing the organisation’s business theory from one that is autocratically oriented to one that is participatory oriented.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A general review of the literature reveals that little has been written about managerial decision making styles in general concerning Saudi Arabia and other developing countries and in particular about subordinates’ participation in the decision-making process in these countries. Whatever the reason for this scarcity, it is apparent that continuous research is needed in this field of study to understand and overcome the problems of management decisions in these countries. This study will provide more in-depth data about this subject, and strengthen the comparative basis for future research.

However, to the knowledge of the researcher, no study has been conducted to analyse the decision making styles of the managers in the Saudi police sector, nor to find out the degree of their involvement in the stages of the decision-making process. Thus, the significance of this study lies in filling this important gap of knowledge which will
provide the government with valuable information for making managerial and
administrative reforms in both the public and private sectors. This makes the study of
management decision styles both interesting and worthwhile. It also presents a
significant contribution to the current research on management by reviewing and
integrating relevant literature and adding to the body of knowledge in an area lacking
empirical research.

The study generates a set of recommendations for the decision makers in the Saudi
security educational institutes and centres in particular and for Saudi public and
private sectors in general about management decisions and their relevant styles, skills,
and techniques. The Saudi managers could utilise the findings of this study to correct,
maintain, and/or eliminate any shortcomings in the decision making process of their
current organisations. This study will be a useful reference for other studies and
researchers as well as for administrative training and reform centres in Saudi Arabia
aimed at finding appropriate and effective ways to manage employees, increase the
productivity, raising job-satisfaction, and improving the quality of management
decisions. Saudi universities, government organisations, private organisations,
training institutes and centres, or other information seekers about management
decision in general and Saudi managers in particular could also benefit from this
study. It is a helpful tool for training centres and administrative reformers in their
attempts to develop the capacity of human resources and to take care of
administrative and managerial problems. It would enrich their knowledge and
understanding of the subject matters of this research.

1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

As was stated by the literature, there is no universal agreement between researchers
and theorists as to the one best style of making a decision. Therefore, this study was
limited to five major styles of making managerial decisions: autocratic (AI style),
semi-autocratic (AII style), semi-consultative (CI style), consultative (CII style), and joint decision making (GII style). It is also important to indicate that Simon's classification for management decisions as programmed and non-programmed was adapted for the benefit of this study. All the respondents' managerial decisions were classified accordingly into programmed and non-programmed decisions.

However, as it is impossible to control all the human errors resulting from the bias and emotive nature of the decision-body, the scientific method of decision making is probably one of the best methods available so as to limit the effects of such problems throughout the several stages that make up the decision-making process. The scientific method involves an orderly decision-making process that comprises several stages. These stages were presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core stages of the decision-making process. The adapted model presented in Figure 4.1 was used in this study. However, there is no universally accepted approach to the manager's choice about how much and in what stages to involve subordinates in the decision making process.

Since participative techniques are associated with managerial decisions, this study will investigate five of the major participative decision making techniques (conference, committee, brainstorming, nominal groups, and the Delphi technique) to identify how familiar the respondents are with them and what their attitudes are towards their usefulness to their current positions and organisations.

Finally, participation in this study does not necessarily mean the full involvement of all subordinates in every type of decisions. The focus, here, is upon the degree of involvement by the concerned subordinates in certain types of managerial decisions. In this study owing to the specific nature of the Saudi security institutes as a police organisations, top secret and crisis decisions are excluded. Furthermore, the top
directors of these organisations and their deputies were also excluded from the target sample due to the politically nature of their position and to the type of decisions they are dealing with. However the degree of participation can be explained by using a scale of two extreme ends as illustrated in Figure 7.1. At one end, manager may decide autocratically without any subordinates' participation (AI style); at the other end, subordinates and their manager may decide jointly as one group (GII style). Between these two extreme ends there is a range of participative points in which the decision maker can be more or less participative.

1.7 TERMINOLOGY DEFINITIONS

In order to establish a precise understanding in this study, clearly defined terms and terminology are needed. the following terms were defined and explained as they were used in the study.

1. Qur'an = Muslims' Holy Book which is in the words of Allâh
2. Sunna (Hadith) = The recorded words and actions of Prophet Mohammad - the Messenger of Allâh to Muslim people (Peace be unto him).
3. Shura: is one of the Islamic government roles defined as “consulting the qualified experts in order to reach the right decision.”
4. Participation in decision making - This managerial concept has become more and more acceptable during the twentieth century of management development. It has been recognised as an important and motivating factor by many theorists and researchers. Most of the writers and managers across managerial occupations define participation as a means of involving employees

in the decision making process. The aim is to give a greater commitment to organisational objectives and to increase the effectiveness of decisions. French et al (1960) defines participation as, "a process in which two or more parties influence each other in making certain plans, policies, and decisions. It is restricted to decisions that have future effects on all those making the decision and on those represented by them".37 Bowditch (1994) said that participative decision making, "is a sharing in the diagnosis, analysis, development, and choice of solution for implementation and management of the change process".38

In this study, participation was defined as any degree of involvement by the concerned subordinates in the decision making process. Thus it covers all styles of the participative decision making approaches. So the range can be from a superficial to an extensive involvement in the decision making process. In other words, it can range from provision of information (All style), through consultation (CI or CII style), to join decision making (GII style). Figures 5.1 and 7.1 illustrate these styles.

Programmed decisions are the type of decisions that are usually well structured, routine, recurring, and can be handled with a high degree of certainty; that is, the outcome and goals are clear and well known, the decision-making rules are already established, and the information is available and well defined.39 In Simon's words, "Decisions are programmed to the extent that they are repetitive and routine, to the extent that a definite procedure has been worked out for handling them so that they do not have to be treated de novo each time they occur".40

---

6 Non-programmed decisions are the type of decisions that are poorly structured, complex, novel and uncertain of the outcomes; that is the decision rules and procedures are not yet established, the outcome is ambiguous and unclear so that they have to be treated as new each time they occur. Simon said, "Decisions are non-programmed to the extent that they are novel, unstructured and consequential. There is no cut-and-dried method for handling the problem because it has not arisen before, or because its precise nature and structure are elusive or complex, or because it is so important that it deserves a custom-tailored treatment".41

7 Scientific decision making method is a process of selecting the most appropriate decision throughout the implementation of an orderly sequential stages that make up the decision-making process.

The stages of the decision-making process are presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core elements of the decision-making process. Figure 4.1 illustrates the stages of this process, starting with the observation of the problem and runs through the process until the best possible decision is chosen, implemented, and monitored. In practice, however, the stages are rarely recognised as distinct stages by the decision-body. They are recognised as a series of interrelated and dynamic stages in a particular order of sequence.42

8 Subordinate-manager is the type of employee who is working as manager and subordinate at the same time. This type of managers can be thought of as

41 Ibid., p. 14.
a leader by the subordinates whom he is responsible for and, simultaneously,
as a subordinate by the superiors that he is responsible to.43

However, Likert believed that the appropriate leadership style is characterised
by the ability of the manager to exercise his influence positively in two
directions. That is upwards as a subordinate and downward as a leader. This
may help to develop good interaction and understanding between both the
manager and his subordinates. It encourages the subordinates' participation in
the decision-making process and achieves a compatible, healthy, supportive,
and friendly environment.44

9 Job-satisfaction is defined as the feelings an employee has about his or her
job.45

10 Conference is defined as a form of participation in managerial decision-
making which requires a face-to-face meeting. It is formed to exchange
views or pass on information which may or may not lead to a conclusion.
However, the conference may conclude that a particular decision would be a
good thing to do, but it does not decide or have the authority to make
decisions by itself.46

11 Committee "is a group of people appointed by some other, generally larger,
body or bodies to meet and discuss matters within some field of reference,
with a view to making group decisions or recommendations to the parent body
or bodies".47 Mondy et al (1990) defined this concept as, "a group of people

44 Ibid., p.216.
47 Anstey, E., 1963, p. 16.
assigned to work together to do something not included in their regular jobs".\textsuperscript{48}

In this study, a committee will be discussed as a technique for enabling subordinates to participate in the managerial decision making process. It requires a face-to-face meeting and is formed to exchange information and advice among its members. The members may come from different organisations, may be of a different status within the organisational hierarchy, may have different roles to play in their regular jobs, have different points of view, and be of a different socio-political persuasion. Most committees have specified duties and authority, and accordingly make recommendations or decisions on actions of some kind or another.

\textbf{Brainstorming} is "a technique used in the alternative generation phase of decision making that assists in the development of numerous alternative courses of action".\textsuperscript{49} Alex Osborn (1953), the major advocate of brainstorming, presented it as a technique designed for encouraging the participants' creative thinking.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) defined brainstorming as, "an unrestrained flow of ideas within a group, with all critical judgements suspended, in order to come up with possible solutions to a problem".\textsuperscript{51}

In this research, brainstorming is seen as a group decision-making technique which requires a face-to-face interaction. Each participant is asked to be as creative and imaginative as possible and to present ideas related to the topic under discussion without paying attention to their feasibility or practicality.

\textsuperscript{49} Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 508.
All ideas are recorded and no criticism or evaluation is allowed, to prevent inhibitions of creative participation. The criticism and evaluation process is delayed until the last member of the group has presented his or her ideas.

13 Nominal Group Technique (NGT) is, "an approach to decision making that involves ideas generation by group members, group interaction only to clarify ideas, member rankings of ideas presented and alternative selection by summing ranks".52

In the nominal group technique, participants meet together face-to-face but discussion or interpersonal communication between them is not allowed. During the meeting they act independently to minimise the effect of personal and inter-personal factors on the types of ideas or suggestions each participant might present.53

14 Delphi Method Technique is another participative decision-making technique which does not require a face-to-face meeting. But, rather, every member is required to express his or her ideas in writing and sends them to the co-ordinator who summarises them and returns the summary to the members. This process continues until an agreeable decision is reached. Harrison (1987) in his book 'The Managerial Decision-Making Process' stated that "The Delphi technique provides for the systematic solicitation and collection of judgements on a particular designed sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarised information and opinions derived from earlier responses".54

However, the Delphi technique is particularly designed for people who are geographically scattered, desirous of anonymity or do not want to meet face-to-face for group decision making because of extreme differences of opinion they may have about the decision problem. In addition, the size of the respondents group can be small or large. Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) pointed out that the group size can range from only a few to 140 participants.

15 **Autocratic Style (AI)** is a decision making style where the manager decides autocratically without the participation of his subordinates. This means that he alone makes the decision using his own information without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation.

16 **Semi-autocratic Style (AII)** is a decision making style where the manager decides autocratically with superficial involvement (participation) from his subordinates. He may or may not explain the problem to his subordinates. He asks them for file information but not for their opinions or suggestions. This means that he alone makes the final decision and he may or may not use such type of information.

17 **Semi-consultative Style (CI)** is a decision making style where the manager makes a prior consultation with each relevant subordinate individually and then decides. This means that, before the decision is taken, he meets with, explains the problem to the relevant subordinate(s) individually and asks each one for his or her advice and to generate or evaluate alternative decisions. He then makes the decision by himself. However, his final decision may or may not reflect the subordinate(s)' influence and opinions.

---

Consultative Style (CI) is a decision making style where the manager makes a prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then he decides. This means that the manager alone makes the final decision but, prior to this, he meets the relevant subordinates as a group in order to discuss the problem, so as to get their ideas and suggestions, and also to ask them to generate or evaluate alternative decisions. However, the final decision may or may not reflect the subordinates' influence and opinions. This style is the same as the previous one (CI), but the manager meets and consults with the relevant subordinates as a group.

Joint Decision Making Style (GII) is a decision making style where the manager joins the decision-making process with his subordinate(s) as a group. This means that the manager and his subordinate(s) together discuss, generate and evaluate alternatives until they both reach an agreeable decision. However, the final decision should reflect the group's influence on a majority basis.

Delegation Style (DI) -- Subordinates decide unilaterally but the manager is available when necessary. Here, the manager delegates the decision to his subordinates - "Do it your way and ask for help if required".57

Abdication Style (ABI) -- Subordinates decide unilaterally without any intervention from their manager. Here, the manager abdicates the decision to his subordinates - "Do it any way you like but don't ask for help if it goes wrong".58

57 Adair, J., 1988, p. 152.
58 Ibid.
This study is organised into nine chapters. The first chapter provides a brief introduction to the study, describes its rationale, states the problem to be examined, and outlines the purposes and objectives of the research. Then, discussion on the significance of the study and a set of managerial terminology and limitations that are important for a better understanding of the subject matters of this research are provided. Chapter Two summarises the ancient and the more recent managerial concepts and practices. It highlights the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making process together with how the ancient and then the more recent civilisations viewed this concept and how it was developed. This development is illustrated in Figure 2.1. Chapter Three reviews the major leadership theories, styles, and skills from the standpoint of managerial decision making. It also concentrates on how these theories and studies view the concept of participation in the decision-making process. Table 3.3 is an attempt to summarise some of the major leadership theories and their corresponding decision styles. Chapter Four covers some of the important concepts of management decision. It presents the decision's types, elements, methods, and process. Chapter Five is devoted to clarify the concept of participation in managerial decision making and to justify why participation is important for employees, both the subordinates and the managers. It reviews the definitions, classifications, justifications, and barriers of participation that were most often given by other writers and analysts in this field of study. It also underlines some of the major variables and techniques which may affect the practice of the participative approaches. Chapter Six describes the methodology used for the study, the research instruments, the sampling procedures, the methods for data collection and the technique for data analysis. Chapter Seven is devoted to the analysis and the findings of the questionnaire survey regarding the decision-making styles of the subject managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. It also examines the degree of their involvement in the process (stages) of making
programmed and non-programmed decisions. Finally, this chapter examines five of the major participative techniques that can be used to enable subordinate-managers to participate effectively in the decision-making process. The respondents were asked about their familiarity with, and practise, of these techniques and how useful they would be to them in their current jobs and organisations. Chapter Eight is a continuing part of the survey questionnaire analysis and findings. The data of this chapter was collected for the purpose of soliciting the respondents' actual attitudes regarding job-satisfaction and participative decision items. It is an examination of the importance of participation in making managerial decisions. Chapter Nine, the summary of findings and conclusions, outlines the major findings of the research project and offers policy recommendations together with suggestions for future research and studies.
CHAPTER TWO
EVALUATION OF MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING
THOUGHT AND PRACTICES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Extensive discussion regarding the development of human management and its theories and practices has taken place throughout history. A large number of books and articles have been written and research has been conducted and written. Therefore, from a human behavioural perspective, this chapter will comprise of brief discussion of managerial development thought rather than a detailed description of the whole development in this field. And it will highlight the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making process together with how been the ancient and then the more recent civilisations viewed this concept and how it was developed.

There can be no doubt, that from the first time of the existence of the human being on this planet, the individual practised an easy decision process which related to his basic needs and later on the needs of his family, his tribe, and so on. In times of the ancient civilisations, mostly in the uneducated societies, people usually had to face and solve their problems as they developed from the basis of their intuitions, whims, wishes and experiences, in fact by trial and error approaches. Hodge and Johnson (1970), mentioned that before the twentieth-century, managerial problems were faced as they developed on the basis of trial and error because there were no previous examples or knowledge on which to base a decision.1

However, the industrial revolution era and the twentieth-century's informational revolution created a new and complicated environment which produced a group of unpredictable and complex problems for management and also for the decision-

making process. This development began to create the necessary conditions for the systematic study of management. From 1900, the principles of management and decision-making began to be developed as a set of concepts and ideas and later on as written theories in the field of management thought.\(^2\) Moreover, this managerial development established the pre-conditions for modern management theories which must be based on rational ways of making decisions. The organisations could no longer be managed on the whims and wishes of the few or the individual.\(^3\)

2.2 ANCIENT MANAGERIAL CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES

Some of the managerial concepts and ideas which were considered to have been developed by twentieth century managerial theorists in fact existed and were practised by many ancient civilisations thousands of years ago. Hodge and Johnson (1970), noted that the conceptual evolution of management theories was established on what had come before.\(^4\) These ancient civilisations knew and practised similar concepts and ideas of modern management but not necessarily by name. Leadership, delegation, span of management, controlling, organising, and planning are managerial practices which can be found amongst the ancient civilisations.\(^5\) Bowditch and Buono (1994) said, “the ancient Egyptians were aware of the importance of planning, organising, and the span of managerial control, Socrates discussed the universality of management principles, and Plato described work specialisation.”\(^6\)

Gager (1960) wrote and discussed many of the managerial concepts and ideas that were practised a long time ago. He said “We are unable to grasp the fact that what we are utilising today are ideas which came into being 200 or 2000 or even more

\(^2\) Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 158.
\(^3\) Wren, D.A., 1994, p.33.
years ago, ideas which, at the time of their invention or inception, were advanced and elaborated by one individual or by more ..... but a few and then spread slowly. New learners in a later generation found new light or caught a richer vision and a fuller meaning in an old idea and felt its potentialities. Not infrequently the result was heralded as a new discovery. It often was an enlargement or better adaptation of an old idea or concept.7

It is difficult to trace exactly the step-by-step development in the practices of management thought throughout the history of ancient civilisations. So, for the purpose of this study, this part will present only examples from some of the most famous ancient civilisations together with a brief description of their managerial thought. All of the managerial principles which were practised by these ancient civilisations will not be covered, but the concentration will be on the managerial ideas and principles that related most particularly to the decision-making process and how these civilisations viewed and practised the decision process, together with the participative management principle.

2.2.1 The Near East Civilisations

In the near east, as early as 3,000 BC, the concepts of authority and power and the making of decisions were practised and gradually developed. At the family level, authority and decisions were practised and controlled by the patriarch or the matriarch. However, at the national level there was conflict between secular leaders and religious leaders.9 The Sumerian civilisations in Mesopotamia, (in the area which is now called Iraq), practised some of the principles of management, i.e. planning, division of labour, supervision, and hierarchy structure. This ancient civilisation also practised a kind of participative management by developing the

concept of a corporation, which consisted of a group of temples under a common body of management handling daily problems.\textsuperscript{10}

As a result of a struggle between the secular leaders and the religious leaders, Babylonian civilisation developed the idea of a divine king. One such divine king was Hammurabi (2123 - 2081 BC). He prepared the first great code of 285 laws which were arranged to manage his Kingdom's business, trade, commerce, labour, personal relations, and many other social subjects.\textsuperscript{11} Therefore, in order to manage their trade, commerce and business dealing, the Babylonians practised a kind of participative management by developing and practising the idea of associations or unions which they called "tribes" or guilds. These guilds were composed of experts and non-expert businessmen who shared common interests or purposes and who advised and consulted each other. Gager (1960) said "as early as Hammurabi, industry was organised into guilds (called tribes) of masters and apprentices".\textsuperscript{12}

2.2.2 The Far East Civilisation

The ancient Chinese civilisation practised several managerial principles a long time ago. In the time of the Chinese Emperor Great Shun (2200 BC) the governor had nine advisors whom he consulted on a host of managerial matters, one of which was decision-making. This committee of advisors also supplied the governor with reports and information which helped him when making his decisions. Moreover, there was a committee of three members whose responsibility was to investigate how the administrators practised their decisions and how improvements could be made in the effectiveness of management.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, pp. 51-52.
\textsuperscript{13} Kanan, N., 1985, pp. 25-26.
\end{flushleft}
The Chinese general, Sun Tzu, (600 BC) encouraged the exchange of views and calculations amongst his leaders before going into a battle. He said, "Thus do many calculations lead to victory, and few calculations to defeat". Also, in the battlefield where there is no time for debate, Sun Tzu made strategic decision rules for his leaders to follow: "if our forces are ten to the enemy's one, to surround him; if five to one, to attack him; if twice as numerous, to divide our army into two, one to meet the enemy in front and one to fall upon his rear ....; if equally matched, we can offer battle; if slightly inferior in number, we can avoid the enemy; if quite unequal in every way, we can flee from him".

Kanan (1985) mentioned that Confucius (552 - 479 BC), one of the greatest Chinese philosophers, recommended and urged the leader to consult his followers, to put into his mind their ideas and recommendations, and to encourage them to provide him with their different ideas before he made any decisions or solved any problems. It is clear that Confucius was aware of the importance of what is now known as managerial participation in the decision-making process and understood how this participation would reflect positively on the acceptance and execution of such decisions.

In an ancient Indian civilisation, Chanakya Kautilya (ca. 332 - 298 BC) can be thought of as the founder of Indian public administration. Kautilya said, "Never listen to just one or two". Wren (1994) noted that Kautilya wrote about some managerial principles, for example the concept of the use of staff advisors, the characteristics of administrators, the job descriptions for various offices, how to select personnel through interviews with the checking of references, and how to

---

16 Kanan, N., 1985, p.27.
18 Ibid, p.15.
establish departments with directors.\textsuperscript{19} In fact, we might say that Kautilya's writings support and strengthen the idea of consultation and participation in the managerial decision-making process.

\subsection{2.2.3 The Ancient Egyptian}

The ancient Egyptian civilisation knew and practised several managerial principles such as centralisation, planning, training, job description, reporting, planning decisions, and participating in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{20} Also, there are signs that they were aware of the span of controlled managerial concepts in which each manager can supervise ten persons.\textsuperscript{21}

The Egyptians (ca. 1750 BC) used one of their oldest words to describe one who was knowledgeable and who had practised special managerial skills, relating the knowledge to his work office. This is the term vizier. Wren (1994), said that “the office of vizier was an ancient office of director, organiser, co-ordinator, and decision-maker”.\textsuperscript{22}

The Pharaoh, the ruler of ancient Egypt, delegated some of his authority to his vizier and he consulted him when making decisions and solving problems. So, the vizier made economic and social decisions, and he provided the king with the advice, consultations, reports, or information that he might need in his work or when making decisions. Joseph, one of the best known viziers to Pharaoh, dealt with and made decisions which related to temporal matters. The spiritual matters were left in the hands of the Pharaoh.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p.15.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Kanan, N., 1985, pp. 22-24; and Bowditch, J.L and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.9.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Wren, D.A., 1994, p.16.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Ibid, p.16.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid, p.16.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Rakhaera (ca. 1587 - 1320 BC) was a famous vizier to Pharaoh. One of his duties as a vizier was to assign and choose a committee of four responsible investigators who had to provide him with three annual reports, together with further advice and recommendations. Furthermore, he always consulted them when making decisions or solving problems. Also, in the time (640 - 323 BC), the Egyptian administration knew and used a system of public government which we now call city councils. The members of these councils debated and discussed all the matters of concern regarding their city and tried to come up with the right decisions. These examples illustrate the idea of how ancient the concept of managerial participation in decision-making is.

2.2.4 The Ancient Hebrews

The Hebrews (1300 BC) recognised the need for leadership, delegation, division of responsibility, planning, organising, controlling, span of management, consultation and the seeking of decisions at the highest levels only for those problems which were the most difficult (management by exception).

With regard to the concepts of decision-making and participation, Hebrews employed what we now call management consultants and management by exception. The Bible reports that Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, advised Moses to: ".....choose able men from all over Israel and make them judges over the people --- thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. They were constantly available to administer justice. They brought the most difficult cases to Moses but judged the smaller matters themselves" (Living Bible, Exod, 18: 25-26).

Also, Hodge and Johnson (1970) noted that the date of the scalar process as a managerial principle goes back to ancient times, as Mooney and Reiley discussed and quoted from the Bible: “And

---

Moses chose able men ..... and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." (Exodus XVIII: 25:26). In fact, if there are discussions and a chance for the interchange of views and ideas between managers, counsellors, or administrators, the decisions can reach their objectives and achieve their organisation's goals. So, the Bible tells: “Without deliberation, plans come to nothing, where counsellors are many, plans succeed” (Prov. 15:22) The Bible also states: “Where there are many hands, lock things up” (Eccles. 42: 6-7).28

However, this indicated that a simpler record of the scalar process, delegation of authority, division of responsibility, managing and deciding by exception, and management consultation were recognised and applied a long time ago.29

2.2.5 The Ancient Greece

Ancient Greece (800 BC) recognised the value of the individual, the scientific method for problem solving, and how individualism can provide and provoke different responses to the same idea or situation.30 This civilisation also knew and practised several managerial concepts, such as centralisation, decentralisation, division of labour, delegation of authority, synergism, and leadership.31

Aristotle (384 - 322 BC), in his politics, discussed many managerial principles some of which were related to the concept of group participation in managerial decisions in order to report and thus strengthen the ideas gained from consultation and other forms of participation in the managerial decision-making process. This relates to the

“synergy” concept where there will be interaction and discussion between managers and employees in order that their combined efforts and decisions will be of greater help than that of an individual's efforts and decisions; Aristotle said, "The whole is naturally superior to the part".32

In addition, the ancient Greeks established a new managerial practice in their city government — the polis. The polis's members have the right to offer their ideas and to be heard by other members. So they developed the practice of the early managerial participation concept when solving problems or making decisions. From the polis's practices, the Greeks provided positive examples and good evidence of the value of consultation and consultative supervision.33 In fact, we can think of this development as a simple attempt at managerial participation in the decision-making process and in participative management.

Wren (1994) said that, “the age of Greece illustrates the first seeds of democracy, the advent of a decentralised participatory government, the first attempts to establish individual liberty, the beginning of the scientific method for problem solving.”34

2.2.6 The Ancient Romans and the Catholic Church

The ancient Romans provided numerous examples of effective management. They knew and practised as did other ancient civilisations, many similar managerial concepts and principles such as the rules of ten, chain of command, hierarchy structure, hierarchy of authority, centralisation, decentralisation of authority and

responsible, job description, participative management, consultative management, and the use of independent advisors.\textsuperscript{35} 

The Romans also made important contributions to early management thought (ca. 50 BC).\textsuperscript{36} Some of their significant events were the decentralisation of authority and sharing the practice of managing rural governments. Gager (1960) mentioned that Romans established decentralised government and that their “provincial governments were headed by two men of approximately equal power”.\textsuperscript{37} Therefore, the two governors would participate and share management as well as the decision-making process.

The Roman army followed the “rules of ten” in which each ten soldiers, thirty soldiers, one hundred soldiers, three hundred soldiers, and one thousand soldiers had a leader. Also, the Roman church was organised on the basis of a hierarchy structure. The Bishops became heads of several local churches. By the third century AD, some bishops became more equal than others and an organised hierarchy was more apparent with additional levels of authority and responsibility.\textsuperscript{38} Thus, we can say that the Romans established units to perform certain tasks as well as a hierarchy of authority to ensure performance.

Diocletian (ca. 284 AD), one of the most famous Roman emperors, recognised the need for the reorganisation of his empire. He abandoned the old structure, in which all rural governors reported directly to him, and he created a new hierarchy with more levels of administrators. By this managerial development and with the participation of his administrators, the emperor became more able to effectively manage his huge empire.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36} Gager, C.H., 1960, p.70.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, p.58.
\textsuperscript{39} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p.30.
The Roman Catholic Church provided limited contributions to the early practice of participative management as well as to the concept of participation in the decision-making process. The Roman Catholic Church encouraged the use of the job description concept, in which everyone's duties were clear and a chain of command was created. Also, the church encouraged and developed the use of consultation management principles and of independent advisors. So, before making any kind of decision, the decision-maker was required to consult other leaders and ask for their advice and recommendations. Finally, the church used independent advisors to give the best advice to the church workers without any fear of retaliation from them.40

2.2.7 The Ancient Islamic Arab Civilisation

According to Dhohayan (1990), the ancient Islamic Arab civilisation knew and practised several management functions more than fourteen centuries ago, i.e. planning, organising, commanding, and controlling.41

In regard to the decision-making concept, Alnemer and others (1991) mentioned that the Islamic Arab civilisation recognised and exercised several managerial principles such as centralisation, decentralisation, labour division, merit system, delegation of authority, training, incentives system, and participation in the decision-making process.42 Kannan (1985) wrote that this civilisation knew and practised the consultative management, the participative management, and participation in the decision-making process concepts.43

43 Kanan, N., 1985, pp. 34-35.
In his first Islamic government (circa. 580 AD), Prophet Mohammad, as a leader of his government, practised the Shura* principle in order to solve problems or make decisions, and he asked his followers to do so. By seeking advice from his followers and by asking them to participate in solving problems and making decisions, we can say that the Prophet Mohammad practised a kind of participative management as well as the concept of participation in the decision-making process. He used to have a consultative group which was composed of fourteen members. He consulted these members in all administrative matters, decisions, and government affairs.44

In fact, the ancient Islamic civilisation provided numerous examples of effective management and its principles a long time ago. The Qur'an** and Sunna*** asks all Muslims to practice consultation principles in all aspects and matters of their lives, solving problems, and making decisions. If the solution to a problem can be found in either the Qur'an or the Sunna, then there is no need for any inter-personal consultation. If not, the consultation should take place and be practised by all Muslims whoever they are.

Qur'an*, the Muslims' holy book, in the Saura**** 42 verse 38 told us, more than fourteen centuries ago, that Moslems (governors, leaders, managers, employees, individuals, or whoever they are) should conduct and manage their affairs by consultation. By translating the meaning of verse 159 in the Saura 3 of the Qur'an, Al-hilali and Khan (1989) wrote, “Because of the Mercy of Allâh, you (Profit Mohammed as the leader) dealt with them (the followers) gently. And were you severe, harsh-hearted, they would have broken away from about you; so pass over

---

* Shura = One of the Islamic government roles (consultation).


** Qur'an = Muslems' Holy Book which is in the words of Allâh

*** Sunna = The words of Prophet Mohammad - the Massengere of Allâh to Muslem people.

**** Saura = Chapter.
(their faults) and ask for forgiveness for them; and consult them in the affair. Then when you have taken a decision, put your trust in Allâh, ... etc." From the meaning of this verse, it is understandable that Qur'an told Muslim people whoever they are that consultation should take place before making a decision and before a matter becomes clear. After the consultation or when the matter becomes clear the leader should make his decision without any hesitation and put his trust in God (Allah).

Moreover, the Qur'an and the Sunna orders each individual Muslim to give his advice and counsel to others, whatever is their position. Even if the others do not ask for this advice, it must be given. The advisor will then be rewarded by Allâh for his obedience. So whenever a Muslim sees anything wrong, he must sensitively and gradually follow one of three steps: first, he must do his best to change and solve the problem by using his hands and all practical means. Secondly, if he cannot do this, he must speak out to tell everybody about the problem and discuss how it might be solved. Finally, if it is impossible to do this, he must keep the matter in his heart and be aware of it, which is the least a good Muslim can do.

2.3 LATER MANAGERIAL THEORIES AND PRACTICES

Prior to the end of the nineteenth century and into the beginning of the twentieth century, there was little systematic studies and research into the evolution of management. These earlier attempts discussed some managerial concepts and principles such as organisational structure, the division of labour, and the importance of machinery to facilitate labour. For instance, Adam Smith (1776) was an economist and pioneer who planted the seeds of later management theories. In his
book, 'An Inquiry into the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations', he emphasised the division of labour and the importance of proper machinery to facilitate labour which became the base for the later assembly-line managerial concept.\textsuperscript{49}

However, both the Industrial Revolution in Europe and in the United States with the twentieth century developments brought a new view of management functions and principles to people, and established the need for a rational formalised, and systematic body of knowledge on how to manage and solve organisational problems, in order to make managerial decisions. Bowditch and Buono (1994) state that, "Towards the end of the nineteenth century and into the beginning of the twentieth century, the social, economic, and technical environment began to create the necessary conditions for the systematic study of management. An Industrial Revolution, initiated by the inventions and technological improvements of the eighteenth century, led to change not only in the work role, but in the very nature of our society as well.\textsuperscript{50}

Hodgetts (1990) mentioned that the industrialisation era created many challenges and problems for management. It, also, brought into play rational, scientific principles for managing workers, materials, money, and machinery.\textsuperscript{51} In addition, Wren (1994) noted that modern management had to be based upon rational ways of making decisions; no longer could the decisions be made on the basis of a few individuals and their sudden ideas, wishes, or whims.\textsuperscript{52}

Twentieth century development in management thought can not be credited to any one person alone. Some of the concepts and principles have been developed from

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{50} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.7.
\textsuperscript{51} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p.60.
\textsuperscript{52} Wren, D.A., 1994, pp. 33, 102.
ancient civilisations, others have been developed through business practices or from the ideas of academic writers and theorists. For instance, Frederick W. Taylor who had a great impact on the development of scientific management, did not claim that he was the originator of this development. Taylor said, "everyone of us realises that this has been the work of 100 men or more, and that the work which any one of us may have done is but a small fraction of the whole."5

Currently, there are many managerial ideas and theories which were developed during the early and near past of the twentieth century. Writers categorised these theories in various ways and by different names. The most famous classifications of management now widely accepted among practitioners and writers are the following: Classical Management Approach, Neo-classical Management approach, and Modern Management approach.54 Each one of these three approaches is based on different assumptions about the work, the behaviour of workers, the types of problems emphasised, the solutions and decisions used, and some other variables.

The following sections will present briefly these three approaches of management thought and their major theories. This is to determine how the understanding of them may help managers and subordinates to analyse managerial problems, how to make perfect decisions, and also to indicate how each theory has contributed to the development of the managerial decision-making process in general and the subordinate's participation in the decision-making process in particular.

2.3.1 The Classical Management Approach

The classical approach to management thought, sometimes known as the traditional approach, was developed during the nineteenth century and into the beginning of the


twentieth century. By this time it was influenced by a wide movement of social, economic, and technological factors.\textsuperscript{55} The classical approach, which focuses on the task of managing work and organisation,\textsuperscript{56} is certainly a vast area of study on which much research, and many books and articles have been written in order to describe both the task and the practices. The classical approach offered a variety of managerial viewpoints, ideas, and theories.

Writers classified the theories of the Classical Management approach into three categories. These categories are: Bureaucracy, Scientific Management theory, and Administrative Management theory. These three theories share many similar characteristics, such as order and rationality and were developed concurrently by separate groups of theorists. Mainly developments were done by Weber, Taylor, and Fayol who came from Germany, the United States, and France sequentially.\textsuperscript{57}

Hellriegel and Slocum (1989) noted that the classical or traditional management approach was the oldest viewpoint of the twentieth century's management thought. They state, "It is split into three main branches: bureaucratic, scientific, and administrative management. All three emerged during the same general period - the late 1800s through the early 1900s."\textsuperscript{58} Hicks and Gullett (1975) said, "the Scientific Management theory developed during nearly the same time as bureaucracy and administrative management theory which was about 1900".\textsuperscript{59} Moreover, Hodge and Johnson (1970) mentioned that the four major significant characteristics and principles of management and organisation as viewed by the classical writers were, division of labour, structure, scalar and functional process, and span of control."\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{55} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{57} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, pp. 126, 138.
\textsuperscript{58} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1989, p.38.
\textsuperscript{59} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p.176.
\textsuperscript{60} Hodge, B.J. and H.J. Johnson, 1970, pp. 24-27.
The following parts highlight in brief these three classical theories with a special focus on some of the elements and principles which might be associated with the decision-making process, and considers the managers' and subordinates' participation in the decision-making process as viewed by these theories.

2.3.1.1 Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy, sometimes known as machine model or organisation without persons, was developed by sociologists whose interest was to increase the effectiveness and the productivity of management and organisation.61 One of the main founders of this theory was Max Weber (1864-1920), a German sociologist who discerned the basic elements that characterise a normative model of bureaucracy.62 This model was work oriented and saw individuals as part of their machines.

According to Weber's model, bureaucratic management is an orderly system that emphasises rules and regulations, hierarchical structure, legal authority and power, specialisation, impersonality, rationality, predictability, uniformity, and stability.63 However, this type of bureaucracy is an ideal model that is often only partially met within reality.64 Hicks and Gullett (1975) said, "Typically an organisation uses some, but not all, of these elements. Thus, an organisation usually is only partly bureaucratic; the degree of bureaucracy in it depends upon the extent to which it contains the elements of bureaucracy."65

In a bureaucracy, decisions are made through an orderly system of impersonal rules, regulations, and procedures. Power and authority are delegated downward. Thus, the basic level of management employees are under the control of a higher

---

64 Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p.131.
65 Ibid., p. 134.
supervisor. Each supervisor is under the control of a higher superior. Each manager is responsible to his superior for his and his subordinates' work and decisions.66 Hellriegel and Slocum (1989) discussed the characteristics of bureaucratic management and they said, "Jobs are ranked vertically in the organisation by the amount of authority (the right to make a decision) given to each position. Typically, power and authority increase through each level up to the top of the hierarchy. Each lower level position is under the control and direction of a higher level position."67

Max Weber mentioned three types of authority structure that both supervisors and subordinates must be aware of when making or applying a decision. The first, traditional authority, happens when subordinates obey the decision maker, as a leader, based on tradition or custom. The second one, charismatic authority, is when subordinates comply with their supervisor's decisions because of his personal abilities, qualities and skills. Finally, rational legal authority, occurs when subordinates comply with their supervisor's decisions simply because of his rank and position in the organisation, his behaviour, and to some extent the employees' acceptance of the organisation's rules and regulations.68

However, bureaucracy as a normative model suffers from unanticipated negative effects such as rigidity, inflexibility, impersonality, and anxiety.69 These unanticipated negative effects slow the decision-making process and cause a delay in handling and solving employees' complaints which may lead to serious and complicated problems.70 Bureaucracy, also, ignores individuals, who in fact are very important factors in the managerial decision-making process. They are

66 Ibid., pp. 129, 131, 134.
68 Ibid., p. 41.
regarded as lazy and inactive factors, so bureaucracy sometimes is called a machine model or organisation without persons.\textsuperscript{71}

However, there is no doubt that bureaucracy is an important concept and its principles and assumptions have significant effects on the development of management and organisation. But considering these previous views, it is clear that the theory of an ideal bureaucracy does not motivate subordinates to participate enthusiastically in the decision-making process. Instead, it controls and slows the decision-making process by a system of rules, regulations, and unforeseen negative effects. In fact, this orderly system and the unanticipated negative effects will make subordinates work under pressure, feel wary, and lose enthusiasm in participating effectively in the decision-making process. This seems obvious as they do not have incentives to encourage them to do so.

2.3.1.2 Scientific Management Theory

Scientific management is the name given to the practice of scientific principles. It includes techniques and methods of analysis together with problem solving so as to improve efficiency and achieve systematisation in management.\textsuperscript{72} This theory is sometimes called the traditional school or Taylorism, which refers to Frederick W. Taylor (1856-1915) who did most to develop this theory. He is often known as the father of Scientific Management movement.\textsuperscript{73}

Scientific Management Theory was work-oriented and saw the individuals as an extension of their machines.\textsuperscript{74} It concentrated on production, measurement, structure, and management effectiveness. It was concerned with the work itself, not

\textsuperscript{71} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 145.
\textsuperscript{72} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{74} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1989, p. 47.
upon the worker doing the work.\textsuperscript{75} Moorhead and Griffin (1992) wrote, "Early management theories, such as those of the scientific management school, advocated a clear separation between the duties of managers and workers; management was to make the decisions, and employees were to implement them."\textsuperscript{76}

In general, this scientific development was the result of efforts of many contributors previously. Their efforts made an opening for Taylor and his followers to make important contributions. These later contributions led to an expansion in the influence of the scientific management movement. Hicks and Gullett (1975) said, "As early as 1795, systematic management techniques were being used in the Soho Engineering Foundry in Great Britain by Boulton and Watt."\textsuperscript{77} In England, almost a half century prior to Taylor's scientific management movement, Charles Babbage (1832) discussed the principles of a scientific approach to business management. Joseph Slater Lewis, also, at this time, analysed some of the principles and elements of industrial management in Great Britain.\textsuperscript{78}

However, the essential development which gave this movement its scientific framework and in which management appeared as a field of study per se, was around 1900.\textsuperscript{79} The most famous founder in this theory was Frederick Winslow Taylor. He made major contributions to management thinking in general and to scientific management in particular. Taylor (1911) developed his philosophy of management and this included four basic principles of scientific management. These principles are:

1. The development of the one-best-way approach to achieve work tasks. The one-best-way approach was developed to replace the rule of thumb method

\textsuperscript{75} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{76} Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p.506.
\textsuperscript{77} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 178.
\textsuperscript{78} Gager, C.H., 1960, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{79} Mondy, R.W. and Others, 1990, p.29.
and other previous methods regarded as no longer satisfactory management and decision-making practice.

2. The scientific selection and the education and development of individuals in order for them to perform their assigned work, to the best of their ability.

3. The encouragement of co-operation and interaction between management and individuals instead of the old managerial individualism method.

4. The equal division of labour and clarification of the responsibility between the management and individuals.\textsuperscript{80}

However, Henry L. Gantt (1861-1919), Frank (1868-1924) and Lillian (1878-1972), Gilbreth, Harrington Emerson (1853-1931), and many others were pioneers in this scientific movement, each of whom became famous in their own right.\textsuperscript{81} Their work to some extent, was agreeable and consistent with that of Taylor, as each tried to achieve the one best way approach to do a job. For instance, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth focused on principles of work simplification. Henry Gantt focused on the principles of work scheduling. Harrington Emerson focused on principles of work efficiency.\textsuperscript{82} Those scientific management's pioneers believed that there was only one-best-way to achieve jobs or to make decisions. They used motion-and-time study to find out the best and cheapest way of achieving work, increasing productivity, and of making workers more efficient.\textsuperscript{83}

In regard to the decision-making process, the Scientific Management Theory views individuals as rational and economic human beings who are capable of considering all decisions and options. Also of being able to select the one-best-decision and

\textsuperscript{80} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{81} Donnelly, J.H. and Others, 1984, pp. 84-86; and Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 187.
\textsuperscript{82} Donnelly, J.H. and Others, 1984, pp. 85-86.
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option that would maximise the output.\textsuperscript{84} It provides a logical method for analysing problems and for making decisions. Henry Gantt believed that scientific managers should make their decisions by using scientific methods, not by opinions.\textsuperscript{85} Mondy and Others (1990) said, "Instead of guessing or relying solely on trial and error, management could go through the logical process of scientific research to develop answers to business problems."\textsuperscript{86} This scientific method as they, also, said consists of, "defining the problem, gathering the data, analysing the data, developing alternatives, and selecting the best alternative."\textsuperscript{87} Moreover, this theory, to some extent, encourages managers and subordinates to interact with each other and participate in the decision-making process. For instance, there can be found in Taylor's scientific management elements and principles the application of cooperation not individualism and of rationality not personality in managerial decisions and practices.\textsuperscript{88} Thus, subordinates' participation in the decision-making process should take place in order to apply these two principles successfully. Morrise L. Cooke, a scientific management pioneer, urged the participation of every worker in order to find the one-best-way to perform work.\textsuperscript{89} The intention is to reduce the random factors, the use of the rule-of-thumb method, the use of the trial and error method, and of personality factors in the managerial decision-making process so as to achieve the best decisions leading to the greatest output.

2.3.1.3 Administrative Management Theory

The third component of the classical approach to management thought is Administrative Management theory. It is sometimes known as the Universal Principles Theory of Management.\textsuperscript{90}
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Administrative Management Theory has developed significantly since the early 1900s. It was evolved by practical men of action many of whom were practising managers. Some of these primary contributors to this development are: Henri Fayol (1841-1925), James D. Mooney (1884-1957), Chester I. Barnard (1886-1961), Lundall Urwick (1891-1984), Luther Gulick (1892-1993), and others.

However, the administrative theory is a normative model which focuses on the formal structure of an organisation. It is also concerned with finding the one-best-way to achieve its objectives in order to solve managerial problems, and to make ideal decisions. One of its significant contributions to management development thought is the study of management as a set of functions and principles.

In 1916, Henri Fayol, the most well-known theorist of this movement, made one of his greatest contributions to management development by identifying the basic functions and principles of management. He described the duties and activities of administrators when handling their jobs. He identified the five basic functions of management as planning, organising, commanding employees, co-ordinating activities, and controlling performance.

However, Fayol believed that these management's functions can be accomplished through the application of 14 management principles. These principles are: division of work, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of management, subordination of the individual's interests to the general interest,

96 Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.11.
remuneration of staff, centralisation, scalar chain and the gangplank principle, order, equity and justice, stability of staff, initiative, and esprit de corps or the team work.97

In 1936, Luther Gulick described seven management functions in one acronym POSDCORB. This acronym stands for planning, organising, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting.98 In 1938, Chester Barnard discussed the functions of management and he wrote a book which he called, *The Functions of the Executive*. Barnard believed that the most significant function of the administrator is to motivate co-operation and communication between the employees and management.99 In 1947, James D. Mooney tried to find out the principles of organisation. According to Mooney, there are four principles of organisation. These include: co-ordination, authority, leadership, and specialisation.100

In regard to the decision-making process, the Administrative Management Theory, as a normative model, focuses upon finding and practising the one best universal formula of management functions and principles in order to make ideal decisions, solve complex problems, and achieve objectives.101 In order to be a successful managerial decision-maker, Fayol believed that managers must understand the five basic functions of management and apply the Fourteenth managerial principles to them. These principles would guide the thinking of managers when resolving problems and making decisions.102

However some of the functions and principles of this theory, in one way or another, and to some extent, motivate the interaction and co-operation between managers and subordinates. In fact, participation in the decision-making process is an effect of

---

100 Donnelly, J.H. and Others, 1984, p. 90.
such interaction. For example, the initiatives and the esprit de corps principles are both encouraging subordinates to participate in the managerial decision-making process in order to achieve their creative objectives and team cohesiveness. The principle of co-ordination aims to cover all the factors necessary in an organisation where people are working together to achieve the organisation's objectives. The subordinates are one aspect of the factors, so this management principle, also, motivates subordinates to interact and to participate in the decision-making process. Hodgetts (1990) noted that co-ordination, one of Fayol’s management functions, provides the base for unity and harmony that is needed to achieve management's goals. He said, "One way of accomplishing this, was through regular meetings of managers and subordinates. If this function were properly implemented, everything would flow smoothly."\(^{103}\)

### 2.3.2 Neo-classical Management Approach

The next movement of management thought was the Neo-classical Management approach which is sometimes called the human relations movement.\(^ {104}\) This approach was developed mostly during the mid-1920s and early 1950s.\(^ {105}\)

As early as the 1920s, a number of neo-classical pioneers began to argue that as accomplishing management works are achieved by and through individuals, the management theorists must focus on individuals and upon human interactions between them and their managers.\(^ {106}\) Therefore, the Hawthorne experiments were started in 1924. At that time and also later the neo-classicists recognised the need to develop or change some earlier concepts and principles of the Classical Management approach so as to adjust to the growing awareness of the complexities of human

\(^ {103}\) Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p.41.
\(^ {104}\) Ibid., p. 192.
\(^ {106}\) Ibid., p. 15.
interactions. Early in the 1930s, the Hawthorne experiments were completed and as a result the human relations movement was born. This approved of the existence of the work group inside the formal organisation and justified the importance of its influence on the worker and on his productivity.

However, this approach introduced a behavioural and a human relations element into management thought. The neo-classicists whose focus was on interaction and the relations within the work groups established the human relation theory. And, those whose emphasis was on the individuals behaviour established the behavioural theory.

The most influential exponent of the human relations movement, however, was Elton Mayo (1880-1949). He made a major contribution by carrying out the Hawthorne experiments circa 1928 to 1932. Mary P Follett (1868-1933) and Chester I. Barnard (1886-1961), also contributed positively in this movement. Other important figures in the behavioural movement, in the 1950s, were Abraham Maslow, Rensis Likert, Chris Argris, and Frederick Herzberg, all of whom made a significant contribution to the behaviour viewpoint of management. Herbert Simon, in the 1950s, introduced his managerial decision-making model. This model contributed to the award to him of the 1979 Nobel Prize in Economics. In his model, Simon expressed his belief that an individuals rationality has limitations and that he or she chooses what seems to be the satisfactory decision rather than seeking

---

110 Ibid., pp. 15-16.
the maximal alternatives so as to maximise the decisions output which had been the previous intention of the classical management approach.115

In general, the neo-classical management approach is worker-oriented,116 focused upon the social needs and human factors of the individual and upon the influence of the work group on the quality and quantity of his work performance.117 It's emphasis was on the feelings of the individual, his acceptance within his work group, and on his participation in the decision-making process.118 Hicks and Gullett (1975) said, "the Hawthorne experiments demonstrated that: regarding people as people may be as important for productivity as rest periods, physical working conditions, or even money."119 Miles (1965) said, "As the worker makes use of the subordinates' experiences, insights, and creative abilities, the overall quality of decision making and performance will improve."120 Moreover, neo-classical theorists challenged the economic person concept. Instead, they believed in the social person concept. So, rather than viewing workers as similar to each other and only motivated by economic incentives, they believed that workers are different from each other and motivated by many incentives. Also, that the work group and other social factors are very important to them and affect their work performance.121 Wren (1994) said, "the social person was born late in the scientific management era but did not achieve any large degree of recognition until the 1930s."122

In regard to participation in the decision-making process, Hawthorne's researchers themselves were practising a sort of participative management by asking the workers for their feelings and opinions about their work group and responding positively to

118 Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 204.
119 Ibid., p. 196.
121 Bowditch, J.L. and A.F Buono, 1994, p. 15.
their answers: "Before every change of programme, the group is consulted. Their comments are listened to and discussed; sometimes their objections are allowed to negate a suggestion. The group unquestionably develop a sense of participation.......

Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "the interpretation of the productivity increases at the Hawthorne plant as resulting from workers' participation in decision making would make the relay assembly room the birthplace of modern-day participative management." Brannen (1983) indicated that Hawthorne studies emphasised that employees should not be thought of as isolated individuals who act in a calculative way in relation to work simply to increase income, but rather as social animals who are influenced in their behaviour by interaction with other employees---especially their immediate work team---and by the formal interaction they enter into with management, especially their immediate managers.

The work of the neo-classicists, however, encouraged managers to allow communication from the bottom-up, as well as from the top-down and to motivate subordinates to participate in the decision-making process to help them to eliminate conflict, minimise resistance to change, and achieve organisational goals. Elton Mayo, a major contributor in this movement, said, "much can be gained by carrying personal consideration to the lowest level of management." Miles (1965) said that, "involving subordinates in the communication and decision-making process will help them in satisfying their needs for belonging and for individual recognition." Mary P. Follett believed that the involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process will create a healthy managerial environment and a good

relationship with managers. Chester Barnard, also urged managers to establish a
good communication system, promote employees efforts, and discuss matters and
decisions with subordinates.

Moreover, the neo-classical writers mentioned three basic elements of this approach.
These basics are: individual, work group, and participation in the decision-making
process in which subordinates discuss with managers and influence decisions that
affect them. The neo-classicists believe that every subordinate can develop his
organisation in general, and his work in particular if he participates at least in
decisions relating to his work. However, Miles (1965) in his comparison between
human relations movement and human resources philosophy said, "The manager
should be willing to explain his or her plans to the subordinates and discuss any
objections they might have. On routine matters, he or she should encourage
participation by them in the planning and decision-making process." He also said,
"The manager should allow participation in important matters as well as routine
ones. In fact, the more important the decision, the more vigorously he or she should
attempt to involve the subordinates."

2.3.3 Modern Management Approach

The third major movement in management thought is the Modern Management
approach, sometimes called system analysis of organisation.
Although some contributions and concepts relating to this movement were made earlier, World War II was identified as the real start of the development of modern management approach.\textsuperscript{136} During that time, the British gathered a team of professionals to consider and deal with wartime problems. These professionals developed the first operations research group. This helped to diagnose complex systems problems that could not be solved by using intuition or from experience.\textsuperscript{137} Research in this field increased rapidly during the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, expanding the theories and the assumptions of modern management approach.\textsuperscript{138} As writers began to recognise the mutual influence of classical and neo-classical elements of organisations, they recognised also the effects of the internal organisational components and the external environmental forces. By this recognition, some managerial concepts such as system, mathematical and quantitative models, and integration ideas began to dominate managerial and organisational theories.\textsuperscript{139}

However, this approach was developed and founded by those theorists and writers who did not fit into classical or neo-classical management approaches.\textsuperscript{140} According to Hicks and Gullett (1975), the main contributor to modern management theories was Ludwig von Bertalanfly who introduced a general system theory in the early 1950s, which is extensively known as the philosophical base of modern theories.\textsuperscript{141} Other important figures in the modern management movement were Trist (1951), Bamford (1951), Emery (1960), and Rice (1963) who believed that both technology and work groups must be included for better understanding of managerial and organisational system.\textsuperscript{142} Katz and Kahan (1964) and Miller and Rice (1967) were

\textsuperscript{136} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{139} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{140} Hodge, B.J. and H.J. Johnson, 1970, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{141} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 212.
\textsuperscript{142} Mondy, R.W. and Others, 1990, p. 43.
also pioneers in developing systems theory. Lupton (1971), Burns and Stalker (1961), Lawrence and Larsch (1967), Woodward (1965), and Perrow (1970) were famous writers in the contingency theory field.

However, the theories of modern management approach have been known and developed by various and sundry names such as management science and operation research, system theory, quantitative techniques and models, and contingency theory. These theories and models have a general modern managerial framework and have particular characteristics and perspectives of management. However, one of their goals is to improve and facilitate the managerial decision process and to solve complex problems that could not be handled through judgement, intuition, experience, or by ignoring the human aspects of management and organisation. In that:

1. **Management Science and Operation Research** relies on the application of quantitative techniques and the use of sophisticated computer programs to handle management and decision problems. However, quantitative and mathematical models - ranging from queuing theory and mathematical programming to game theory - might help managers to analyse and measure alternatives and then to identify and explain the managerial decision-making process related to operations and production.

2. **System Theory** views organisations as an open dynamic system composed of several subsystems that continually depend upon and interact with each other, influenced by their internal components and external environmental forces, and transform inputs into outputs which are accompanied by a

---

feedback loop that enables the organisation and the decision-makers to adapt to any changes at the right time.\footnote{148} Hellriegel and Slocum (1989) said, "The system viewpoint stresses the application of system analysis and mathematical models to management decision-making. With the development of the computer, many more variables could be analysed quantitatively, giving managers a better and more complete understanding of the situations and options they have to deal with."\footnote{149}

3. Contingency Theory expresses that management practices should be compatible with the internal component factors and technologies, the external environmental forces, and the workers of the organisation.\footnote{150} It takes a situational view of management and of decision-making activities rather than the one-best-way approach or the universal managerial principles approach.\footnote{151} Hellriegel and Slocum (1989) said, "The contingency viewpoint encourages the manager to diagnose the factors involved, then chooses the approach and techniques best suited to solving a particular problem in a particular set of circumstances."\footnote{152}

In general, Modern Management approach is different from both Classical and Neo-classical approaches in that it concentrates on the application of systematic analysis, the use of empirical research, and the integration of the other two management approaches with their internal and external environmental factors and forces.\footnote{153} It, also, emphasises the improvement of the manager's decision-making abilities, the application of mathematical models, and the utilisation of sophisticated computer programs, all of which help to make the decision process easier and less expensive

\footnotetext[149]{Ibid., p. 69.}
\footnotetext[150]{Ibid., p. 65.}
\footnotetext[151]{Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 25.}
\footnotetext[152]{Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1989, p. 70.}
\footnotetext[153]{Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 19.}
than ever before. Moreover, modern management theories are multimotivated, probabilistic, descriptive, multilevel and multidimensional, multidisciplinary, multivariable, and adaptive with its environment forces. Mondy and others (1990) said, "Since 1960s, however, the schools of thought that have prevailed have each integrated the human perspectives with the structural perspectives to form the third major area of organisational thought, integrative perspectives." Moorhead and Griffin (1992) said, "In the earlier days of management studies, both researchers and practising managers searched for universal answers to organisational questions. They sought prescriptions that could be applied to any organisation under any conditions." He also said, "Eventually, however, researchers realised that the complexities of human behaviour and organisational settings make universal conclusions virtually impossible. They discovered that in organisations most situations and outcomes are contingent; that is, the relationship between any two variables is likely to be influenced by other variables."

3.4 SUMMARY

In this chapter an attempt is made to highlight the major approaches of management thought and their development throughout the civilisation's history. These approaches were discussed briefly with the special focus on how the decision-making process is generally viewed, and in particular the subordinates' participation in this process. This is to determine how the understanding of them may help managers and subordinates to analyse managerial problems, and how each approach has contributed to the development of the managerial decision-making process in general and the subordinates' participation in this process in particular. Table 2.1 summarises the main points discussed in this chapter.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Pre-scientific and Ancient Civilisations</th>
<th>Classical Approach</th>
<th>Neoclassical Approach</th>
<th>Modern Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td>Pre-1880s</td>
<td>1880s - 1920s</td>
<td>1920s - 1950s</td>
<td>1950s - 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumption about Human Nature</strong></td>
<td>Great Person</td>
<td>Economic Person</td>
<td>Administrative Person</td>
<td>Complex Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Management Thought</strong></td>
<td>Very little development of</td>
<td>Bureaucracy,</td>
<td>Human relations and</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formal theories and research in</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Behavioural Management.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management thought took place</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>functions and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistent job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division of labour,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure, rules,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis of Management</strong></td>
<td>Economic factors.</td>
<td>Economic and</td>
<td>Social needs and</td>
<td>Interrelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stressed the division and machinery</td>
<td>physical factors.</td>
<td>human factors.</td>
<td>and independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilitation of labour.</td>
<td>Management functions</td>
<td></td>
<td>aspects,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some managerial concepts practised a</td>
<td>and principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>situational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long time ago but not necessarily by</td>
<td>Efficient and</td>
<td></td>
<td>aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>later concept’s names.</td>
<td>consistent job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division of labour,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure, rules,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Bottom-up as well as</td>
<td>Bottom-up as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Total rationality</td>
<td>Rationality limitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule-of-thumb</td>
<td>Maximise outcome</td>
<td>Satisfactory outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial and error</td>
<td>The application of</td>
<td>Individuals’ feeling,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whims, intuitions, experience</td>
<td>functions and</td>
<td>motivation, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>principles.</td>
<td>other social and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Model</strong></td>
<td>Military models</td>
<td>Ideal models</td>
<td>Human relations and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling decision</td>
<td>One-best-way model</td>
<td>Behaviour models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Universal formula</td>
<td>Satisfactory decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximal decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Subordinates’ participation in the</td>
<td>Precise ways of making decisions</td>
<td>Precise ways of</td>
<td>Interactional and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision process**</td>
<td>Small hints of consultative and</td>
<td>making decisions</td>
<td>participative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participative practices in the ancient</td>
<td>Little indications</td>
<td>managerial decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>era</td>
<td>in some of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>managerial functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and principles which,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and to some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extent, encourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subordinates’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the previous discussion, it is clear that some of the management principles and the concepts of consultation and participation in the decision-making process are not new ideas as they were favoured and practised by many ancient civilisations. They have been practised for thousands of years, as is seen in the practises of the ancient nations, i.e. Sumerians, Babylonians, Chinese, Indians, Egyptians, Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and the Islamic Arab civilisation. In terms of participation in the managerial decisions, it is obvious that military style dominates the practice of making decisions in the era of ancient civilisations. However, there were also hints that they were aware of the importance of what is now known as managerial participation in the decision making process. Wren (1994) said that, “the age of Greece illustrates the first seeds of democracy, the advent of a decentralised participatory government, the first attempts to establish individual liberty, the beginning of the scientific method for problem solving.”\(^{159}\) This illustrate the idea of how ancient the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making is. In fact, we can think of this development as a simple and early attempts (hints) in the field of managerial participative decision.

However, the industrialisation era and twentieth century development has presented management with new challenges and problems. The concept of employees' participation is developed. Hodgetts (1990) said, “With industrialisation it became necessary to develop rational, scientific principles for handling workers, materials, money, and machinery”\(^{160}\) In fact, twentieth century development and its theories has played a significant role in accomplishing such objectives, to face challenges, and to solve problems. This evolution and development of employees’ participation in management decisions is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

\(^{159}\) Wren, D.A., 1994, P.19
\(^{160}\) Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p.60
Figure 2.1 Evolution of Employees' Participation in Managerial Decision Making
However, this study did not give any fixed start or end to the periods of management thought development, because each period was an extension of the previous ones and a base for the later ones. Wren (1994) said, "Eras in management thought never begin and end neatly in any particular year". Management history clearly extends several thousand years into the past, and prior to the end of the nineteenth century very little development of formal theories and research in management thought took place. The basic managerial models, during that time, were the military models and the Roman Catholic Church organisation. However, both the Industrial Revolution in Europe and in the United States, together with the twentieth century informational and technological developments produced a new view of management functions and principles of people, work, and organisation. And they, also, introduced and developed the three major approaches of management. However, these three management approaches and theories evolved in sequence throughout history. Thus, the previous approaches helped to form the basis for the later ones. However, throughout this time, the later approaches did not always replace the previous ones, they complemented each other and added to the knowledge of the previous ones. Therefore, each one of these approaches has its supporters and it can be very helpful if it is applied to the appropriate situation.

The Classical Management Approach emphasises the use of structures, regulations, principles, and physical and financial factors to management decision making. It focuses on the application of rational decisions so as to ensure predictable results, the selection of the one-best-way decision that would maximise the outcome, helps managers to perform and apply the universal formula of management's functions and principles. In general, this approach does not really encourage

---

subordinates to participate fully in the decision-making process. But, by tracing the development of the theories of this approach, it is obvious that there is a general and slow movement in this direction. Bureaucracy, as an ideal model, does not motivate subordinates to participate enthusiastically in the decision-making process. It's decisions are made through an orderly system of impersonal rules, regulations and procedures so as to ensure predictable results. However, there are a few elements and principles of scientific management theory and administrative management theory that generally motivate managers and subordinates to interact with each other and as a result to participate in the decision-making process. For instance, co-operation, co-ordinating, initiative, and esprit de corps all, in one way or another, motivate and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to apply them successfully and to achieve their creative objectives. Morrise L. Cooke, one of the scientific management pioneers, urged for the participation of every worker in order to find the one-best-way to perform work. Hodgetts (1990) said, "one way of accomplishing this (co-ordinating function), Fayol believed, was through regular meeting of managers and subordinates. If this function were properly implemented, everything would flow smoothly.""}

The neo-classical management approach emphasises the application of social need and human factors to management decision making. It focuses on the influence of subordinates' motivation, feeling, interaction, participation, and work groups in the decision-making process more than upon the influence of rules, regulations, and physical and financial factors in such a process. Elton Mayo, a major contributor in this movement, said, "much can be gained by carrying personal consideration to the lowest level of management". Miles (1965) said, "As the worker makes use of

---
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the subordinates' experiences, insights, and creative abilities, the overall quality of
decision making and performance will improve."\textsuperscript{172} Moreover, neo-classical
theorists challenged the economic person concept. So, rather than viewing workers
as similar to each other and them only being motivated by economic incentives, they
believed that workers are different from each other and are motivated by social,
human, physical, financial, and many other factors and incentives.\textsuperscript{173} Simon (1950)
mentioned that an individuals rationality has limitations and can never be total.
They choose what is seen to be the satisfactory decision rather than seeking the
maximal decision which had been the main intention of the classical management
approach.\textsuperscript{174} Mary P. Follett, also, believed that the involvement of subordinates in
the decision-making process would create a healthy managerial environment and a
good relationship with managers.\textsuperscript{175} Chester Barnard urged managers to establish a
good communication system and to discuss matters and decisions with
subordinates.\textsuperscript{176}

The modern management approach emphasises the use of system analysis models,
inTEGRATIONAL and situational models, mathematical and quantiative models, and
computer technology to management decision making.\textsuperscript{177} In general, the modern
management approach is different from both the classical and neo-classical
approaches in that it concentrates on the application of systematic analysis, the use
of empirical research, and the integration of the other two management approaches
with their internal and external environmental factors and forces.\textsuperscript{178} However, the
focus of attention in management has gradually shifted from the one-best-way
approach and the fixed universal formula methods in making managerial decisions,

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item[175] Ibid., p. 60.
\end{itemize}}
\end{footnotesize}
to human, integrational, and situational methods in which subordinates have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{179} Moreover, one of the modern management goals is to improve and facilitate the managerial decision-making process and to solve complex problems that could not be handled only through judgement, intuition, experience or by ignoring the human and environmental aspects of management which had been the main intention of the previous management thought.\textsuperscript{180} Thus, managers are required to know that complex decisions cannot be made by the use of a fixed formula or by ignoring the influence of human factors, technological inventions, resources available in the workplace, and environmental variables.\textsuperscript{181} Also, they should recognise, diagnose, and evaluate all the variables and factors involved, then choose the appropriate decision. In general, this approach makes it easier, faster and is less expensive for managers to analyse the huge amounts of data, enabling them to make timely, participative, and more accurate decisions. It gives them clear options and helps them to have a wider knowledge and a more complete understanding of situations and alternatives to apply to the decisions they have to deal with.

As this chapter has summarised the ancient and the more recent managerial concepts and practices, the following chapter will briefly present the major leadership theories, styles, and skills from the standpoint of managerial decision making. Also there will be special concentration on how these theories and studies view the concept of participation in the decision-making process.

\textsuperscript{180} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1989, pp. 61, 70.
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid., p. 70.
CHAPTER THREE

LEADERSHIP AND SUBORDINATES' PARTICIPATION
IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Managerial decisions are central factors in leadership applications and practices. Many of the leadership styles and applications reflect the decisions that managers take. Therefore, an examination of leadership studies and theories is important, not only to understand the studies and the theories but also to understand managerial decisions and the participation of subordinate-managers in the decision-making process.

The technological and informational revolutions of the twentieth century have greatly affected and influenced the practices of today's managers and subordinates. They have gained in knowledge, skills and experience, and their perception and participation in the decision-making process has been enriched. They are better educated, more experienced, and more skilled. They can no longer be effectively managed and commanded in the old way as they were previously, because they have gained more technological and educational development.

The following sections of this chapter will discuss briefly major leadership theories and studies from the standpoint of management styles and decisions. Also there will be special concentration on how recent theories and studies colour the views of subordinates and affects their participation in the decision-making process.

---

1 Vroom, V.H. and P.W. Yetton, 1973, p.4
3.2 LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND STUDIES

In order to identify and examine effective leadership decision styles, thousands of studies and much research has been conducted into this field of knowledge. A greater part of these studies and much of the research has classified leadership theories into three broad categories. Each category uses a different set of factors and assumptions in order to describe its theories and also to predict which styles of decision-making are the most appropriate ones.\(^2\) Three broad categories include: traits theory, behavioural theories, and situational theories.\(^3\)

3.2.1 TRAITS THEORY OF LEADERSHIP

Traits theory was one of the earliest attempts to understand leadership and managerial practices. It concentrates on the personal characteristics of the individual. It assumes that the individual is either born to be a leader or a follower. The born leader will emerge in the group as a leader because he has certain qualities of mind, spirit, and character.\(^4\)

The traits theory of leadership evaluates and selects managers depending on their physical, mental, and psychological characteristics.\(^5\) According to the assumptions of this theory, effective managers are mainly characterised as having inherent capabilities with certain stable and enduring traits. They have particular traits which cannot be learned or passed on to others, which are found to be effective at any time and in any situation.\(^6\)

With regard to both managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, traits theory assumes one best universal way to lead. It argues that the effectiveness of leadership decision styles is based on certain traits that are born with the leader. Thus, the individual who was born as a leader will effectively make the right decisions and solve any problems he deals with properly. However, such an assumption gives the opportunity to the leader to practice an autocratic leadership style, to control the decision-making process, and to impose the decisions he wants.

In general, and in spite of the critics of this theory, i.e. that it is inconsistent with the findings of later studies and research, traits theory was an important movement in the right direction. It encouraged researchers and theorists to conduct a number of researches in this field and led to the development of the behavioural and the situational perspectives of leadership.

3.2.2 BEHAVIOURAL THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

The second movement in leadership development was that of behavioural theories. Behavioural theories focus on 'what' and 'how' leaders act when accomplishing their functions and decisions rather than upon who they are. These theories aim to find out what actions and behaviours are associated with an appropriate leadership style.

The behavioural theories in general assume that effective leadership decision styles are not necessarily based upon inherent traits. Behavioural leadership styles suggest
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solutions and decisions rather than dictate them. Also they encourage participative management, and can be learned and be trained to others.\textsuperscript{9}

In 1938, one of the first major empirical research studies in this field was conducted at the University of Iowa. The studies were directed by Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph White. They examined the behavioural impact of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Some of the findings of the Iowa studies and of similar behavioural research generally supported the participative and democratic leadership styles in opposition to the autocratic and laissez-faire styles.\textsuperscript{10}

The major behavioural theories into the study of leadership include the University of Michigan studies, the Ohio State University studies, McGregor's theory X and Y, Blake and Mouton's management grid theory, Tannenbaum and Schmidt's continuum theory, and Likert's leadership theory.\textsuperscript{11}

3.2.2.1 University of Michigan Studies

The Michigan studies of leadership were conducted under the direction of Rensis Likert and his associates at the University of Michigan.\textsuperscript{12} The Michigan studies identified two behavioural leadership styles. One of them is the production-centred behaviour style which is similar to the autocratic leadership style. The other is the employee-centred behaviour style which is similar to the style of democratic leadership.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Bennett, R., 1991, p.332.
  \item Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p.257.
  \item Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.213.
\end{itemize}
Regarding subordinates' participation and leadership decisions, the production-centred leadership style concentrates upon maximising the performance of subordinates, controlling the decision-making process, and explaining all the work procedures. In contrast, the employee-centred leadership style focuses on the satisfaction and well-being of subordinates in the work place. It also encourages subordinates' participation in the decision-making process. Rensis Likert noted that the highest performance and the best employee co-operation and management were accomplished by managers who built "the subordinates into cohesive, highly effective, co-operative problem-solving team."

3.2.2.2 Ohio State University Studies

The Ohio State research and studies identified initiating-structure (task) and consideration for others (relationships) as the two most important factors of leadership behaviour. According to the combinations of these two behavioural factors, Ohio State studies and research represented four different leadership styles. These leadership and decision styles can be classified as high in both initiating structure and consideration, low in both, or high in one and low in the other.

The initiating-structure motivated leadership style concentrates on task performance, formal authority, and on controlling subordinates' activities and decisions. Thus, this style was viewed as an authoritarian leadership style as managers tended to tell subordinates what to do and how to do it. In contrast, the consideration motivated leadership style focused upon subordinates' interest, respect, dignity, and satisfaction. Therefore this style was viewed as a democratic leadership style in
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which the manager was inclined to respect subordinates' ideas, feelings, and participation in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{17}

### 3.2.2.3 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor developed two contrasting sets of assumptions concerning human behaviour. He labelled these two sets of assumptions as Theory X and Theory Y. They are illustrated in Table 3.1.

According to McGregor, leaders who believe in theory X assumptions assume that subordinates avoid responsibility and prefer to be told what to do. They require close managerial supervision. Alternatively, leaders who believe in theory Y assumptions assume that subordinates seek responsibility. They can be relied upon to make decisions and participate in the decision-making process. They do not welcome close managerial supervision.\textsuperscript{18}

#### TABLE 3.1 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions of Theory X</th>
<th>Assumptions of Theory Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The typical employee dislikes work and will avoid it if possible.</td>
<td>• People like to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employees want direction whenever possible.</td>
<td>• Employers who are committed to the company's objectives will exercise self-direction and self-control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manager must coerce employees (threaten them with punishment) to get them to work.</td>
<td>• Employees learn to accept and even seek responsibility at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hellriegel and Slocum (1992, p. 476)


\textsuperscript{18} Bennett, R., 1991, pp.332-333.
In regard to managerial decisions, McGregor argued that managers exert one of two leadership decision styles, either the autocratic or participative decision style. The manager who practices theory X assumptions tends to use an autocratic style in which subordinates do not have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. In contrast, the manager who practices theory Y assumptions tends to encourage and employ a participative style in which subordinates do have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. In general, subordinates prefer to deal with the manager who believes in and exerts a participative decision style rather than with the one who believes in autocratic styles. Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) state: "It is clear that employees prefer Theory Y because of the opportunities to get involved in the decision-making process."\(^{19}\)

3.2.2.4 Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid Theory

Managerial grid theory was developed by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton during the 1960s.\(^{21}\) This theory represents many possibilities of leadership decision styles, each of which exhibits a degree of concern for production and people.

Blake and Mouton focused upon and identified the following five major leadership styles.\(^{22}\)

1. Impoverished style: in which a manager seeks to minimise the concern for both production and human factors (1.1 position).

\(^{20}\) Ibid., p.477.
2. Task style, sometimes called authority-obedience style: in which a manager tends to maximise the concern of production factors and to minimise the concern of human factors (9.1 position).

3. Country Club style: in which a manager seeks to minimise the concern of production factors and to maximise the concern of human factors (1.9 position).

4. Middle-of-the-road style: in which a manager seeks to balance the concern for both production and human factors (5.5 position).

5. Team style: in which a manager tries to reach the maximum concern for both production and human factors simultaneously (9.9 position).

In regard to managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in the decision process, Blake and Mouton believed that the first four styles are not the most effective leadership decision styles. Rather, they argued that the team management style (9.9 position) was the most effective one, where managers share ideas and suggestions with subordinates and encourage them to participate in the decision-making process.23

3.2.2.5 Tannenbaum and Schmidt's Leadership Continuum

Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt developed a decision-making continuum of leadership styles showing the balance between the use of manager's authority and the subordinates' freedom in the work place. Tannenbaum and Schmidt's continuum represents seven leadership decision styles. These range from extreme autocratic on one side to extreme democratic on the other, as shown in Figure 3.1.24
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FIGURE 3.1 Decision-Making Continuum

Source: Adair (1988, p.52)
With regard to effective managerial decisions and the subordinate's participation in the decision-making process, Tannenbaum and Schmidt argued that there is no one of these seven styles which can be considered to be the only effective decision style. The effective decision style is dominated by different factors. These are the manager's characteristics, the subordinates' characteristics, and the objectives and goals to be accomplished by both manager and subordinates. They also believed that participative decision styles can exist when subordinates clearly understand the goals and objectives to be achieved and where they are well educated and experienced in doing their job. Subordinates should expect a participative managerial environment, and should seek independence and responsibility for decision making.

3.2.2.6 Likert's Leadership Theory

Likert's leadership theory, sometimes called Liking Pin Theory, was developed by Rensis Likert (1961) who examined the impacts of behaviours and functions of managers on their leadership decision styles.

Likert argued that the manager can be thought of as both leader and subordinate at the same time. In other words, the manager can be classified as a leader by the subordinates whom he or she is responsible for and, simultaneously, as a subordinate by the supervisors that he or she is responsible to.

28 Ibid
In a subsequent work, Likert identified the following four basic managerial leadership styles: exploitative-authoritative style; benevolent-authoritative style; consultative-democratic style; and participative-democratic style.29

With regard to managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, Likert's four leadership styles viewed these concepts as follows:30

1. In the exploitative-authoritative style, a manager has no confidence in his subordinates and neither of them place enough trust in each other. Therefore, the manager makes most of the decisions himself. He applies a top-downwards communication system and discourages the subordinates' participation in the decision process.

2. In the benevolent-authoritative style, subordinates might be able to make a few decisions at the lower levels. However, such limited decisions must be within a prescribed framework and must be approved by the manager before an action is taken. In addition, the manager applies a one way communication system in order to pass his decisions down the line.

3. In the consultative-democratic style, there is a kind of trust and confidence between the manager and the subordinates. Therefore, the manager consults his subordinates, encourages them to participate in making specific solutions and decisions at the lower levels and motivates a two way communication system. However, the major and important decisions are still made and controlled by the top level manager.
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29 Ibid., p.217.
4. In the participative-democratic style which is preferred by Likert, the manager has full trust and confidence in his subordinates. Therefore, he or she decentralises the decision-making process, motivates subordinates to participate in this process and applies a two way communication system in order to solve problems and make decisions.

However, Likert believed that the appropriate leadership style is characterised by the ability of the manager to exercise his influence positively in two directions. That is upwards as a subordinate and downward as a leader. This leadership style helps to develop good interaction and understanding between both the manager and his subordinates. It encourages the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process and achieves a compatible, healthy, supportive, and friendly environment.\(^{31}\)

### 3.2.3 SITUATIONAL THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

The situational theories were an attempt to integrate the previous two separate approaches of leadership theories (traits and behaviour), into the situational or contingency approach as it has sometimes been termed.\(^ {32}\)

The situational theories of leadership tried to determine effective leadership styles with regard to the demands of the situation. According to these theories, there is no one best leadership style that works successfully in all situations so that it can be viewed as a universal form. Situational theories therefore assume that it is always the situation which determines who is going to be a successful leader and the type of leadership styles he or she has to apply.\(^ {33}\) Therefore, the most effective leadership

---


\(^{32}\) Ibid., p.218.

\(^{33}\) Adair, J., 1988, p.15; and Bennett, R., 1991, p.333.
style is the one that can be adjusted to the changes within the situation, or the group and accounts for the personal values of the leader.\textsuperscript{34}

Major situational theories on the study of leadership decision-making styles include Fiedler's contingency theory, House's path-goal theory, Hersey and Blanchard's situational theory, and Vroom-Yetton-Jago's participation theory.\textsuperscript{35} These theories will be discussed briefly as follows.

3.2.3.1 Fiedler's Contingency Theory

The Contingency Theory of leadership was developed by Fred Fiedler and his colleagues in 1967. They assumed that the effective leadership style is dependent upon the extent to which it matches the situation and to how much the situation enables the manager to exert influence over the work group.\textsuperscript{36} Fiedler believed that the manager cannot change his or her leadership style. Instead, he or she must either change the situation to match his style or leave the position to someone in the work group whose leadership style matches the situation.\textsuperscript{37} Fiedler (1967) said, "It would seem more promising at this time, therefore, to teach the individual to recognise the conditions under which he can perform best and to modify the situation to suit his leadership style."\textsuperscript{38}

In order to measure leadership and decision-making styles and identify the most effective one, Fiedler developed what he called the Least Preferred Co-worker

\textsuperscript{34} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.218; and Bennett, R., 1991, p.333.
\textsuperscript{38} Vroom, V.H. and A.G. Jago, 1988, p.51.
(LPC) scale. The LPC scale is a relatively simple questionnaire which asks the managers with whom they work least well, and it evaluates their responses in terms of 16 extremes such as pleasant-unpleasant, friendly-unfriendly, efficient-inefficient, and so on. Fiedler also identified three situational variables that affect situations and that determine the appropriate leadership decision styles. These three variables include leader-member relations, task structure, and leader position power. To Fiedler and according to the combination of these three variables, the situation might be very favourable, moderate, or very unfavourable.

According to the foundations of this theory, there are two major leadership styles. One of them is the task-oriented leadership style which to some extent is similar to the autocratic style and mainly focuses upon getting the work done. The other is the relationship-oriented leadership style which to some degree is similar to the participative style and mainly concentrates upon the subordinates' feelings and welfare.

In regard to both managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in the decision process, Fiedler believed that managers exert the leadership decision style which matches the situation. The task-oriented leadership style can be the most effective style when the situation is very favourable or very unfavourable. In contrast, the relationship-oriented leadership style can be the most effective style when the situation is moderately favourable or unfavourable. It seems that the task-oriented leadership style works best in an extreme situation that is either highly

---

favourable or highly unfavourable. The relationship-oriented leadership style works best in a moderate situation which is neither extremely favourable or unfavourable.43

3.2.3.2 House's Path-Goal Theory

The Path-Goal Theory was developed by Robert House and his associates in the 1970s.44 The theme of this theory is to determine subordinates motivation by clarifying the paths that will lead to the desired objectives, facilitate job performance and achieve both high satisfaction and high outcome.45

House's path-goal theory identifies four styles of leadership which are determined by the characteristics of subordinates and by the task. These four leadership styles include directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement oriented leadership.46 However, this theory does not provide a universal formula for the best leadership style. It assumes that managers can use or change any one of these four leadership styles instead of changing the situation itself. In other words, House believed that managers can change their leadership style in order to match the situation they deal with and also that the appropriate style is dependent upon the characteristics of the subordinates and of the task itself.47 Moorhead and Griffin (1992) said, "The path-goal theory thus allows for the possibility of adapting leadership to the situation."48

With regard to managerial decisions and subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, the four leadership styles will be discussed and are summarised as follows.49

1. Directive leadership is a style of leadership in which subordinates do not have opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. They appreciate the manager who clarifies the paths to their objectives and tells them what to do and when and how to do it. This style is appropriate for unstructured, ambiguous, and complex tasks with subordinates who have low needs for independence and responsibility. The Directive leadership style is nearly the same as the initiating-structure and production centred leadership styles.

2. Supportive leadership is the style of leadership in which a manager shows interest in the subordinates' status, well-being, and needs. This style is appropriate for structured, simple, and repetitive tasks, with subordinates who have high needs for self-esteem, confidence, and affiliation. Supportive leadership, to some extent, encourages the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process and is similar to the considerate and employee-centred leadership styles.

3. Participative leadership is the style of leadership in which subordinates are asked for their counsels, suggestions, and advice before making a decision. This style is appropriate when the tasks are ambiguous and complex, as when the manager does not have some of the information needed to make the decision, and when the subordinates' acceptance of the decision is highly
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important. Under these circumstances, subordinates' participation in the decision-making process will be the most effective leadership style.

4. Achievement-oriented leadership is the style of leadership in which a manager 'sets' challenging goals, expects his subordinates to work to their highest level of performance, has full trust and confidence on behalf of his subordinates and believes that subordinates will achieve the organisation's goals and objectives excellently. This style is appropriate for unstructured, ambiguous, complex, and non-routine tasks with subordinates who have high needs for responsibility, independence, excellency, and the sharing of decisions. Here, subordinates usually handle responsibility and make decisions without seeking the manager's advice.

However, House believed that the participative leadership style is not necessarily effective at all times. Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) said, "House's model indicates that participative leadership styles are not always effective. A participatory style is needed most when employees' acceptance of the decision is important, when the leader does not have some of the information needed to make a decision, and when the problem is unstructured".50

3.2.3.3 Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Theory

This theory is one of the more recent situational leadership theories and was developed by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard in 1982.51 Hersey and Blanchard's situational theory was an attempt to integrate many of the previous managerial and leadership studies into a comprehensive situational theory.52

52 Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p.221.
Hersey and Blanchard used two dimensions in developing this theory. The two dimensions are task and relationship activities which are sometimes called directive and supportive activities. They also identified three situational factors which affect and determine the appropriate leadership styles. These three factors include the amount of task activities a manager emphasises; the amount of relationship activities a manager provides; and the subordinates' task-readiness or maturity level. The subordinates' task-relevant readiness includes their level of achievement, their willingness and ability to assume responsibility, and their relevant experience and education.5

With regard to managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, Hersey and Blanchard's situational theory identifies four leadership decision styles which include telling, selling, participating, and delegating. As a subordinates' maturity increases, then the appropriate leadership style should become more participative and the subordinate's commitment to the decision-making process will also become more appropriate. However, these four leadership styles will be summarised and discussed where relative to the participation concept as follows:5

1. The telling style, otherwise termed the directive style, is the style of leadership which is characterised by a high directive and a low supportive manager, immature subordinates, and downward communication. Here the manager makes all the decisions and controls the decision-making process without any intervention or the participation of his subordinates. Hersey and Blanchard believed that this telling leadership style is an appropriate one for

subordinates who have just started their new work, those who lack task-relevant readiness, and who are unready for instant responsibility.

2. The selling style, occasionally called the coaching style, is the style of leadership that is characterised by a high directive and a highly supportive manager with immature subordinates, and downward communication. In this style the manager makes all of the decisions and controls the decision-making process but he explains and clarifies all of these decisions and the process for his subordinates. According to Hersey and Blanchard, the selling leadership style is an appropriate one for subordinates who, to some extent, know their task but at the same time are inexperienced and are not skilled enough to assume more responsibility.

3. The participating style, sometimes called the supporting style, is the style of leadership that is characterised by a low directive and a highly supportive manager, with a participative decision-making process. It is further characterised by mature subordinates and a two-way means of communication. In this style, the decisions are made by both the manager and his subordinates, or by the subordinates with their manager's encouragement and support, which encourages responsibility. Hersey and Blanchard believed that a participatory leadership style is an appropriate one for subordinates who have task-relevant readiness and have become more experienced, more skilled, more achievement motivated, and therefore are more willing to assume responsibility.

4. The delegating leadership style is characterised by a low directive and a low supportive manager, highly mature subordinates, and two ways of communication. In this style, subordinates take over the whole responsibility for making and implementing decisions while the manager observes and
monitors the outcome. Hersey and Blanchard believed that this delegating leadership is an appropriate one for subordinates who are highly mature, highly skilled, highly experienced, highly achievement motivated, and both capable and willing to assume responsibility.

However, Hersey and Blanchard argue that there is no one of these four leadership decision styles which is the best and which can be used universally to meet the demands of the situation and will always match the level of the subordinates' maturity.55 Rather, they believe that the appropriate leadership style is the one that can be inter-changeable, adaptable, and flexible enough to meet most of the needs.56 In fact the most effective leadership and decision style is the one that is determined by the match between both the manager's task and relationship activities on the one hand and the subordinates' level of task-related readiness on the other.57

3.2.3.4 The Vroom-Yetton-Jago's Model

Victor Vroom and Philip Yetton introduced their leadership decision model, sometimes called the Leader-Participation model, in 1973.58 This model was developed by Victor Vroom and Arthur Jago in 1988.59

Vroom-Yetton-Jago's model concentrates upon the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process and on the extent to which they should be allowed to be involved in the decision process.60 Moorhead and Griffin (1992) said, "the Vroom-Yetton-Jago model concerns itself with only a single aspect of leader behaviour:

subordinate participation in decision making."\(^{61}\) This model also argues that the effectiveness of leadership decision styles are influenced by the following three factors which include the quality of the decision, the acceptance of the decision by subordinates, and the time required to make the decision. Thus, the model is designed to protect the quality of the decision, assure subordinates acceptance of the decision, and minimise the time needed for the decision-making process.\(^{62}\)

With regard to managerial decisions and the subordinates' participation in solving group problems and making decision, the Vroom-Yetton-Jago's model identifies five leadership decision styles which include two autocratic styles (AI, AII), two consultative styles (CI, CII) and one participative which is sometimes called group style (GII).\(^{63}\) Each one of these five leadership styles reflects a degree of the subordinates' involvement in the decision-making process. As the involvement of subordinates in the decision process increases then the effective decision style should become more participative.\(^{64}\) However, these leadership decision styles are appropriate when dealing with group problems and will be discussed and are summarised as follows.\(^{65}\)

**AI:** The manager alone solves the problem and makes the decision by using his own information and without any participation of subordinates.

**AII:** The manager alone makes the decision but he asks subordinates to supply him with the necessary information rather than to generate or to evaluate alternative decision. He may or may not inform them about the problem.
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\(^{64}\) Wilson, D.C. and R.H. Rosenfeld, 1990, p.165.

CI: The manager alone makes the decision but, previously, he meets with the relevant subordinates individually in order to discuss the problem so as to get ideas and suggestions and also to ask for generating or evaluating alternative decisions. The manager's decision may or may not reflect the subordinates' influence.

CII: The manager alone makes the decision but, prior to this, he meets subordinates as a group in order to discuss the problem, so as to get their ideas and suggestions, and also to ask them to generate or evaluate alternative decisions. The manager's decision may or may not reflect the subordinates' influence.

GII: Both the manager and his subordinates meet as a group to discuss the problem to generate and evaluate alternative decisions, to share ideas and suggestions, and to reach a final and agreeable decision. The decision should reflect the group's influence.

However, this model assumes that there is no one of these five leadership decision styles which is best for all situations. Thus the appropriate and most effective leadership style depends upon the characteristics of the situation. Therefore, the manager should be flexible and be ready to adapt or even change his or her leadership style so as to meet the demands of a given situation.66

In order to determine the most effective leadership decision styles for group problems, Vroom and Jago developed a decision tree model. Eight situational characteristics concerning time, quality, and acceptance are arranged along the top
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of this decision tree model and are expressed in question form, as illustrated in Figure 3.2.67

Vroom and Jago's decision tree model is an essential tool which managers and researchers can apply with some confidence when identifying appropriate leadership decision styles, as when determining the level of a subordinates' commitment in managerial decisions, when deciding as to what extent subordinates should be allowed to participate in the decision-making process.68

The researcher can apply this model by evaluating the characteristics of the problem and the situation in terms of the model's eight questions. Then, using the answers to those questions, following the paths through the tree branches until a terminal node is reached. In practice, the researcher must start from the node at the left-hand side of the decision tree and begin to ask respondents to answer the model questions sequentially and relatively, as illustrated in Figure 3.2. The answer to each question determines the path on the decision tree branches and leads to the next related node and question. This process continues until the last related question is answered. By the end of this process, the researcher will be able to identify and explore the leadership decision styles that are exerted by managers and come to recognise the amount of a subordinates' participation in the decision-making process in a given organisation.

Finally, the Vroom-Yetton-Jago model confirms the findings of other research that the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process is not always a necessary condition for them when they accept a decision. Sometimes they can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Problem</th>
<th>Situational Variables</th>
<th>The Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State the Problem</td>
<td>Quality Requirement • How important is the technical quality of this decision?</td>
<td>Commitment Requirement • How important is subordinate commitment to the decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3.2 The Vroom-Yetton-Jago Decision Tree Model (Time-Driven Group Problems)**

Source: Adapted from Vroom and Jago (1988, p.184)
accept a decision without their participating in the making of it. Vroom and Yetton (1973) said, "the subordinates may accept the leader's decision because they believe that it is his legitimate right to make that decision by virtue of the position he occupies, because he is the acknowledged expert and the only one capable of taking all the necessary factors into consideration, or because he is strongly admired. In such situations, it is not at all difficult for the leader to "sell" his decision to his subordinates, thereby gaining the necessary acceptance." 69

3.3 LEADERSHIP DECISION STYLES

There are a number of different leadership styles by which managerial decisions can be exercised. These styles range from a complete autocracy on the one hand to a totally permissive or abdication style on the other; all have certain advantages and disadvantages.

As previously discussed in this chapter, theorists and researchers used many ways to classify the leadership styles. These decision styles vary according to the degree of a manager's authority, the amount of the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, and other situational variables. In general, the literature on leadership and managerial decisions tends to focus upon four basic styles which are termed as autocratic, participative, democratic, and laissez-faire: 70

1. Autocratic leadership decision style involves a manager who seeks to centre and control authority and the decision-making process. The manager solves problems and makes decisions independently of subordinates. He or she tells them what to do and how to do it, and expects them to carry out the
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instructions and decisions without any questions. The subordinates' initiatives, skills, and experiences are controlled and not used to their maximum extent. However, this style might be appropriate when the subordinates are immature and/or have a low need for independence and responsibility.\textsuperscript{71}

2. The Participative style emerged during the neo-classical era of management. This style involves a manager who allows and encourages subordinates to participate in the decision-making process, while he or she is still accountable for the final authority and responsibility over the subordinates. By applying this style, ideas and suggestions are interchanged between subordinates and also with the manager. However, the participative style could be appropriate when subordinates are mature and are willing and able to assume this degree of responsibility.\textsuperscript{72}

3. The Democratic style involves a manager who seeks a very high degree of subordinates' participation and requires interaction in the decision-making process. Together they discuss problems, interchange ideas and suggestions, and come out with an acceptable decision. In this style the manager tends to lead through group input and decision making in order to do what the majority of subordinates desire. Subordinates are expected to be mature, willing and capable of taking responsibility.\textsuperscript{73}

4. The Laissez-faire style, sometimes called free-rein or permissive style, involves a manager who tends to relieve himself or herself from the authority


\textsuperscript{72} Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, pp.302-303; and Mondy, R.W. and Others, 1990, p.554.

and decision-making responsibility. Here, a manager delegates his authority to subordinates and lets them make and execute all decisions without any interactions or opposition. This style might be appropriate for unstructured, ambiguous, and complex tasks with subordinates who are highly mature, highly skilled, highly experienced, highly achievement motivated, and are capable and willing to assume responsibility.\textsuperscript{74}

However, leadership theories failed to provide a universal formula for the best way to lead and make decisions. Thus, it appears that there is no one leadership decision style which is the most effective and will work best at all times and in all situations. Most managers use all of the leadership styles at one time or another. The appropriate style is dependent upon such variables as the demands of a given situation, the environment, the technology, the task, and the characteristics of the manager and the subordinates involved.\textsuperscript{75} Elbing (1978) said, "The search for the management or leadership style has had a long history, never very successful. Probably the reason is that it has always been a search for 'the one' style, the 'right' approach. Given the variety of needs of employees, the different organisational situations and goals, and the different frames of reference of managers, there may be no single 'right' approach."\textsuperscript{76}

Moreover, subordinates are an essential factor in choosing the most appropriate decision style in a particular situation. Their backgrounds, their maturity, their knowledge and their experience can determine the type of leadership decision style which they prefer to be managed through and which will achieve the desired goals. For instance, subordinates who are recently hired and are immature or inexperienced, with only the minimum of work skills, may prefer the autocratic

\textsuperscript{74} Bennett, R., 1991, pp.232, 335; and Mony, R.W. and Others, 1990, p.554.  
\textsuperscript{76} Elbing, A., 1978, p.404.
leadership decision style. Subordinates who are technically proficient, skilled, experienced, and mature and confident, may prefer the democratic and participative leadership decision style. Finally, subordinates who are experts, specialists, highly skilled, highly experienced, and highly mature with confidence may prefer the permissive leadership decision style. The most effective managers adapt their styles to the demands of a given situation, task, group, and their own needs and personal characteristics. Table 3.2 illustrates the relationship between subordinates' characteristics and their preferable leadership decision-making styles in a particular situation.

**TABLE 3.2** Subordinates' Characteristics and Their Preferable Leadership and Decision Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Styles</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>• Manager solves problems and makes decisions independently of his subordinates.</td>
<td>• Manager allows and expects subordinates to participate in the decision making process.</td>
<td>• Manager encourages participation and tends to do what the majority of subordinates desire.</td>
<td>• Manager lets subordinates make and execute all decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates</td>
<td>• McGregor's Theory X subordinates</td>
<td>• McGregor's Theory Y Subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immature subordinates (recently hired unskilled, inexperienced, .....etc.)</td>
<td>• Mature subordinates (skilled, experienced, proficient,.... etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Mondy and Others (1990, p.554) with some modification.
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According to Hellriegel and Slocum (1992), subordinates' participation in the decision-making process is a very important style. This might be most effective and most appropriate when the quality of the decision is important and subordinates are mature, with enough confidence and trust between both managers and subordinates and in situations when the subordinates' acceptance of the decision is required, when the problem is complex and unstructured, and when the manager does not have some of the vital information needed to make a decision.\(^{80}\)

However, although one recognises the importance of the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, it is not always an effective or a necessary condition for them to accept and execute a decision. Sometimes they may accept and execute a decision without any participation in the making of it. All depends upon the nature of the situation and the maturity of individuals. Vroom and Yetton (1973) state that "subordinates may accept the leader's decision because they believe it is his legitimate right to make that decision by virtue of the position he occupies, because he is the acknowledged expert and the only one capable of taking all the necessary factors into consideration, or because he is strongly admired by them. In such a situation, it is not at all difficult for the leader to 'sell' his decision to his subordinates, thereby gaining the necessary acceptance."\(^{81}\)

### 3.4 LEADERSHIP DECISION SKILLS

So far this chapter has dealt with leadership theories and decision-making styles that might help a manager and his or her subordinates to solve problems and make effective decisions. As stated earlier, the manager's choice of leadership styles is very important in the achievement of desired goals and in making successful decisions.

---


However, the success of a decision and the achievement of its desired goals is dependent not only upon the manager's style but also upon his or her skills in using that style.\textsuperscript{82} Thus, managers as well as subordinates must possess and develop adequate skills in order to perform effectively all the tasks and the decisions for which they are responsible and to prepare themselves for higher management levels.\textsuperscript{83}

Such skills can broadly be classified under four categories: technical, conceptual, interpersonal, and communicational. Figure 3.3 illustrates these four skills. They are summarised as follows.\textsuperscript{84}

1. Technical skills are abilities related to the effective use of technical aspects, specific methods, tools, and procedures in order to perform work in a specialised field.\textsuperscript{85} The importance of these skills is greatest at the lower level of management and least at the top level. Obviously, the lower levels of management deal with day-to-day technical activities more than do the top levels of management. Therefore, upper level managers are required to rely upon the technical skills and abilities of their subordinates and, as a result, should encourage and enable them to participate in any related decisions.\textsuperscript{86}

2. Conceptual skills require the ability to understand and anticipate most activities, problems and changes, and consider the interests of the whole organisation in abstract terms with the view of applying them to a particular

\textsuperscript{82} Vroom, V.H. and A.G. Jago, 1988, p.47.
\textsuperscript{83} Donnelly, J.H. and Others, 1984, pp.27,42.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.
situation when necessary. These skills are most important within the top level of management where concerns often involve the whole organisation, both the internal and external environment.\textsuperscript{87}

Conceptual skills include such abilities as administrative skill (dealing with the internal environment), political skill (dealing with the external environment),\textsuperscript{88} self-understanding skill (recognising strengths and compensating for weakness), intuition skill (anticipating changes and actions that should be taken), value congruence skill (understanding and reconciling the organisation’s guiding principles and subordinates’ values).\textsuperscript{89}

In regard to managerial decisions and the subordinates’ participation in the decision-making process, such skills help managers to understand how individuals are dependent upon, how the departments interrelate, how changes in one area can influence other areas and how the organisation works as a whole.\textsuperscript{90} Thus, conceptual skills in one way or another will help managers to make decisions that reflect both the management’s and the subordinates’ concerns, will encourage qualified subordinates to participate in the decision-making process, and will help to decide when and to what extent subordinates should be allowed to participate.

3. Interpersonal skills are concerned with the abilities needed to understand people, to motive, to lead, to make effective decisions, and to build subordinates into a well co-ordinated and participative group. These

\textsuperscript{88} Alnemer, S.M. and Others, 1991, p.322.
\textsuperscript{89} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Siocum, 1992, pp.469-470.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., p.26.
individual skills are approximately equal in importance for both managers and subordinates throughout all management levels.\textsuperscript{91}

However, interpersonal skills include such abilities as sharing influence and control with subordinates (empowerment skill), understanding others, building subordinates into a well co-ordinated and participative group, and encouraging subordinates' participation in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{92} Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) said, "A manager with excellent interpersonal skills encourages participation in decision making and lets subordinates express themselves without fear of humiliation. A manager with good interpersonal skills likes other people and is liked by them."\textsuperscript{93}

4. Communication skills are abilities related to the effective use of verbal and non-verbal communication and include the process of sending and receiving information, ideas, suggestions, decisions, feelings, and attitudes.\textsuperscript{94} Communication skills are basic to the other previous skills and are about equally important at all levels of management. These skills enable the manager and the subordinates to discuss problems, exchange ideas and suggestions, and make effective decisions. Therefore, ideas, suggestions, decisions, the employees interests, and the organisation's goals and objectives may fail or have little influence if they cannot be communicated effectively to the internal and external environment.\textsuperscript{95}

In practice it is difficult to define precisely the amount of each of these four leadership decision skills which will be needed at each level of management. It is

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., pp.26, 469-470.  
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., p.26.  
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., pp.26-27.  
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.
also hard to determine the transition points between the management levels. The required combination of these skills varies according to managerial level. Figure 3.3 illustrates the four leadership decision skills and shows their relative importance at each level of management in the structural hierarchy. Technical skills are most important at the lowest level of management but decrease in importance as a person moves up in the managerial hierarchy. Conceptual skills, on the other hand, are least important at the lower level of management but increase in importance as a person moves up in the managerial hierarchy. Finally, the interpersonal and communication skills are almost of equal importance at all levels of management in the structural hierarchy.

FIGURE 3.3  Leadership Decision Skills at Various Levels of Management

Source: Adapted from Hellriegel and Slocum (1992, p.27); and Hicks and Gullett (1975, p.308) with modification.
Abbreviations: I.: Interpersonal; Com.: Communication; Con.: Conceptual; T.: Technical

3.5 SUMMARY

Managerial decisions are central factors in leadership applications and practices. Many of the leadership styles and applications reflect the decisions that managers take. As previously discussed in this chapter, theorists and researchers used many ways to classify the leadership styles. Table 3.3 is an attempt to summarise some of the major leadership theories and their corresponding decision styles. Using this table, it is clear that leadership theories exhibit various decision styles. These decision styles vary according to the degree of a manager's authority, the amount of the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, and other situational variables.

However, leadership theories failed to provide a universal formula for the best way to lead and make decisions. Thus, it appears that there is no one leadership decision style which is the most effective and will work best at all times and in all situations. Most managers use all of the leadership styles at one time or another. The appropriate style is dependent upon such variables as the demands of a given situation, the environment, the technology, the task, and the characteristics of the manager and the subordinates involved.98 Elbing (1978) said, "Given the variety of needs of employees, the different organisational situations and goals, and the different frames of reference of managers, there may be no single 'right' approach."99

However, the success of a decision and the achievement of its desired goals is dependent not only upon the manager's style but also upon his or her skills in using that style.100 Thus, managers as well as subordinates must possess and develop adequate skills in order to perform effectively all the tasks and the decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>High initiating structure (task-oriented manager (high, low))</td>
<td>Manager makes decision and announces it</td>
<td>Manager presents ideas and invites questions</td>
<td>Autocratic leadership (theory X)</td>
<td>Directive leadership</td>
<td>Telling or directive leadership</td>
<td>Selling or coaching leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>High structure and consideration oriented manager (high, high)</td>
<td>Manager presents tentative decision, subject to change</td>
<td>Manager presents problem, gets suggestions, makes decision</td>
<td>Consultative leadership (system 3)</td>
<td>Organisation Management (5.5)</td>
<td>Supporting leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Democratic oriented manager (high, high)</td>
<td>Manager defines limits, asks group to make decision</td>
<td>Manager permits group to make decisions within prescribed limits</td>
<td>Participative leadership (theory Y)</td>
<td>Participative group leadership (system 4)</td>
<td>Participative leadership</td>
<td>Participating leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Laissez-faire (relationships) oriented manager (low, low)</td>
<td>High consideration (relationships) oriented manager (low, low)</td>
<td>Country Club Management (1.9)</td>
<td>Achievement-oriented leadership</td>
<td>Delegating leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impoverished</td>
<td>Low structure and consideration oriented manager (low, low)</td>
<td>Low structure and consideration oriented manager (low, low)</td>
<td>Impoverished Management (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Vroom and Yetton (1973, p.17) With Major Modification.*
for which they are responsible and to prepare themselves for higher management levels. Such skills can broadly be classified under four categories: technical, conceptual, interpersonal, and communicational. Figure 3.3 illustrates these four skills and shows their relative importance at each level of management in the structural hierarchy.

Moreover, subordinates are an essential factor in choosing the most appropriate decision style in a particular situation. Their backgrounds, their maturity, their knowledge and their experience can determine the type of leadership decision style which they prefer to be managed through and which will achieve the desired goals. Subordinates today are also better educated, more experienced, and more skilled. They can no longer be effectively managed and commanded in the old way as they were previously, because they have gained more technological and informational development. However, although one recognises the importance of the subordinates' participation in the decision-making process, it is not always an effective or a necessary condition for them to accept and execute a decision. Sometimes they may accept and execute a decision without any participation in the making of it. All depends upon the nature of the situation and the maturity of individuals. The acceptance of a decision may be attributed to the decision-maker's legitimate right to make that decision according to his position, experience, capability, or because he is strongly admired by his subordinates.

The following two chapters will concentrate the discussion on the concepts of management decisions' types, the stages of the decision-making process, the degree of subordinates involvement in the decision making process, the concept of participation and the major participative techniques that can be used to implement management decision in a participative way.

---
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CHAPTER FOUR

MANAGERIAL DECISION MAKING

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Managerial decision making is an essential element of management. It is applicable to all levels of management in any kind of organisation or activity throughout the world. Knootz (1969) said, "It does not really matter what is being managed, whether business, government, charitable or religious organisation, or even universities, the task of every manager at every level is to decide so as to accomplish group purposes with the least expenditure of material or human resources".

The concept that decision making is both an essential and central element of management has motivated researchers from a variety of social science disciplines to study this phenomenon. Therefore, these studies constitute a school of thought that treats decision making as a process synonymous with the process of management. Herbert A. Simon (1960), in his classic work on the science of management decision making, suggested that decision making is synonymous with management. Cyert and Welsch (1970) said, "We view decision making as synonymous with managing". Simon (1977) stated, "But to understand what is involved in decision making that term has to be interpreted broadly - so broadly as to become almost

---

1 Harrison, E.F., 1987, pp. 1, 6, 25.
3 Harrison, E.F., 1987, p.5.
4 Ibid., pp. 2,7.
synonymous with managing".6 Harrison (1987) said, "I agree with Simon that good management and effective decision making are synonymous".7

Generally, managerial decisions as a human activity are more likely to be effective if both managers and subordinates interact with each other, share the decision-making process, and understand the reasons for the final course of action. Cooke and Slack (1991) stated that, “Decision making is a specifically human activity, and all decisions are made (or at least caused to be made) by human beings working with other human beings. It is the characteristics of the decision makers themselves which add probably the most intriguing dimension to the decision process”.8

However, as was stated in the previous chapters, there is no universal agreement between researchers as to the one best style of making a decision. Also there is no universally accepted approach to the manager's choice about how much and in what ways to involve subordinates in the decision making process.

4.2 TYPES OF MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

Researchers and theorists in the field of decision theory have proposed several ways to classify the types of management decisions. In general, such classifications can be divided into two basic categories. The first category includes routine, recurring, and certain decisions with clear and available information. The second category includes non-routine, non-recurring, and uncertain decisions with ambiguous information.9 Table 4.1 shows an example of some of the attempts to classify management decisions.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon(^{10})</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td>Non-programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore(^{11})</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Adaptive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker(^{12})</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson(^{13})</td>
<td>Computational</td>
<td>Judgmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland(^{14})</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharples(^{15})</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke and Slack(^{16})</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Simon's proposition is one of the most widely recognised classifications of the types of management decisions as programmed and non-programmed.\(^{17}\) Programmed decisions are usually well structured, routine, recurring, and can be handled with a high degree of certainty; that is, the outcome and goals are clear and well known, the decision-making rules are already established, and the information is available and well defined.\(^{18}\) In Simon's words, "Decisions are programmed to the extent that they are repetitive and routine, to the extent that a definite procedure has been worked out for handling them so that they do not have to be treated de novo each time they occur".\(^{19}\) In contrast, non-programmed decisions are poorly

\(^{13}\) Thompson, J.D., 1967, pp. 134-135; Cited in Harrison, E.F., 1987, p. 16.
structured, non-routine, non-recurring, and uncertain of the outcome; that is, the
goals are unclear, the decision cannot be made according to existing decision rules,
and the information is ambiguous and complex. Simon said, "Decisions are non-
programmed to the extent that they are novel, unstructured and consequential. There
is no cut-and-dried method for handling the problem because it has not arisen
before, or because its precise nature and structure are elusive or complex, or because
it is so important that it deserves a custom-tailored treatment".

The level of management at which the decision should be made is determined by the
decision's nature, frequency, and degree of certainty. Programmed decisions, where
the process is clear and have a high degree of certainty, are more common at the
lower levels of management where the technical skills are mostly applied. Non-
programmed decisions, because they are complex and uncertain, are usually made at
the top levels of management where the conceptual skills are mostly applied. However, middle management levels also supervise the making of programmed
decisions and in many situations assist in handling the non-programmed decisions.

With regard to participation in decision-making, programmed decisions are most
likely to be made unilaterally because they are repetitive and have a good deal of
certainty associated with the outcome. Such decisions, in their total effect, are
important to the success of an organisation but individually they have little impact
on the organisation. Therefore, programmed decisions are usually delegated to the
lower level managers and are most likely to be made unilaterally with no real need
for participation. Harrison (1987) concluded that participation in making a
programmed decision, where the outcome is certain, represents a tremendous waste
of human resources.

---

23 Ibid., pp. 22-23, 26.
24 Ibid., p. 23.
require the decision maker to exercise judgement, intuition, and creativity. Non-programmed decisions are critical to the existence of the whole organisation. Because of their relative ambiguity and complexity, these decisions usually require more expertise than most individuals have. In respect of this, it is important to involve and allow subordinates to participate in the non-programmed decisions in order to increase their involvement, motivation, and satisfaction. Participation generates more ideas and more interests and helps to accomplish the organisation's goals and activities. Harrison (1987) argued that participation in making and implementing non-programmed decisions is the appropriate way to achieve their objectives successfully. He said, “Such choices are the proper concern of group decision makers at the middle-management or, more appropriately, top-management level”25 Table 4.2 shows a comparison between programmed and non-programmed decisions and summarises their major characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>Non-programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Well structured</td>
<td>Poorly structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Repetitive and routine</td>
<td>New and unusual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Clear and specific</td>
<td>Vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Readily available</td>
<td>Not available and unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial level</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td>Upper level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for solution</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Relatively long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for solution</td>
<td>Decision rules, procedures</td>
<td>Judgement and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Certain outcome</td>
<td>Uncertain outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision style</td>
<td>Delegatable and unilateral</td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Moorhead and Griffin (1992, p. 483).

25 Ibid.
4.3 ELEMENTS OF MANAGEMENT DECISION

The identification of the elements of management decision is a very important tool for one to distinguish the different types of management decisions. It also helps researchers to determine and classify decisions into their related categories. Cooke and Slack (1991) argued that any management decision is composed of four elements. These elements include the decision body, the decision alternatives, the uncontrollable factors, and the consequences or outcomes of a decision. These elements will be summarised as follows:

1. The decision-body:

This element concentrates on how many persons participate in making the decision. A decision is usually made on the basis of a single or a multi-decision maker. When only one person makes the decision, the decision is said to have a single-decision-maker decision body. On the other hand, when more than one person participates in making the decision, the decision is said to have a multi-decision-maker decision body.

However, it is obvious that the decision body element is an essential part of the decision-making process. For instance, the decision body can affect and control what information is regarded as relevant to solve the problem, which alternatives are considered as true and appropriate, how each alternative is evaluated, and how the final course of action is chosen and implemented. Cooke and Slack (1991) said, “It is the characteristics of the decision makers themselves which add probably the most intriguing dimension to the decision process”. Moreover, the beliefs and values of the managers and the subordinates within the decision body can also affect the way in which they perceive the future, risks, ends and means, and the internal and external

---

27 Ibid., p. 11.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., p. 41.
environment of the organisation.\(^{30}\) Donaldson and Lorsch (1983) stated, “This belief system provides corporate managers with a framework for thinking about the complex and uncertain choices they must make... Thus it sets important limits on the strategic choices these managers are willing to make”\(^{31}\)

With regard to the relationship between the decision body and the types of management decision, a programmed decision is usually made on the basis of a single-decision-maker's decision body. Such a decision has a single-person decision body with no real need for participation because it is limited, routine, well understood, well structured, and unlikely to affect other decisions. In contrast, a non-programmed decision is likely to have a multi-decision-maker decision body. In such a situation, participation is very important because the decision is novel, complex, unstructured, dependent, uncertain as to the outcome, and is likely to affect the whole organisation.\(^{32}\)

2. The decision alternatives:

This element is characterised by how many alternatives are available, how obvious these alternatives are, and how certain the decision is. However, writers and researchers in the field of management decision believe that there should be more than one alternative to choose from, so as to enable the decision body to make a decision. If there is only one alternative or if an alternative is apparently the best and certain one, then there is no course of action to be chosen and no decision to be made.\(^{33}\) Cooke and Slack (1991) stated that, “Options lie at the heart of decision making because, unless there is more than one way to proceed, then there is no choice to be made and therefore no decision. The number of options in a decision can be anything between two and infinity”\(^{34}\) However, Dale and Michelon, in their study

\(^{31}\) Ibid., p. 99.
\(^{33}\) Ibid., pp. 11-12.
\(^{34}\) Ibid., p. 11.
about managerial decision making, highlighted the importance of both the number of decision options and their degree of certainty as to the outcome. They believe that a decision is mainly required when there is more than one option and when there is some uncertainty about which option to choose. Dale and Michelon (1971) said, “It is not necessary to make a decision when only one course of action is feasible. The same is true when one course is obviously the best one, for in that case the situation dictates the decision. A real decision is required when there is some uncertainty about choosing one course rather than another - when the manager can not really be sure that it is better to decide one way rather than another”35 Moreover, Butler (1991) also underlined this concept when he said, “If there was no uncertainty as to the course of action to take there would be no decision to make”.36

With respect to the programmed and non-programmed decisions, a programmed decision is likely to have reasonably apparent and certain alternatives but there could be many of them. On the other hand, a non-programmed decision may have a few alternatives but these are unlikely to be immediately apparent. Such alternatives are complex, ambiguous, and difficult to generate.37

3. The uncontrollable factors:

The third element of a decision is the uncontrollable factors. This element concentrates on the parts of the decision which cannot be controlled directly by the decision body but still has a substantial impact on the decision process and its outcome. Such a factor could be, for example, the demand for a new product, the raw material costs, a natural disaster, and unforeseen technological developments.38

38 Ibid., p. 12.
However, a programmed decision is likely to involve only a few uncontrollable factors because of the limited nature of the decision. Such a decision is well structured and well documented; that is, the objectives are obvious and well known, the decision-making rules are already established, and the sources of information are clearly defined. On the other side, a non-programmed decision is likely to have several uncontrollable factors, some of which may not even be known by the decision body and most of which will be difficult to forecast, because the information is ambiguous, there is no previously established decision rules, and the objectives are often vague and uncertain.\(^3\)\(^9\)

4. The consequences:

This element is characterised by the number of attributes each consequence or outcome has and the degree of difficulty regarding the prediction of each attribute. The consequence of a programmed decision could involve several attributes but it is easy for the decision body to forecast each one of these attributes. In contrast, the consequence of a non-programmed decision is likely to have several attributes all of which could be difficult for the decision body to forecast.\(^4\)\(^0\)

4.4 THE RELATION BETWEEN DECISION TYPES AND DECISION ELEMENTS

As stated previously, the understanding of the elements of a decision can help managers to distinguish between the different types of management decision. The type of management decision also has important effects on its elements. Table 4.3 summarises the relationship between the type of management decision and its elements.

---

\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 27; and Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, pp. 481, 483.

TABLE 4.3 The Relationship Between the Type of Management Decision and Its Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Types</th>
<th>Decision Elements</th>
<th>Decision body</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Uncontrollable factors</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category I</strong></td>
<td>- e.g. - Programmed decision</td>
<td>• Possible to have a single-person decision body with complete autonomy, since decision is limited, well understood and unlikely to affect other decision.</td>
<td>• Likely to have reasonably apparent options but there could be many of them.</td>
<td>• Likely to be a few uncontrollable factors because of the bounded nature of the decision - what there are will probably be well documented.</td>
<td>• Could be several attributes of each consequence but likely to be fairly forecastable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- e.g. - Non-programmed decision</td>
<td>• Unlikely to involve others or to have a participative group decision.</td>
<td>• Sources and channels of information are clearly defined and available.</td>
<td>• Likely to have clear rules and procedures for making the decision.</td>
<td>• Likely to have certain, clear, and well know goals and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category II</strong></td>
<td>- e.g. - Non-programmed decision</td>
<td>• Likely to need a multi-person decision body, since decision is important for whole organisation, prone to different interpretation and wide reaching in its effects.</td>
<td>• Alternative options unlikely to be immediately apparent but may not be numerous, because options are either difficult to generate (unstructured) or the result of compromises (dependent).</td>
<td>• Likely to be many uncontrollable factors, some of which may not even be known and most of which will be difficult for the decision body to forecast.</td>
<td>• Likely to be several attributes of each consequence, all of which could be difficult to forecast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- e.g. - Non-programmed decision</td>
<td>• Likely and appropriately to involve others and to encourage participative decisions and group participation.</td>
<td>• Sources and channels of information are ambiguous and unclear.</td>
<td>• Unlikely to have previously established decision rules and procedures.</td>
<td>• Likely to have vague goals and uncertain outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Cooke and Slack (1991, p. 27)
4.5 METHODS OF MAKING MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

Managers can use one, or a combination of methods to make their managerial decisions. They may rely on their past experience, observe the activities and decisions of other managers, attempt and amend, employ the scientific method, or use a combination of two or more of these methods.41

However, decision making methods and decision making styles are not synonymous. There are several differences between these two sets. For example, the decision making method is general and it can involve one or more decision styles or decision methods; whereas the decision making style is specific and it can not involve any other decision styles. The following discussion highlights four decision making methods which include past experience, current observation, attempt and amend activities, and the scientific method.42

4.5.1 The Experience Based Method:

The use of past experience in decision making is one of the most popular decision methods. According to this method, decisions are reached on the basis of the experience that a decision maker has had in the past.43

Experience as an important method can be used in decision making in many situations. For example, the previous decisions that were carried out effectively and that have enough similarities to the one under consideration may encourage managers to rely on their past experience and as a result to apply it to the present
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Also, it is possible for a manager to practice autocratic, democratic, participative, consultative, or any other decision making styles under the influence of his or her past experience. The decision making styles that were well accepted by subordinates and that achieved the mission successfully may encourage the manager to apply such decision styles to the current situation.

However, it is important for the decision makers to be aware and cautious when using this method in decision making. What was once a successful decision in the past may well be a poor decision in the present. This is because there is the possibility that conditions, managers, subordinates, or some other situational variable has changed over time. Therefore, the decision makers must evaluate and examine the situation fully before choosing their final decision. They have to look at the problem as a new one and not as a reflection of their past experience. Elbing (1978) said, “However, relying on past experiences tends to make us search for similarities between a current and a prior experience and to reduce a new situation to the terms of an old one. Even in truly similar situations, the second will differ from the first - if only because the two occurred at different points in time”.

4.5.2 The Observation and Imitation Based Method:

Another method in making a managerial decision is observation. By this method, the decision-body observes the activities and decisions of other decision-bodies in the same organisation or in outside organisations. Then, the observer decision-body tries to imitate all decisions, styles, or methods that have been implemented successfully and have a similar nature to the one under consideration. In this

---
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approach, it is possible for the decision-body under the influence of this method to practice an autocratic, democratic, participative, or any other decision making style.

However, observation can be a useful method in decision making especially where an organisation is small or has limited resources. But it is also important to note that the decision-body should always be aware of the possibility that the current situation and decisions are different from the observed ones. What looks to be a suitable decision for one organisation may not be the best decision for another. The resources available, the time factor, the internal and external environmental factors, and the personal characteristics of the decision-body are some of the major variables which have important effects on the observation process. Hodge and Johnson (1970) mentioned that, "No two organisations will have exactly the same situation - if for no other reason than that they will have different resources for the solution of their problems. What appears to be an excellent solution for one organisation, given one set of resources, may not be the best solution for another organisation with a different resources base. It is also difficult to determine whether others are using the same time dimension in solving problems. One concern may provide a short-run solution to a problem; to copy this short-run solution may be a disadvantage to a firm that is seeking a long-term solution".

Moreover, it is also important for the decision-body to be aware of how the activities of other decision-bodies have been perceived and interpreted, and how the personal characteristics affect the final perception. Sometimes the outcomes of the observation are different from the actual situation. Individuals observe the same things in a variety of ways and their final perceptions are mostly different. For example, if a person looks at the following two photographs he or she will think that they are very similar and to some extent they are beautiful. But if the same person

49 Ibid., p. 338.
or another person turns the page upside down he or she will see that they are different and one photo looks very ugly. These differences, however, arise mainly because of the individual's different perception.

Source: Moorhead and Griffin (1992, p. 79)

4.5.3 The Attempt and Amend Based Method:

Another method when making managerial decisions is the attempt and amend method - trial and error. Sometimes the decision-body faces a novel situation in which neither a manager nor any one of his subordinates has had any experience. In such a situation, it is difficult for the decision-body to apply either the experience or the observation method to decision making. Therefore, the decision-body may use the trial and error method to solve such a problem.\(^{51}\)

Following this method, the decision-body attempts and amends several tentative solutions; and this process continues until a satisfactory solution and an acceptable decision has been reached.\(^{52}\)

---


With regard to the use of decision making styles and decision making methods, it appears that the decision-body has an open option to use them. The decision-body apparently has the opportunity to practice any one of the decision making styles and methods. On the basis of the findings, the experiments will continue until the effective decision making style has been reached.

However, the trial and error method can only be justified occasionally. Most usually this would be where time is not critical and where the decision-body could learn from observing the experiments and benefit from the knowledge gained from mistakes. On the other hand, it is important to note that this method is a costly one and has major disadvantages. Therefore, it is important for the decision-body to be careful when using this method. Here there are likely to be several trials, some of which will be a waste of resources, effort, and time and some may be unnecessary. This will increase the costs due to heavy utilisation of resources.53

4.5.4 The Scientific Based Method:

The scientific method is another option that can be used effectively in making managerial decisions. This method concentrates on the decision making process as an essential way to reach management objectives and the desired outcome. However, as it is impossible to control all the human errors resulting from the bias and emotive nature of the decision-body, the scientific method of decision making is probably one of the best methods available so as to limit the effects of such problems throughout the several stages that make up the decision-making process.54

54 Ibid., p. 342.
However, the stages of the scientific method which make up the decision-making process are proposed by different models and in various forms. Newman, Summer, and Warren assign four stages to the process: (1) making a diagnosis and defining the problem, (2) arriving at alternative solutions, (3) analysing and comparing alternative courses of action, and (4) the selection of a solution.\textsuperscript{55} Janis offers a process that includes five stages: (1) recognition of a challenge, (2) acceptance of the challenge, (3) meeting the challenge through a choice, (4) committing oneself to the choice, and (5) adherence to the choice.\textsuperscript{56} Hodge and Johnson propose a scientific method to decision making that includes six stages: (1) defining the problem, (2) establishing the solution hypotheses, (3) gathering data, (4) formulating the proposed solutions, (5) testing the proposed solutions, and (6) formulating final solution.\textsuperscript{57} Dale and Michelon focus on six elements of decision making process: (1) setting the objectives, (2) making an analysis of the situation in the light of the objectives, (3) setting the possible alternatives, (4) considering these alternatives in the light of the situation, (5) deciding by choosing an alternative, and (6) determining what should be done to carry out the decision.\textsuperscript{58} Simon divides the process into four phases: (1) finding occasions for making a decision, (2) inventing, developing, and analysing possible courses of action, (3) selecting among courses of action, and (4) evaluating past choices - or what he called review activity.\textsuperscript{59} Harrison describes a decision-making process with six functions: (1) setting managerial objectives, (2) searching for alternatives, (3) comparing and evaluating alternatives, (4) the act of choice, (5) implementing the decision, and (6) follow-up and control.\textsuperscript{60} Cooke and Slack advance a comprehensive process composed of nine stages: (1) observe problem, (2) recognise problem, (3) set objectives, (4)
understand problem, (5) determine options, (6) evaluate options, (7) choice, (8) implement, and (9) monitor.\textsuperscript{61}

However, the researchers argued that the decision-body in all types of formal organisations should practice this process whenever practicable. Harrison (1987) cited that, “business executives, government, administrators, military officers, and managers in any type of formal organisation all perform the several functions (stages) that make up the decision-making process”.\textsuperscript{62} The following section highlights the stages of the decision-making process and adapts a model that will be used for this present research.

### 4.6 THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS MODEL (STAGES)

The scientific method involves an orderly decision-making process that comprises several stages. The decision-making process is presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core elements of the decision-making process. However, participation in the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates’ understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. In respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction. Such participation will generate more ideas and more interests and help to accomplish the organisation’s goals and objectives.

Figure 4.1 illustrates the stages of this process, starting with the observation of the problem and runs through the process until the best possible decision is chosen,

\textsuperscript{62} Harrison, E.F., 1987, p. 31.
FIGURE 4.1 The Decision-Making Process
Source: Adapted from Cooke and Slack (1991, pp. 5,10); and Moorhead and Griffin (1992, pp. 488, 494) with major modification.
implemented, and monitored. As stated previously and as it is mapped in Figure 4.1, the decision-making process deals with two types of managerial decisions which are programmed and non-programmed decisions. They share the first three and the last three stages of the decision-making process (see Figure 4.1). Based on the decision type, the following model (Figure 4.1) is adapted and the stages of the process are summarised as follows:

1. **Observation:**

The observation stage is accomplished based on the decision-body's intuition, feeling, and awareness that something is going wrong and an action needs to be done or that some likely decision opportunity exists in the organisation or its environment.\(^{63}\) Elbing (1978) concluded that, "In human management, the decision-making process is usually initiated by the perception that something is wrong, that there is a problem, that something is out of equilibrium, that a situation requires a decision".\(^ {64}\)

2. **Recognition:**

The second stage a decision-body must take in applying the scientific method to decision making is recognition. This stage is reached when the decision-body recognises the difference between the observed state of affairs and the desired state, and is convinced that the need for a decision is real and must be made.\(^ {65}\) Therefore, it is important for the decision-body to have a clear understanding of the situation, diagnose the problem, and distinguish between the problem and its symptoms.\(^ {66}\)


3. **Setting objectives and determining the decision type:**

Next, the decision body must set the desired objectives of the situation and determine what type of decision is required. Setting objectives will provide adequate guidance for managerial decision making and will help to close the gap between what has been recognised in the previous stage and what is regarded as the desired state. So to make a good decision, it is important for the decision-body to determine, understand, and state the possible objectives of the situation fully and clearly. On the other hand, the determination of the decision type will help to find out which stage of the decision-making process is needed to move on. If a programmed decision is required, the appropriate decision rules are implemented, and the process moves on directly to the choice stage. If a non-programmed decision is required the process moves on to the generation of alternatives stage. Figure 4.1 identifies the stages of the process that relate to each type of decision.

However, wrong objectives, inaccurate information, or faulty understanding will seriously affect the rest of the process as will the decision itself. It can lead to unnecessary or unacceptable decisions or, worse, no decision when one is required.

4. **Generation of alternatives:**

The next stage in making a non-programmed decision is to select and generate alternatives in the light of the objectives. Once the situation or the problem has been recognised and the objectives set regarding it, then the

---
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decision-body is ready to formulate alternatives that are regarded as having some potential for solving the problem and seem likely to fulfil the objectives. Such alternatives determine the courses of action that will be considered when choosing the final decision.70

Moreover, the decision-body should always search the internal and external environments of the organisation for all of the possible alternatives, rather than assuming that the first or apparent alternative is necessarily the best.71 The alternatives usually are controlled by several factors such as the resources available to the decision-body, the severity of the situation, and the urgency of the decision. Therefore, the decision-body should develop and generate as many alternatives as resources, time, and money permit.72

However, because it is appropriate to select and generate as many alternatives as possible, subordinates' participation in this stage of the decision-making process is obviously more important. They should be asked and encouraged to take part. The managers are required to combine their own experience, education, and knowledge with the relevant experience, education and knowledge of their subordinates so as to formulate and produce such alternatives.73

5. Evaluation of alternatives:

The next stage in making a non-programmed decision is to evaluate the alternatives that were generated in the previous stage. Such alternatives

represent several courses of action that singly or in combination may help to achieve the desired objectives. The decision-body should evaluate each one of these alternatives in order to find out how sound it is.\(^7^4\)

However, there are a number of ways of evaluating alternatives. For example, one way is to list the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. Another way is to determine the expected payoff associated with each alternative.\(^7^5\) According to Moorhead and Griffin (1992), the evaluation process usually includes the identification of the expected outcomes, the anticipated costs, and the estimated degree of certainty that associates with each alternative.\(^7^6\) In general, the evaluation process concentrates on how each alternative meets the organisation's objectives and participates in reducing the discrepancy between the desired state and the actual state.\(^7^7\)

However, this evaluation process provides the decision-body with adequate guidance to follow in executing the next stage. The differences among the course of action alternatives helps the decision-body to identify the alternative that is clearly superior to the others.

6. Choice of an alternative:

The next stage is the choice of a particular course of action from among a set of alternatives. Figure 4.1 shows that this stage deals with all types of decisions (programmed and non-programmed). As stated previously, a programmed decision is likely to have reasonably apparent alternatives. The

\(^{74}\) Harrison, E.F., 1987, p. 35.
\(^{75}\) Mondy, R.W. and Others, 1990, pp. 175-176.
decision-making rules and procedures are already established and the sources of information are clearly defined. Thus, it is easy for the decision-body to choose the appropriate course of action by applying such rules and procedures. On the other hand, a non-programmed decision is likely to have complex and uncertain alternatives. There are no previously established rules or procedures to make such a decision. The information sources and channels are ambiguous. Therefore, it is not easy for the decision-body to decide which alternative is most likely to solve the problem and achieve the organisation's objectives.78

Based on the established rules and procedures (for programmed decisions) or the results of the evaluation stage (for the non-programmed decisions), the decision-making body is in a position to choose the alternative that is clearly superior to the other alternatives, represents the best thinking possible and achieves most of the desired objectives. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) mentioned that the, “Choice consists of selecting the alternative with the highest possible payoff, based on the benefits, costs, risks, and uncertainties of all alternatives”.79 Harrison (1987) said, “The decision maker obviously wants to select that alternative or combination of alternatives that appears most likely to attain the managerial objectives.”80

The choice process mostly is influenced by the size of the decision-making body. The alternative that is chosen by a single decision-maker decision body will be affected by his or her values and interests. Such a course of action will mostly be based on an autocratic decision making style where there is no room for the subordinates participation. The manager controls the whole process. In contrast, the alternative that is chosen by a multi-decision-

---
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maker decision body will be enriched by the interaction between both manager and subordinates. Such a decision could be based on debate, consultation, participation, or any other democratic decision making style.\textsuperscript{81}

In case of confusion or if some difficulties arise in the choice stage, the decision-making body is required to obtain more information, use some other criterion to make the choice, generate more alternatives, or change the situational objectives.\textsuperscript{82}

However, one of the important things that must be taken into account during this stage is the consideration of contingency plans. The decision body is required to develop contingency plans that can be used if unexpected events have occurred during the implementation stage.\textsuperscript{83} Moorhead and Griffin (1992) define the contingency plans as the, "alternative actions that can be taken if the primary course of action is unexpectedly disrupted or rendered inappropriate".\textsuperscript{84}

7. Implementation and support:

The implementation stage is that moment in the total decision-making process when the selected alternative is put into action under the actual conditions.\textsuperscript{85} This stage is a major element in the decision-making process and without effective implementation the best alternative can be a worthless decision. Wheeler and Janis (1980) said, "It is not enough to select the best

\textsuperscript{83} Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 491.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{85} Harrison, E.F., 1987, p. 35.
alternative. If the decision is not adequately implemented the favourable outcome will not be achieved".⁸⁶

Moreover, the implementation stage involves executing and supporting the chosen alternative, issuing the necessary orders and instructions, and making whatever changes the decision requires to see that it is carried out and has achieved the favourable outcomes.⁸⁷ Hill and others (1978) stated that, "Once a decision has been made, appropriate action must be taken to ensure that the decision will be carried out as planned........All too often even the best decisions fail to be implemented due to the lack of resources, such as necessary funds, space, or staff, or some other failure, such as inadequate supervision of subordinate employees".⁸⁸

In order to increase the chances of acceptance and successful implementation, it is important for both managers and subordinates to understand the selected course of action alternative. Participation is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. Samuel Trull, in his study 'Some Factors Involved in Determining Total Decision Success', believes that the understanding of the decision depends on the openness of communication and the participation of individuals in the decision-making process. Such participation increases the chances of acceptance and successful implementation and gets personal commitments.⁸⁹ In brief, subordinates' participation in executing the chosen alternative becomes apparent during the implementation stage. But it will become more useful if it is considered early in the decision-making process rather than after the choice.

---

However the implementation process also requires follow-up and monitor, in which the decision-making body receives a feed-back that shows how the implementation of the selected alternative narrows the gap between the actual state and the desired state that was diagnosed and determined in the setting of objectives stage.90

8. Follow-up and monitor:

The final stage of the decision-making process cycle is follow-up and monitor. This stage aims to ensure that the implemented decision results in outcomes that are compatible with those expected at the time the objectives were set out. Therefore, the decision-body should follow-up and monitor the implemented decision to see how effective it is and to deal immediately with any problems or sudden events that may happen during the execution of the decision.91 The follow-up and monitor process provides the decision-body with continuous feedback about the outcomes of the implementation process and whether the implemented decision resulted in movement toward narrowing the gap between the recognised state and the desired state.92

In this stage, the actual outcomes of the decision are measured and compared with those expected at the time the decision was made. If the actual outcomes have narrowed the gap between the recognised state and the desired state sufficiently, then this stage marks the end of the decision-making process. If, however, a discrepancy remains or the gap between the recognised and the desired state of affairs is not narrowed sufficiently with the outcomes not regarded as satisfactory, then a backtrack movement to

check the earlier stages has to be taken or the whole process is likely to be started again.\textsuperscript{93} Cooke and Slack (1991) stated that, "decision making is improved greatly when the opportunity is taken to recycle back to earlier stages in order to improve comprehension or to correct wrong steps".\textsuperscript{94} Figure 4.1 illustrates this process and the arrows show the direction of the main and the backtrack routes.

\textbf{4.6.1 The Sequence, Interrelatedness, and Dynamist Nature of the Process:}

In practice, however, the stages in the decision-making process are rarely recognised as distinct stages by the decision-body. They are recognised as a series of interrelated and dynamic stages in a particular order of sequence.\textsuperscript{95} Harrison notes that interrelatedness of the decision-making process as follows, "If managerial objectives are absent, there is no basis for a search. Without the information obtained through a search there are no alternatives to compare. Without a comparison of alternatives, the choice of a particular course of action is unlikely to yield desired results. Without effective implementation of a choice, the actual outcome of the decision is unlikely to be the attainment of the managerial objectives. And, finally, in the absence of follow-up and control the successful implementation of a decision is difficult".\textsuperscript{96}

Moreover, a backtrack movement from one stage to earlier stages can be made at any time of the process in order to add or to change some information. It is also possible for a new cycle to commence if the implemented decision failed to achieve its objectives.\textsuperscript{97} Decision making therefore is a dynamic and ongoing process in

\textsuperscript{94} Cooke, S. and N. Slack, 1991, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., p. 9; and Harrison, E.F., 1987, pp. 36-39.
\textsuperscript{96} Harrison, E.F., 1987, pp. 36-37.
\textsuperscript{97} Cooke, S. and N. Slack, 1991, pp. 8-10.
organisations. Cooke and Slack (1991) argue that, "The process does not necessarily progress from one phase to the next without any backtracking or recycling. Real decision behaviour can exhibit frequent backtracks and jumps forward before an option is finally selected. Thus the decision-making process may not be smooth but a jerky and hesitant progression involving, at times, one step forward and two steps backwards". The framework depicted in Figure 4.1 illustrates the dynamic nature of the decision-making process with both the interrelatedness of the stages and their sequential organisation. The arrows show the direction of the main, recycle, and backtrack movements of the process.

4.6.2 The Degree Of Subordinates' Involvement In The Decision Process

The decision-making process is affected seriously by the size of the decision body. If the decision is taken by a single-decision-maker decision body, an autocratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will not participate effectively in the decision-making process. On the other hand, if the decision is taken by a multi-decision maker decision body, a democratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Therefore, it is obvious that the decision body plays an important part on the decision-making process. Cooke and Slack (1991) said, "It is through the decision body that the organisation's objectives are interpreted and translated into operational criteria. This means that the individuals within the decision body not only make the choice itself, but can also play an important part in deciding to what end the decision should be contributing. Furthermore, the decision body can, in effect, control which options are considered, what information is considered as relevant and how each option is evaluated.

---
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Because of this, the decision body is the single most important element in any decision".99

However, participation in the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. It increases the chances of acceptance and successful implementation and allows for personal commitments.100 As stated previously and as it is mapped in Figure 4.1, decision-making process deals with the two types of managerial decision which are programmed and non-programmed. Programmed decision is repetitive and is most likely to have reasonably apparent and certain alternatives. Its sources and channels of information are available and well defined. The decision-making rules and procedures are already established. Thus, it is easy for the decision-body to choose the appropriate course of action by applying such rules and procedures.101 In respect of this, a programmed decision is usually delegated to the lower level of management and is more likely to be made unilaterally with no real need for participation in the decision-making process.102 However, a non-programmed decision is unique and likely to have complex and uncertain alternatives. The information sources and channels are ambiguous. There are no previously established rules or procedures to make such decisions. Therefore, it is not easy for the decision-body to decide which alternative will most likely solve the problem and achieve the organisation's objectives.103 However, because of their relative novelty, ambiguity and complexity, non-programmed decisions usually require more expertise and skill than most individuals have. In respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the non-programmed decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction.

---
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Such participation, however, will generate more ideas and more interests and help to accomplish the organisation's goals and other activities.104

4.6.3 The Main Problems Of The Decision-Making Process

There are a number of factors that have strong effects on the decision-making process. Elbing (1978) mentioned various roadblocks that, he argues, constrain decision-making effectiveness. This section outlines some of the more important of these roadblocks.105

1. Some managers have an inclination to respond automatically and to make an immediate evaluation rather than to conduct a full inquiry for all the possible alternatives. Such a response leads to premature decision and affects the decision-making process seriously.

2. Some managers have an inclination to regard new problems as equal to old and similar problems. Therefore, they tend to reduce the new problem to the terms of the old one. Elbing (1978) stated, “Even in truly similar situations, the second will differ from the first - if only because the two occurred at different points in time”.106

3. Some managers have a tendency to use apparent alternatives rather than to investigate the precise nature of the problem and the best alternative solutions.

4. Some managers have an inclination to direct decisions in terms of a single goal in their mind. Therefore, such managers usually fail to see other

106 Ibid., p. 50.
organisational goals which may be more relevant to the problem under consideration.

5. Some managers become confused between the problem and its symptoms. They have a tendency to deal with the symptoms rather than the problem itself. In order to avoid such confusion, it is important for the decision makers to go beyond the symptoms and to understand the situation. A better understanding is needed to determine whether the symptoms result from the problem under consideration, or from a wholly different problem, or both. This will help the decision makers to discover the real cause of the symptoms and as a result to solve the problem.

6. Some managers have an inclination to overlook endurable problems. As a result, when a crisis happens, these endurable problems can mostly be ignored by the decision maker despite the fact that they may become part of the factors that have caused the crisis. In such a situation, of course, the decision-making process will be affected negatively.

4.7 SUMMARY

This chapter highlighted some of the important concepts and elements of management decisions. As stated previously in this chapter, the understanding of the elements of a decision can help managers to distinguish between the different types of management decision. The type of management decision also has important effects on its elements. Table 4.3 summarises the relationship between the type of management decision and its elements.

The level of management at which the decision should be made is determined by the decision's type, elements, nature, frequency, and degree of certainty. Programmed
decisions, where the process is clear and have a high degree of certainty, are more common at the lower levels of management where the technical skills are mostly applied. Non-programmed decisions, because they are complex and uncertain, are usually made at the top levels of management where the conceptual skills are mostly applied. However, middle management levels also supervise the making of programmed decisions and in many situations assist in handling the non-programmed decisions. Table 4.2 shows a comparison between programmed and non-programmed decisions and summarises their major characteristics. However, Simon's proposition is one of the most widely recognised classifications of the types of management decisions as programmed and non-programmed.

However, the scientific method of decision making is probably one of the best methods available so as to limit the effects of the human errors resulting from the bias and emotive nature of the decision-body. The scientific method involves an orderly decision-making process that comprises several stages. These stages were presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core stages of the decision-making process. However, as was stated previously, there is no universal agreement between researchers as to the one best style of making a decision. Also there is no universally accepted approach to the manager's choice about how much and in what stages to involve subordinates in the decision-making process.

The adapted model in Figure 4.1 illustrates the stages of the decision-making process, starting with the observation of the problem and runs through the process until the best possible decision is chosen, implemented, and monitored. In practice, however, the stages in the decision-making process are rarely recognised as distinct.
stages by the decision-body. They are recognised as a series of interrelated and
dynamic stages in a particular order of sequence. Moreover, a backtrack movement
from one stage to earlier stages can be made at any time of the process in order to
add or to change some information. It is also possible for a new cycle to commence
if the implemented decision failed to achieve its objectives. The adapted model in
Figure 4.1 shows the dynamic nature of the decision-making process with both the
interrelatedness of the stages and their sequential organisation. The arrows show the
direction of the main, recycle, and backtrack movements of the process.

Generally, managerial decisions as a human activity are more likely to be effective if
both managers and subordinates interact with each other, share the decision-making
process, and understand the reasons for the final course of action. However,
participation in the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to
enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. In
respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in
the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and
satisfaction. Such participation generates more ideas and more interests and helps to
accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives. The following chapter (Chapter
5) will concentrate on this concept of subordinates' participation in management
decisions in more details and more discussions. The objective of the chapter is to
provide a review of literature on the subject of participative management and the
importance of subordinates' involvement in the decision-making process. To this
reason, materials have been selected that clarify the role of participative decision, the
justifications for and the barriers to the implementation of this managerial approach.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUBORDINATES' PARTICIPATION AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION TECHNIQUES

5.1 INTRODUCTION AND CLASSIFICATION:

This research intends to explore and discuss the current practices and patterns of the participative decision making approaches within the Saudi police organisations with particular reference to the Saudi security institutes and to the King Fahad Security College. The intention is to go on to analyse and explain the research findings, and to discuss and review the concept of participation in the managerial decision-making process as is presented by other writers.

In most organisations there are too many functions and duties required for any one manager to do them all by himself, but without the participation of his subordinates, it is difficult to achieve such tasks effectively and successfully. Subordinates' participation in managerial decision making has frequently been recognised by many writers as an important motivating factor. To some, it is the answer to most human problems in decision making. They argue, that it motivates participants to accept more readily a decision and also implement it more effectively as they feel that they are part of the process of making it.1

A study in 1980 covering over 16,000 managers at different levels of management concluded that high achievement managers have in common the following characteristics:2

1. They trust and rely upon their subordinates.

---

2. They are concerned with individual fulfilment and satisfaction.
3. They encourage subordinates to develop their abilities and skills.
4. They are concerned with the openness of all communication channels.
5. They are concerned with both human and task problems.

Similar findings were also accomplished in another study which was conducted in that same year covering over 11,000 managers. The findings of these two studies can be used to justify participation in managerial decision making, as participation usually encourages and enables participants to strive to possess these characteristics and act accordingly. Adair (1988) stated that the successful managers often work as senior partners with their subordinates. They build up a group team to meet both individual and organisational needs. They encourage subordinates to participate in making decisions on matters of mutual interest. The aim being to produce solutions to the problems which will be of benefit to all concerned.

However, participation in this study does not necessarily mean the full involvement of all subordinates in every type of decision. The focus, here, is upon the degree of involvement by the concerned subordinates in certain types of managerial decision making. In this study owing to the specific nature of the Saudi security institutes as a police organisation, top secret and crisis decisions are excluded. However the degree of involvement can be explained by using a scale of two extreme ends as illustrated in Figure 5.1. At one end, managers may decide autocratically without any subordinates' participation (AI style); at the other end, subordinates may decide unilaterally without the intervention of their managers (DI and ABI styles). Between these two extreme ends there is a range of participative points in which the decision maker can be more or less participative. These participative points can be

---

3 Burke, W.W., 1980, pp. 54-56.
Figure 5.1 Scale of Subordinate's Participation
ranged from a superficial participation (All style), through consultation (CI or CII styles), to joint decision-making (GII style). Briefly, the decision making styles which are illustrated in Figure 5.1 can be explained and described as follows:

**AI style:** The manager decides autocratically without the involvement of his subordinates.

**All style:** The manager decides autocratically with superficial participation from his subordinates. He may ask them for file information but not for their opinions or suggestions.

**CI style:** The manager makes a prior consultation with each subordinate individually and then decides. His final decision may or may not reflect the subordinate(s) influence and opinions.

**CII style:** The manager makes a prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then he decides. The final decision may or may not reflect the subordinates' influence.

**GII style:** The manager joins the decision-making process with his subordinates. The final decision reflects the group's influence on a majority basis.

**DI style:** Subordinates decide unilaterally but the manager is available when necessary. Here, the manager delegates the decision to his subordinates - "Do it your way and ask for help if required."  

**ABI style:** Subordinates decide unilaterally without any intervention from their manager. Here, the manager abdicates the decision to his subordinates - "Do it any way you like but don't ask for help if it goes wrong."

However, there is no one appropriate degree of participation that can be used effectively at all times and for all types of decisions and subordinates. It all depends upon the characteristics of the situation, the individuals, and the decision itself. The

---

5 For more details please go back to Chapter two.  
7 Ibid.
attitudes, co-operation and enthusiasm of the employees, both the subordinates and
the managers, to participate are some of the factors that may affect the degree of
participation. The decision type, the level of management, the techniques of
participation, and the nature of the situation are also some other factors that may
affect the degree of participation in managerial decisions.\textsuperscript{8} According to Vroom and
Deci (1992), the advocates for the participative decision making approaches, have
argued that the use of one of these approaches should be made contingent upon the
characteristics of the situation. There are situations where consultative or joint
decision-making approaches would clearly be useful and others where they would
not.\textsuperscript{9} Schweiger and Leana (1986) support that argument by stating that "no single
approach, whether autocratic, consultative, or totally participative, can be effectively
employed with all subordinates for all types of activities".\textsuperscript{10} However, Vroom and
Jago (1988) present a model which is precise about the degree and style of
participation in decision making which is an appropriate approach for a number of
different situations.\textsuperscript{11}

The following sections of this chapter highlight the meaning of definitions,
classifications, justifications, barriers and problems encountered in participative
decision making approaches. It also underlines some of the major variables and
techniques which may affect the practice of the participative decision making
approaches.

\textbf{5.2 PARTICIPATION AS A CONCEPT}

It is believed that the concept of what is now known as participation in decision
making is almost as old as the practices of ancient civilisation nations, i.e.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{8} For more details, please see Chapter 2 of this study.
  \item \textsuperscript{9} Vroom, V.H., and E.L. Deci, 1992, p. 347.
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Schweiger, D.N., and C.R. Leana, 1986; Cited in Ibid., pp. 345-346.
  \item \textsuperscript{11} For more details, please go back to Chapter 3.
\end{itemize}
Sumerians, Babylonians, Chinese, Indians, Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and the Islamic Arabs Civilisation. From their managerial practices discussed in Chapter 2, there were several indicators that these ancient nations were aware of the importance of the concept and were in favour of its practice. For example, Wren (1994) said that "the age of Greece illustrates the first seeds of democracy, the advent of a decentralised participatory government, the first attempts to establish individual liberty, the beginning of the scientific method for problem solving".12

The complexity of the post industrial society, the growth of education, the speed of technological change, and the twentieth century informational revolution are important factors which increase efforts for participatory decisions and encourage both managers and subordinates to be involved in the decision making process.

Participation in decision making has become more and more acceptable during the twentieth century of management development. It has been recognised as an important and motivating factor by many writers. Morris L. Cooke (1919), in his book Our Cities Awake, offered an early idea of participation in management decision making. He said, "Here then is a work [job] in which we can all have a hand, a work which will always be ineffectually done if it is confined to well-educated and highly trained men at the top ... administrative leadership will in the future more and more consist in getting the largest possible number into play in having the great body of employees increasingly critical in their judgements about both their own work and the work which is going on around them".13 Drucker (1961) presented a similar conclusion. He stated that, "people who have to carry out the decision should always participate in the work of developing alternatives. Incidentally, this is also likely to improve the quality of the final decision, by revealing points that the manager may have missed, spotting hidden difficulties and

---

uncovering available but unused resources".\textsuperscript{14} In his study comparing individual
decision to group decision, Donald Piper (1974) found out that the decisions made
by a group of employees are more often correct than the decisions made by the
manager himself alone. He added that the participative manager provides better
decisions than the non-participative one.\textsuperscript{15} These ideas were presented also by
Stoner (1982) who said, "there is strong evidence that commitment to a decision is
usually increased when employees are involved in the decision making process".\textsuperscript{16}
He also added that the "Subordinates' involvement increases their self-esteem; they
take pride in their demonstrated value to the situation".\textsuperscript{17}

However, researchers in this field of study support the fact that the subordinates
involvement in the decision making process often results in the most effective
decisions.\textsuperscript{18} When subordinates feel that their ideas have been listened to and that
they have contributed to the decision, then they are more likely to accept the
decision and to execute it more effectively because it is developed by them rather
than being imposed upon them by the manager. Elbing (1978) pointed out that,
"One way of creating or increasing the acceptability of a solution is to allow the key
persons involved in the problem situation to participate in choosing among the
alternative solutions available".\textsuperscript{19} Furthermore, the participative process of making
a decision, implementing it, and then seeing the positive results can help to increase
subordinates satisfaction, provide recognition and responsibility and reduce any
conflict and ambiguity experienced by the work group.\textsuperscript{20} In this regard, Mondy et
al (1990) states, "When a group makes a decision, additional knowledge and skills
are brought into play, which tends to result in higher quality decisions. In addition,
since individuals are involved in making the decision, generally become committed

\textsuperscript{14} Drucker, P., 1961, pp. 322-323.
\textsuperscript{15} Piper, D.L., 1974, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{17} bid.
\textsuperscript{18} Mondy, R.W. et al., 1990, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{19} Elbing, A., 1978, p. 135.
to it, group consensus expedites acceptance of the decision by the group. Therefore, both individual and group commitment to the decision is increased.²¹ Moreover, it is generally accepted that today’s subordinates have more knowledge and more skills than ever before. Therefore, they want to have some say in what they do at work, how they work, and when. They want to have meaningful feedback on their efforts; they want to be informed and participate in the decisions affecting their current jobs and future life.

5.3 DEFINITION OF PARTICIPATION

What do we mean by the concept participation in managerial decision? This was a question debated by a number of writers who tried to define this concept and to determine its elements.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines participation as "taking part with others in some action or matter". In explaining this definition, Diana (1992) said, "taking part is a shared activity requiring individuals to join with others in some way, and most often, with those who make decisions".²²

Many efforts have been taken to define this concept by many writers. Some of them concentrate on determining the elements and dimensions of participation. For example, Wall and Lischerson (1977) in their study Worker Participation argued that, "Participation is not a unitary concept, but consists of interrelated elements which may be manifested in the decision-making process of an organisation in a wide variety of ways. Three elements central to the concept of participation are influence, interaction and information-sharing".²³ Roca and Retour (1981) have analysed the dimensions and meaning of participation that were given by 30

---

different authors in the field of management. They concluded that, "there is no agreement as to what the dimensions of participation are and furthermore within each dimension there exists marked discrepancies of treatment".24 Diana (1992) in her study *Participation In Decision Making*, finds that previous research in this field of study has identified four dimensions when discussing participation; firstly, who should be involved, and in which stages of the decision-making process, through which managerial decision styles, and with what degree of influence.25

Other writers identify two different types of participation and define each one differently. Pateman (1970) distinguishes between partial and full participation. The former type includes a situation where the members of the decision making body influence each other in the making of decisions but they do not have equal power to choose the final decision. The final choice remains in the hands of one party (e.g. the manager). The latter type includes a situation where each individual member of the decision making body has equal power to influence and choose the final decision.26 Similarly, Richardson (1983) has also proposed two types of participation; indirect and direct participation. Each type was defined according to how the participants are involved in making a decision. Richardson refers to the ways of participation which do not involve face-to-face contact with the decision maker as indirect participation. Direct participation, by contrast, includes the ways of participation by which the participants are brought into a direct contact with the decision makers. In this, participants meet with each other and the decision makers face-to-face.27

However, most of the writers and managers across managerial occupations define participation as a means of involving employees in the decision making process.

---

26 Pateman, C., 1970, pp. 70-71
The aim is to give a greater commitment to organisational objectives and to increase the effectiveness of decisions. French et al (1960) defines participation as, "a process in which two or more parties influence each other in making certain plans, policies, and decisions. It is restricted to decisions that have future effects on all those making the decision and on those represented by them". Similarly, Poole et al (1981) argue that participation means, "forms of involvement on the part of employees or their representatives in the decision-making of an organisation". Richardson (1983) seems to concur when she writes, "Participation in decision making means participation in the process by which decisions are made". Moreover, these ideas were presented by Mondy and others (1990). They believe that participation in managerial decisions is an act of involving employees in the decision making process. Bowditch (1994), too, supports that finding by concentrating on the employees' involvement in achieving the stages of the decision making process. He said that participative decision making, "is a sharing in the diagnosis, analysis, development, and choice of solution for implementation and management of the change process".

In short, participation in its broadest meaning can be considered as any degree of involvement by the concerned subordinates in the decision making process. Thus it covers all styles of the participative decision making approaches. So the range can be from a superficial to an extensive involvement in the decision making process. In other words, it can range from provision of information (AII style), through consultation (CI or CII style), to join decision making (GII style). Figure 5.1 illustrates these styles.

---

31 Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 194
5.4 THE JUSTIFICATION FOR PARTICIPATION:

In order to answer the question of whether or not there are real demands and proper justification for subordinates' participation in making managerial decisions in the developing countries, a survey questionnaire has been conducted in the Saudi security educational institutes and in the King Fahad Security College in Saudi Arabia as one of these countries. A number of early and recent related studies are also covered by this research.

This section highlights some of the major justifications for subordinates' participation in managerial decisions as presented by other scholars in the literature on management. Some of which includes:

1. Legitimacy of participation: Some writers underline the legitimacy effect of participation. They justify the employees' participation as a right in itself especially for the employees who are going to carry out the decision and live with its consequences. Diana (1992) summarises the argument thus, "Participation is sometimes justified as a right in itself: those who are affected by a decision should have the right to participate in the making of the decision".33 This idea was presented also by Brenton (1978), who asserted that, "The citizen's investment in a modern democratic society accords him the right to take part in the wider political process; the argument for worker participation could be considered a logical extension of this".34 Similarly, Druker (1961) stated that, "the people who have to carry out the decision should always participate in the work of developing alternatives".35

33 Diana, M., 1992, p. 64.
2. **Redistribution of power:** Participation leads to a more equitable redistribution of power. It works as a means to redistribute power and influence between the superior and subordinates. Cressey and Williams (1990), in their study *Participation in Change*, have argued that participation in decision making is a way of redressing the balance of power towards an equitable distribution between superiors and subordinates. However, the argument used to justify this view of participation is that the subordinates have to implement the decision and live with its consequences, and so they should be given more influence by involving them in the process of making it. Moreover, redistribution of power might increase the subordinates' commitment to the decision, encourage their creativity, and uncover the available but unused skills and abilities. In this regard, Wren (1994) describes participative leadership as "a movement to reduce the power and status differentials between the superior and subordinates. The goal was to play down the organisational hierarchy of authority, give the worker a greater voice in decisions, encourage creativity, and overcome apathy by getting people involved and committed to organisational goals".

3. **Provision of information:** Participation provides management with a great deal of information and knowledge. It enables managers to receive valuable feedback from their subordinates which may help them to make successful decisions. In this regard, Mondy et al (1990) said, "When a group makes a decision, additional knowledge and skills are brought into play, which tends to result in higher quality decisions." These ideas were presented also by Pipe (1974), who argued that decisions made by a group of workers applying their experience, knowledge, and recommendations are more often correct than decisions made by one manager sitting alone.

---

37 Diana, M., 1992, p. 69.
40 Piper, D.L., 1974, p. 94.
4. **Better use of the available skills and experience:** Participation means better use of the subordinates' skills, experience, and knowledge that may be available in the organisation. In organisations of a non-participative climate (autocratic), subordinates' initiative, knowledge, and skills may not be applied to their maximum extent. In contrast, participative organisation enables management and subordinates to use and benefit from all the skills and knowledge that is available in the organisation.\(^ {41}\) The organisation also gains from the combined knowledge of the superior and his subordinates. Armstrong (1993) in his argument for and against participation supports this finding by stating that, "It [participation] makes better use of skills and capacities available in the enterprise."\(^ {42}\) Mondy et al (1990), too, argued that participation in the decision making process brings diverse knowledge and skill into consideration when making a decision and therefore results in higher quality decisions.\(^ {43}\)

5. **Open communication channels:** Participation encourages the openness of communication channels to all employees. Rensis Likert in his leadership theory argued that participative decision making style motivates each employee to use a two way communication system – upward as a subordinate and downward as a superior.\(^ {44}\) Bowditch and Buono (1994) explained the relationship between participative communication and participative decision making. They pointed out that, "Participative communication refers to the opportunity to contribute information to decision-making process, either about a particular problem itself or about how recommended solutions are likely to be received and how they might most effectively be implemented."\(^ {45}\)

---

\(^ {41}\) Bennett, R., 1991, p. 332.
\(^ {44}\) Likert, R., 1961, p. 105. For more details, please go back to Chapter Two.
Management decisions may fail or have little result or influence if they cannot be communicated effectively to the internal and external environment. Open communication is an important factor in managing resistance to the new decisions and overcoming information and control conflicts during the implementation stage. Open communication channels help to provide information and to close the gap between managers and subordinates. In the absence of information, the gap will increase and may be filled with rumours, inappropriate or false information, which may constrain the decision process. Effective communication channels supply the decision process with the needed information at the right time. It enables employees, both subordinates and managers, to discuss problems, exchange ideas and suggestions, and therefore to make better quality decisions.46

6. **Means of training and learning:** Participation may work as a means of developing the training and learning aspects of the participants. It develops subordinates' skills, experience, and knowledge. It develops also their understanding both by learning about the organisation in which they work and by discovering themselves through this activity. Ramirez (1990) summarises the argument thus, "The emphasis on the learning process provides participants with an experience which may be replicated and improved on a sustainable basis. In the eventuality that the agency were to retire from the area those involved with the project will have gained new knowledge and skills, but more importantly they will have had an experience in planning a learning process as a group".47 A justification for this view is offered also by Pateman (1970), who said, "the major function of participation in the theory of participatory democracy is therefore an educative one, educative in the very widest sense, including both the psychological aspect and the gaining of practice in democratic skills and problems."48 She added also that,

"Participation develops and fosters the very qualities necessary for it; the more individuals participate the better able they are to do so".49

7. **Improve morale and satisfaction:** Participation appears to have a direct effect on improving the level of subordinates' morale, satisfaction, willingness and relationship. Hicks and Gullett (1975) argued that, "Participation in decision making can lead to improved manager-worker relations, higher morale and job satisfaction, and decreased dependence on the leader."50 Mondy et al (1990), too, said, "the development of greater employee participation appears to have a direct and immediate effect on employee morale."51 However, most studies and research in this field of management indicate positive correlation between subordinates' morale and the degree of participation in the decision making process.52 By involving subordinates in the decision process, co-operation among task force members could be maximised, resistance to the new decision could be minimised, and satisfaction and better feeling could be increased within the organisational members.53 Furthermore, the cost of implementing a new decision in terms of turnover, absenteeism, complaints, grievances, conflict, ambiguity, and re-learning skills could be reduced by applying such participative approach in making managerial decisions.54

8. **Increased responsibility, confidence and commitment:** A participative decision making approach may increase confidence and encourage responsible attitudes among work force members. A greater commitment to organisational goals also could be obtained by applying this approach. Mondy et al (1990) said, "since individuals involved in making a decision generally become committed to it, group

---

49 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
consensus expedites acceptance of the decision by the group. Therefore, both individual and group commitment to the decision is increased. In general, participation is seen as a means of giving subordinates the opportunity to develop their responsible attitudes and confidence both by discovering themselves through the participative process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their current jobs and organisation. Proponents of this approach argue that participation increases subordinates' responsibility, confidence, sense of autonomy, and commitment to the managerial decisions. If, they argue, subordinates are enabled to participate in making decisions and if they feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to those decisions, then their managerial skills, confidence, responsible attitudes, and commitment to organisational decisions are more likely to be increased. In turn, participation will prepare subordinates to a higher level of management occupations. In this regard, Stoner (1982), in his book Management, pointed out that, "Subordinates involvement increases their self-esteem; they take pride in their demonstrated value to the situation." He further added, "There is stronger evidence that commitment to decision is usually increased when employees are involved in the decision making process." A justification for this view is offered also by Vroom and Deci (1992), who said, "proponents of Participative or Theory Y Management advocate that subordinates should play an active role in setting the goals, choosing how to achieve them, and then evaluating their own performance. Such an approach is useful not only as a means of fostering subordinates' internal motivation and commitment to the job but also as a strategy for employee development. By participating in this process, the subordinates will be

---

59 Ibid.
learning how to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisation."60

9. **Improve Quality and Efficiency:** Participation improves the quality and efficiency of management decisions. Here, participation is seen as an aid to coordinating employees activities, brings additional knowledge and skills into play, and reduces conflict and ambiguity inside the organisation. It may also help in enabling cost savings through the rational and agreed use of the available resources. Interpreting these factors, the previous researchers support the idea that the subordinates' participation in the decision making process often results in the most effective and qualified decisions.61 Mondy et al (1990), in their argument for and against group decision making, concluded that, "Research supports the fact that group decision making often results in the most effective decision. Participation may also reduce any role conflict and role ambiguity experienced by the task force members."62 Along the same lines, Elbing (1978) pointed out that many writers in this field of study concluded that, "employees who feel they are part of the process of making a decision will accept it more readily and will be motivated to implement it more effectively."63

10. **Recognise the reality of life:** The last justification but not the least, is the recognition of reality of present and future life. It is generally accepted that today's subordinates are more educated, highly skilled, and more experienced than ever before. They cannot be managed by the old authoritarian decision making styles. Today's subordinates want to participate in all matters affecting them. They want to have some say in what they do at work, how and when; they want to get meaningful feedback on their efforts; they want to be informed about and be involved in

---

decisions and activities affecting their current jobs and future. Armstrong (1993) in his argument for participation supported this view. He said, "It recognises the reality of life today, in which traditional authoritarian patterns of behaviour are being steadily eroded."64 Furthermore, Cressey et al (1988) pointed out that, "The growth of education and diffusion of information in the society are other factors which will enhance the capacity and desire of larger sectors of the working population to be involved and will consequently increase the chances of participation."65

In short, this is a real situation with which managers, especially those in developing countries, have to deal with. Therefore, it is better for the managers to develop and implement the participative decision making approach in an orderly and planned way by themselves rather than for it to be imposed upon them by government legislation or because of the pressure of environment and society.66

5.5 BARRIERS OF PARTICIPATION:

Despite the justification of a participative approach to managerial decision making, there are a number of barriers that may encounter the implementation of this approach, especially in developing countries, and this includes Saudi Arabia. Some of the major barriers include the following:

1. **Authority and power barriers:** Subordinates' participation in managerial decision making might interfere with manager prerogatives and authority. This makes some managers, especially in developing countries, not willing to welcome the practice of participation in their organisations. They believe that participation will reduce their power and authority and will impair their administrative position.

---

Bergmann (1978) summarises the argument thus: "Managers continue to be afraid of losing their prerogatives and of losing control to union officials who are foreign to the company. They also shy away from facing subordinates in situations where the latter can challenge their authority, and in which conflicts have to be met head-on. In short, there seems to be little in it for management but potential trouble."67 Furthermore, Bowditch and Buono (1994) said that, "The notion of participative management is often perceived by supervisors as a loss of control from managers to workers."68

2. **Responsibility barriers:** In fact, subordinates in any organisation are not equally in favour of participation. Some subordinates avoid any responsibility and therefore do not want to be involved in the decision making process. To many of them, participation makes work harder and leads to more responsibility. They feel that it is so much easier to let decisions be made by others and criticise management for its failure rather than to participate in making the decision and taking the responsibility for it.69 Such feeling, however, is one of the barriers that may weaken the effective implementation of the participative decision approach. Mondy et al (1990), in their book *Management and Organisation Behaviour*, said, "It should also be noted that not all employees are equally desirous of participation. Managers must face the fact that some workers do not seek more responsibility and greater involvement in their job."70

3. **Confidentiality barriers:** Confidentiality of information might work as a road block in the way of effective participation. It may weaken, or even worse, prevent subordinates' opportunity to participate in making managerial decisions. This view is justified by the argument that subordinates' participation might lead to dangerous
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leaks of information that has been or should be concealed. In this regard Armstrong (1993) in his arguments for and against participation said, "the necessarily confidential nature of much top management decision making would be seriously impaired if work people were involved." Bennett (1991), too, in his argument against employee participation in management decision making stated that, "Certain decisions necessarily require the discussion of confidential information that cannot be disclosed to workers."

In general, the confidentiality concept works as a road block for participation, but it sometimes might be justified being seen as an unavoidable matter. In some organisations, the nature of certain types of information and decisions might require a great deal of confidentiality which not all subordinates should know about. When this is the case, then the subject of confidentiality is justified and therefore both manager and subordinates have to deal with it as a fact, accept its consequences, and try to minimise the side effects upon the participation process. However some managers, especially in developing countries may tend to misuse the application of this concept by classifying an extensive range of information and decisions as confidential matters. This is done to avoid their subordinates' participation in these matters. When this is the case, confidentiality becomes a serious and destructive barrier to the participation process.

4. Skills, knowledge and interest barriers: The skills, knowledge, and interest of employees are very important factors which may seriously affect their enthusiasm for participation in the managerial decision making process. The absence of these factors works as a road block to the development and implementation of a participative decision making approach. The more the employees possess of the above factors the more successful and participative they are; and vis-a-vis the less

they have, they are less successful and participative. Mondy et al (1990) summarised the argument thus: "Whether or not greater involvement in decision making can be developed depends largely upon the ability and interest of the participants, both of the subordinates and the managers. This is not an easy concept to implement. Obviously, if the subordinate has neither knowledge of, nor interest in a subject, there is little need to consult that person."\textsuperscript{73}

However, it is generally accepted in any organisation that not all subordinates have equal skills, knowledge and interest to support participation. Managers must face the fact that some subordinates may not be capable of or interested in contributing to decision making or working without close supervision. This group of subordinates do not want increased participation, either because they are apathetic or because they do not have the necessary skills and knowledge for such an activity. Therefore, they will try to constrain the practice of participation inside their organisation.\textsuperscript{74}

5. \textbf{Time barriers}: Subordinates' participation in decision making is seen as a time-consuming process. The exchange of information, ideas, and suggestions among both subordinates and the manager, as well as effort spent on reaching an agreeable decision, is time-consuming. In short, participation often slows down the decision making process, lengthens the decision making time, and makes a quick managerial decision more difficult. These consequences were classified as time barriers of participation in decision making by many writers.\textsuperscript{75}

In certain situations where decisions cannot be delayed but need to be taken immediately, time cannot be spent on waiting for the participants to reach their consensus. Under such pressures of time and under the need to reach an agreeable

\textsuperscript{73} Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 628.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
decision, participants might select a satisfactory but not the best decision. Mondy et al (1990) in their argument for and against group decision making said, "Sometimes, to reach a decision more quickly, or to reach a decision which all group members will accept, groups sacrifice rather than optimise; this is, they select a satisfactory but not the best solution."76

6. Task barriers: There are several features relating to the task itself which might constrain the effective use of participation in decision making. These features are classified as task barriers unless the employee knows how to deal with them effectively. High tech and complexity of the task are examples of such barriers which subordinates might find themselves unable to understand or unable to participate in decisions relating to such sophisticated tasks.77 Bennett (1991) pointed out that one of the arguments against subordinates' participation in managerial decision making, is that they might not be competent to comprehend the sophisticated tasks sometimes involved in the decision.78

7. Group and individual barriers: With regard to the group barriers, participation might create the possibility of informal groups inside the organisation. When this happens, subordinates come under the pressure of the group's members and be afraid of their sanctions and boycott.79 It is also possible that members of the informal group dominate the discussion and drive the final decision the way they want regardless of other participants opinions. These types of barriers, however, may limit the effectiveness of participation, empty this concept from its real meaning, and discourage other subordinates to be involved in decision making.

78 Bennett, R., 1991, p. 344.
Moreover, the group's decision making approach might encourage participants to make riskier decisions. Each one of the participants may feel that he personally is not responsible for the consequences of such decisions. But he feels that it is the whole group's responsibility and therefore will be encouraged to accept riskier decisions. Because riskier decisions are often undesired and might have serious consequences, managers might limit the use of this approach in their organisation.

Mondy et al (1990), in their argument for and against group decision making, supported the view that group decision making encourages riskier decisions. They said, "Groups tend to make riskier decisions. Because no single person shoulders the consequences of a decision made by a group, individuals feel less accountable and will accept riskier, more marginal solutions."

In regard to individual barriers, participation may enable some individuals to use and consolidate their positions in relation to their group. Individuals with strong personalities or who occupy high-level managerial positions might dominate the discussion, causing less insistent and lower-level employees to go along with them. These types of barriers will minimise the effectiveness of participation and may decrease subordinates' enthusiasm and interest toward it.

8. **Traditional barriers:** The traditional values of some managers and some organisations may constrain the effective use of participation. Therefore, the participative decision making approach must fit with the traditional values of both management and organisations as much as possible if it is to work effectively.

So if employees, both the manager and his subordinates, do not believe in the real worth of participation or feel threatened by its implementation, there may be

---

81 Ibid., p. 195.
participation in theory, but not in reality. In addition, if they have been raised in a non-participative culture and learned to function autocratically, there will be a great deal of resistance to the introduction of participation. Furthermore, overly rigid bureaucratic organisational structures are expected to resist the implementation of this approach. In such organisations, however, managers tend to rely on the formal chain of command, shorter spans of management, and stricter individual accountability.

The traditional barriers are more obvious in developing countries where subordinates may have no real family, school, job, or social experience in participation. Because of the lack of real experience in participation, subordinates may resist the practice of the participative decision making approach. Therefore, both subordinates and managers need to be prepared before introducing this approach to the organisation if it is to work effectively. Without such preparation the traditional barriers will constrain and limit the effective use of participation in managerial decision making.

9. **Misunderstanding and misuse barriers**: Misunderstanding of participation is one of the major barriers that faces participation in managerial decision making. This is true for both managers and subordinates.

In this situation, some managers introduce participation to their organisation in a relatively superficial and selective way. They might not take participation seriously and may adopt short-sighted and selfish perspectives. They may use the participative decision making approach when things are going well, but turn back to non-participative approaches when things get tough. Such superficial participation creates more feelings of mistrust, hesitation, uncertainty, and frustration than of satisfaction. This is quickly perceived by subordinates, who then may resist not only
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86 Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 404
superficial but real participation. Vroom and Deci (1992) supported the argument that superficial participation creates problems of mistrust and resentment. They said, "The problem all too often is that organisations adopt these newer, participative approaches in a relatively superficial way, espousing them when things are going well, but falling back on more traditional, authoritarian approaches when things get tough. This inevitably creates problems of mistrust and resentment, thus undoing any advantages that were obtained. The general participative approach (to the extent that it is situationally appropriate) must be fully accepted by top managers and used conscientiously in bad times as well as good if it is to work effectively. When it is, the approach can have remarkable effects on employee attitudes and work effectiveness."88

In contrast, some managers take the opposite side of the argument. They think of participation as a magical remedy to all managerial and organisational problems. Therefore, they impose the participative approach upon the organisation and direct subordinates to use it. That is certainly another facet of misunderstanding participation. Participation by imposition often creates negative reactions, develops stress, and increases subordinates' suspicions about management and its objectives. These types of consequences will work as barriers in the face of participation and may encourage subordinates to resist the implementation of this approach. Bergmann (1978) said, "where participation has been introduced from the top down, it has often created more stress and feelings of frustration than of satisfaction."89 Elbing et al (1975), also argued that, "When the participative system is imposed from above and employees are directed to use it, it becomes as authoritarian as a non-participative system. The common attitude is if management requires it, is it really for me? Unfortunately, in their fervour to 'change', 'be modern', or to 'rescue a

88 Ibid.
sinking ship', some managers impose participative systems as though they will work magically. A system that is imposed is by definition non-participative."90

Moreover, participation is sometimes misunderstood and initiated on the assumption that subordinates have a participative enthusiasm and spirit.91 Certainly that is not necessarily the case, since the environment of organisations and the degree of interest in participation are not the same for all subordinates. If subordinates do not have the interest of participation or if they work in an autocratic environment for a long time, they may resist the practice of participation and therefore be seen as a barrier to its effectiveness. Armstrong (1993) pointed out that, "Employees do not want increased participation, either because they are apathetic or because they do not see any advantage to themselves."92 This idea was presented also by Elbing et al (1975), who stated that, "if employees have learned to function in a non-participative environment there is no reason why a participative spirit should automatically exist. If no efforts have been made to produce such an environment it may not exist at all."93 Along the same lines, Mondy et al (1990) supported this argument. They said, "It should also be noted that not all employees are equally desirous of participation. Managers must face the fact that some workers do not seek more responsibility and greater involvement in their job."94

Finally, misunderstanding of participation may also lead subordinates to an expectation that cannot be fulfilled, so causing resistance and frustration rather than co-operation and satisfaction. For example, if the ideas participated by subordinates turn out to be inadequate and are finally rejected, those subordinates may become

91 Ibid.
alienated and more resistance will result than if they had not been involved from the beginning.\textsuperscript{95}

In short, these types of misunderstanding are seen as barriers to participation in decision making which might limit its effectiveness. To minimise the impact of these barriers, the participative approach needs to be fully understood and accepted by both subordinates and managers. Employees need to be taught, encouraged, and prepared to work in a participative environment. The participative approach must also be introduced to the organisation in a relatively gradual and persuadable basis. Participation must not be imposed on the organisation or used in a superficial way if it is to work successfully and effectively.

5.6 \textbf{TECHNIQUES FOR EMPLOYING PARTICIPATIVE APPROACHES:}

As a result of the growing importance of the participative decision making approaches, several techniques and models have been developed which enable subordinates to participate in the process of creating alternatives and making decisions. The literature is rich in this area and covers many techniques which can overcome some of the problems and barriers of participation in managerial decision making. However, in this section, five important techniques will be discussed. These are: conferences, committees, brainstorming, nominal groups, and the Delphi technique. Each one of these techniques is highlighted as follows:

5.6.1 \textbf{Conference Technique:}

A conference is a form of participation in making managerial decisions and requires a face-to-face meeting. It is formed to exchange views or pass on information which

may or may not lead to a conclusion. However, the conference may conclude that a particular decision would be satisfactory, but it does not decide or have the authority to make decisions by itself.\textsuperscript{96}

The head of an organisation, a department, or a unit may call his subordinates together for a conference to pass on information, exchange ideas, talk over some matter, or ask for a general conclusion, which he may or may not use. He may take other reasons and information into consideration before he makes the decision based on that conclusion.

\textbf{5.6.1.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Conferences:}

Conferences have some advantages to offer. They can contribute to motivation, coordination, democracy, communication, persuasion, advice, and broad explanation of points of view.

However, conferences also have several disadvantages. Often, they are costly, time-consuming and indecisive. Other disadvantages are that points or suggestions may be duplicated, irrelevant issues may be brought up during the discussion, personal arguments or clashes might develop among participants, lower level subordinates may hesitate to argue with their managers, and individuals with strong personalities may dominate the discussion, forcing others to accept their arguments.

\textbf{5.6.2 Committee Technique:}

Another common participative technique for making managerial decisions is committees. Research indicates that the basic ideas for the use of committees can be

\textsuperscript{96} Paterson, T.T., 1966, pp. 169-171.
credited to administrative theorists. However, committees are found in all types of organisations, i.e. government, educational institutions, religions, and business organisations. With today's organisations becoming increasingly large and complex, the committee technique becomes more important and more widely used in the practice of making managerial decisions.

There are many definitions of a committee. One general definition is: "A committee is a group of people appointed by some other, generally larger, body or bodies to meet and discuss matters within some field of reference, with a view to making group decisions or recommendations to the parent body or bodies". Another definition is: "A committee is a group of people who function collectively". Koontz and O'Donnell (1976) defined this concept as, "a group of persons to whom, as a group, some matter is committed". Similarly, Mony et al (1990) said, "A committee is a group of people assigned to work together to do something not included in their regular jobs". However, these and some other definitions mean that a committee is composed of members who are assigned to accomplish specific tasks and objectives.

In this study, a committee will be discussed as a technique for enabling subordinates to participate in the managerial decision making process. It requires a face-to-face meeting and is formed to exchange information and advice among its members. The members may come from different organisations, may be of a different status within the organisational hierarchy, may have different roles to play in their regular jobs, have different points of views, and be of a different socio-political persuasion. Most

committees have specified duties and authority, and accordingly make recommendations or decisions on actions of some kind or another.

5.6.2.1 Advantages of Committees:

There are many positive attributes of committees which have been discussed in both the previous and more recent literature. For instance, Hicks and Gullett (1975)\(^{103}\), Luthans (1985)\(^{104}\), and Bennett (1991)\(^{105}\) discussed most of the following as advantages of committees.

1. A committee is expected to utilise from all the available skills, knowledge, experience, creativity, and personality characteristics of the participating employees. The committee's members will examine the proposed problem in depth and the agreed decision is often superior to that which could be made by one person working alone. The old adage says that "two heads are better than one"\(^{106}\).

2. A committee can represent all the parties involved in a subject which will strengthen its results. It can be used to bring together experts, workers and managers from various areas to handle difficult situations.

3. Committees increase the persuasion and the acceptance of their decisions. Subordinates will more readily accept and implement what has been decided by a committee as they or their representative participated in making it.
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\(^{103}\) Hicks, H.G. and C.R. Gullett, 1975, p. 168.
\(^{104}\) Luthans, F., 1985, pp. 369-370.
\(^{105}\) Bennett, R., 1991, p. 31.
\(^{106}\) Luthans, F., 1985, p. 369.
4. Committees may enable management to avoid autocratic, extreme or biased decisions. By involving several employees such things are less likely to happen.

5. Committees may improve and encourage internal and external communications in an organisation. They improve internal communication between the departments of one agency and the external communication between the departments of different agencies.

6. Committees often lead to more effective co-ordination of activities. They can help reduce conflict and increase co-ordination between the departments, units, and sub-units of one organisation or several organisations.

7. Committees can work as an educational or training agent. The young and inexperienced members of a committee can observe and learn from the more experienced members who have different skills, talents and knowledge. Luthans (1985) said, "A committee provides the opportunity for personal development that individuals would never receive on their own".107

8. Committees can provide the basis to increase subordinates' motivation and enthusiasm to accept and implement the committee's decisions. Luthans (1985) said, "From a human standpoint, the biggest advantage of committees may be the increased motivation and commitment derived from participation".108

---

107 Ibid.
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5.6.2.2 Disadvantages of Committees:

From a human and an organisational standpoint, there are a number of disadvantages associated with making decisions in a committee. Luthans (1985) and Bennett (1991) summarised some of the committees disadvantages as follows:

1. Committees are time-consuming. Often the decision-making process is slow and takes a longer time to complete. The nature of a committee enables each member to have an equal opportunity to speak out and present his or her argument. Consequently, many committees spend an excessive amount of time discussing trivial matters or repeating similar points and suggestions. This is, of course, a time-consuming process. The old adage says, "In a committee, minutes are taken but hours are wasted".

2. Committees are also costly. They are costly in terms of work hours, money and effort. Bennett (1991) said, "Since committee members are usually highly paid managers, the labour cost of time spent in committees is substantial".

3. Committees often encourage compromise decisions that satisfy nobody. After arguing over a problem for a long time, the committee members may decide to compromise on their final decision. In this regard, compromise often waters down decisions and weakens their effectiveness. However, the old adage that the camel is a horse designed by a committee emphasises this argument. The horse can never be a camel except in a compromise situation.

---

110 Bennett, R., 1991, pp. 31-32  
4. Committees may reach decisions that are the result of log-rolling or of one-person or minority domination. Bennett (1991) stated that "Minority groups can exert great influence on committees through their ability to hold up progress on particular issues".\textsuperscript{113}

5. A committee may divide responsibility or accountability for mistakes or bad or risky decisions, as it reaches them on a collective basis. Collective decisions allow each member of a committee to conceal his or her accountability if something goes wrong. The word 'collective' means that no one member is held responsible, it is the total committee. Luthans (1985) stated that "individuals may use the committee as a shield to avoid personal responsibility for bad decisions or mistakes".\textsuperscript{114}

6. Subordinates may hesitate to disagree with their managers in a committee discussion. The high ranked members seem to do most of the talking during the discussion and low ranked members remain silent and agree with the decisions reached.

5.6.2.3 Guidelines for Effective Committees:

If committees are to be effectively employed and the side effects of their disadvantages are to be minimised, managers should follow some important guidelines and rules. Hodgetts (1990)\textsuperscript{115} summarises the following five important guidelines:

1. The aims of the committee should be clearly stated in writing.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., p. 32.
\textsuperscript{114} Luthans, F., 1985, p. 371
\textsuperscript{115} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p. 147.
2. The members of the committee should be chosen according to the aims of the committee. They must have the skills and knowledge necessary to accomplish the objectives and aims of the committee.

3. The size of the committee should include members with the expertise needed to attain the aims of the committee. It should not be so large that decisions cannot be reached quickly.

4. There should be an agenda for each meeting containing the matters to be discussed.

5. The committee Chairperson should encourage participation while keeping the discussion on track. Donnelly et al (1984) stated that, "Successful committees often have chairpersons who understand group processes and keep the committee moving forward its objectives without becoming constrained by endless debates, conflict, and personality clashes".116

5.6.3 Brainstorming Technique:

The brainstorming technique was in use as far back as 1939117, but it was developed and became more popular in the 1950s.

Since its development, the technique has been used in many situations where it is desirable to have a large number of alternatives for making a decision.118 It is possibly the most widely known of all creativity decision-making techniques.119 This technique is useful for all types of decisions, but it is more effective when the
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problems are simple and well-defined. It may also be applied at any stage of the decision-making process, but it is most successfully applied at the alternative generating stage.120

There have been several attempts to define the brainstorming technique. Alex Osborn (1953), the major advocate of brainstorming, presented it as a technique designed for encouraging the participants' creative thinking.121 Moorhead and Griffin (1992), also define brainstorming as "a technique used in the alternative generation phase of decision making that assists in the development of numerous alternative courses of action".122 Similarly Mondy et al (1990) stated that, "Brainstorming is an idea-generating technique wherein a number of persons present alternatives without regard to questions of feasibility or practicality".123 Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) defined brainstorming as, "an unrestrained flow of ideas within a group, with all critical judgements suspended, in order to come up with possible solutions to a problem".124

In this research, brainstorming is defined as a group decision-making technique which requires a face-to-face interaction. Each participant is asked to be as creative and imaginative as possible and to present ideas related to the topic under discussion without paying attention to their feasibility or practicality. All ideas are recorded and no criticism or evaluation is allowed, to prevent inhibitions of creative participation. The criticism and evaluation process is delayed until the last member of the group has presented his or her ideas.

The number of participants in a brainstorming session may range from five to twelve persons in order for as many ideas as possible to be considered, and to successfully

achieve its objectives. The participants can come from different departments and different backgrounds and may or may not know each other. A highly skilled and well-trained chairperson is essential to keep order and encourage reticent participants. It is also necessary to assign a secretary to ensure that all ideas are recorded.125

The typical brainstorming session begins with the chairperson, often the manager, informing the participants of the topic and encouraging them to generate as many related ideas as possible, without too much consideration of their realism, feasibility, or practicability.126 The participants may present their own ideas or they may use the contributions of other participants as a basis for developing new ideas.127 Each idea must be recorded in full view of all participants, usually on a chalk board, flip chart, or writing pad.128 However, participants are not allowed to criticise any contributed idea, as this may squelch not only that idea but also many other ideas in the mind of each of the participants.129 Only after the last idea has been recorded do the participants begin to evaluate and choose from among the generated ideas.130 Often the final result of a well-conducted set of brainstorming sessions is a solution or decision that is effective and superior to anything that would have resulted from a non-participative decision making approach.131

---

5.6.3.1 Guidelines for Effective Brainstorming Sessions:

Osborn (1957)\textsuperscript{132} and (1963)\textsuperscript{133} stated the following four basic rules as a guideline for a successful brainstorming session.

1. *Criticism is ruled out.* Participants are not allowed to evaluate or criticise the contribution of others until the last member has presented his or her ideas. "Studies have shown that ideas are more prolific and come more rapidly in a non-evaluative atmosphere".\textsuperscript{134}

2. *Freewheeling is welcomed.* Participants should not be bound by formal procedures, formal behaviour, responsibility, or the results of the idea itself. They should suggest ideas on the subject which immediately come to mind. The generation of ideas should be based upon a wild, spontaneous, free, and random thinking. "The wilder the idea, the better; it's easier to tame down an idea than to think up new ones".\textsuperscript{135}

3. *Quantity is wanted.* Participants are encouraged to be as creative and imaginative as possible. The greater the number of ideas, the more the probability that some are useful.

4. *Combination and improvement are sought.* In addition to contributing ideas of their own, each participant is asked to build on contributions of other participants; or use them as a basis for developing better ideas.

\textsuperscript{132} Osborn, A.F., 1957, p. 84; Cited in Alshalan, F., 1991, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{133} Osborn, A.F., 1963, pp. 155-158.
\textsuperscript{134} Elbing, A., 1978, p. 133.
5.6.3.2 Advantages of the Brainstorming Technique:

Mondy et al (1990)\textsuperscript{136} mentioned the following points:

1. The brainstorming technique encourages enthusiasm and a competitive spirit among participants in generating ideas.

2. It keeps participants away from feeling hopeless in regard to the number of alternatives they have generated in a given situation.

3. It stimulates and urges participants to propose new ideas.

Lin (1984)\textsuperscript{137} presented the following two advantages for this technique:

1. Creative collaboration by the participants (as a group) seems to be greater than by an individual deciding alone. The total effect of the group is often greater than the sum of the individual effects.

2. It often helps to generate a large number of alternatives in a short time.

Taylor et al (1958) stated that the brainstorming technique aims to "free individuals from inhibition, self-criticism, and criticism by others in order that in response to a specific problem they may produce as many different ideas as possible".\textsuperscript{138}

Cleland (1983) also stated that "The interaction of individual members of the group is believed to stimulate the emergence of ideas. A synergistic effect often results from the interaction of the brainstorming session".\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{137} Lin, M., 1984, p. 180; Cited in Alshalan, F., 1991, p. 82.
5.6.3.3 Disadvantages of the Brainstorming Technique:

Lin (1984) highlighted some of the negative aspects of a brainstorming session, such as:

1. In a freewheeling climate, the chairperson will find it difficult to rule the participants and manage the brainstorming session effectively.

2. As this technique encourages the development of spontaneous ideas it does not produce structured or refined ideas.

3. This technique also does not provide enough time for generating and evaluating the new ideas.

4. Strong social pressure is often exerted on participants to accept the perception of the majority of the group even when they have different opinions.

5. Participants often present what they assume to be ideal or obvious ideas then slow down their participation or even withdraw from further participation until the end of the brainstorming session.

6. This technique requires a highly skilled chairperson to keep order and encourage reticent participants to speak out during a brainstorming session. It also requires participants who are familiar with the proposed problem.

7. It might be difficult for some participants to delay their judgement or follow the rules of this technique precisely.

5.6.4 Nominal Group Technique (NGT):

The nominal group technique (NGT) offers another means of implementing the participative decision making process. It was developed by Delbecq and Van de Ven in 1968 from industrial engineering studies, managerial studies, social work studies, and social psychological studies in the public sector.\(^{141}\)

Luthans (1985) defined the nominal group technique as "a group of individuals added together on paper but not verbally interacting".\(^{142}\) He also added, "It is a group in name only because no verbal exchange is allowed between members".\(^{143}\) Moorhead and Griffin (1992) presented this technique as a generate-discussion-vote cycle process that the group members should follow until they reach an appropriate decision.\(^{144}\) Moreover, Mondy et al (1990) said that the nominal grouping is, "an approach to decision making that involves ideas generation by group members, group interaction only to clarify ideas, member rankings of ideas presented and alternative selection by summing ranks".\(^{145}\)

In the nominal group technique, participants meet together face-to-face but discussion or interpersonal communication between them is not allowed. During the meeting they act independently to minimise the effect of personal and inter-personal factors on the types of ideas or suggestions each participant might present.\(^{146}\) Mondy et al (1990) said "An important feature of this technique [NGT] is that it

---


\(^{142}\) Luthans, F., 1985, p. 607.

\(^{143}\) Ibid.


allows the members to meet face to face but does not restrict individual creativity as traditional group discussions do".\textsuperscript{147} Furthermore, a meeting helps participants develop a participative feeling and puts inter-personal pressure on the participants to do their best in generating new ideas and alternatives.\textsuperscript{148}

However, the nominal group technique can be used in different stages of the decision-making process, such as identification of the problem, generation of the available alternatives, evaluation of the presented alternatives, and choosing the appropriate alternative or decision.\textsuperscript{149}

5.6.4.1 The Steps of the NGT Process:

The process of the nominal group technique consists of the following steps:\textsuperscript{150}

1. \textit{Statement of the decision problem.} The issue must be addressed to the participants by the chairperson clearly and briefly. No discussion is allowed at this step, but participants may ask questions for clarification.

2. \textit{Ideas Generation.} Each participant silently and independently writes down his or her ideas for solving the proposed problem. No discussion is permitted between the participants at this stage.

3. \textit{Round-robin recording.} Following the idea generation period, participants take turns reporting their ideas, one at a time, while the chairperson summarises and lists the ideas on a flip chart or chalkboard visible to the

\textsuperscript{147} Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 184.
\textsuperscript{148} Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 509.
\textsuperscript{149} Bass, B.M., 1983, pp. 162-163.
entire group. This process continues without discussion until the last idea has been recorded.

Figure 5.2 Steps in Nominal Group Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS IN NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Statement of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Idea Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Round-robin recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarification of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preliminary Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discussion of revised list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Final voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Mondy et al, 1990, p. 185

4. *Clarification of ideas.* After all ideas have been presented and recorded in the list, the participants may ask questions to clarify any confusion about what each idea means. No evaluation is allowed at this stage.
5. **Preliminary voting.** Each participant silently and independently votes on the ideas priority by using any useful and anonymous means. The ideas that receive the lowest priority are eliminated from the list.

6. **Discussion of the revised list.** Highly concentrated discussion is made to clarify and explain the ideas that remain. The aim of this step is not to persuade but to increase understanding.

7. **Final voting.** The meeting concludes with a silent, independent and anonymous ranking vote on the priorities of all the revised ideas. The idea with the highest total ranking is adopted as the group joint decision. In other words, the final decision or recommendation is made on the basis of the highest ranking idea.

**5.6.4.2 Advantages of The Nominal Group Technique (NGT):**

Van de Ven and Delbecq (1971) pointed out that nominal groups:¹⁵¹

a. Stimulate creative tension by means of the presence of others, the silence, and the evidence of activity. This tension is important for individual commitment to the search process.

b. Avoid evaluation or elaborating comments while problem dimensions are being generated (Maier & Hoffman, 1960).

c. Provide each individual time and opportunity to engage in reflection (search) and force participants to record their thoughts (Dunnette, 1964; Horowitz & Newman, 1964; Maier & Solem, 1952).

d. Avoid the dominance of group output by strong personality types (Maier & Maier, 1957).

e. Prevent premature closure to the alternative search process and decision making (Bennett, 1955; Maier & Hoffman, 1960).

f. Allow all participants to share in the opportunity for influencing the direction of group-discussion outcomes (Goldman et al, 1961; Pelz, 1956).

g. Encourage the generation of minority opinions and ideas which consequently are more likely to be voiced (Maier & Solem, 1952; Shukla, 1970).

h. Tolerate conflicting, incompatible ideas since all ideas are revealed in writing (Deutsch, 1949; Guetzkow & Gyr, 1954; Vroom et al, 1969).

i. Alleviate "hidden agendas" or covert political group dynamics which are difficult to develop when writing (Foureizos et al, 1950).

j. Induce a sense of responsibility in the member to achieve group success (Benne & Sheats, 1948).

k. Impose a burden upon all participants to work and produce their share in the necessary task (Bales, 1953; Deutsch, 1949).
1. By means of written expression, induce a greater feeling of commitment and a greater sense of permanence than does the spoken expression (Bouchard, 1953; Horowitz & Newman, 1964).

Furthermore, Moorhead and Griffin (1992) stated that the nominal group technique has the following advantages:

1. It helps minimise the negative effects of power and status differences among participants.

2. It can be used in different stages of the decision making process, such as problem exploration, alternative generation, and alternative evaluation.

3. Nominal group technique often puts inter-personal pressure on the participants to do their best to generate ideas.

5.6.4.3 Disadvantages of The Nominal Group Technique (NGT):

Lin (1984) presented some general disadvantages of the nominal group technique as follows:

1. The nominal group technique requires a highly skilled and knowledgeable chairperson who can handle and manage the process of this technique effectively.

2. Some of the NGT questions might mislead participants if they are not carefully prepared.
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3. Nominal group technique requires participants to possess good writing and reading skills. No illiterate person would be included.

4. The voting procedure and results can be manipulated by some participants to give them more influence.

5. It is considered to be a single-purpose technique because it deals with one idea at a time. This increases the time, cost and efforts that are needed to accomplish the whole process.

6. It is burdensome and costly, especially when there is a large number of participants.

5.6.5 The Delphi Technique:

The Delphi Technique, named after an ancient Greek oracle, was originally developed in the 1950s by Norman Dalkey and his associates at the Rand Corporation in the United States. This technique has been successfully used on various decision problems in the fields of business, government, education, health, industry, and military organisations. It is also recognised as an important and popular aid to strategic decision making or planning.

In general, the Delphi technique is characterised by a sequential group of questionnaires, a group of experts, anonymous responses, a process of recycling information and a final result of consensus. Quade (1975) in his study 'Analysis for Public Decisions' argued that the Delphi technique "is an iterative procedure for
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eliciting and refining the opinions of a group of people by means of a series of
individual interrogations”.\textsuperscript{156} Similarly, Harrison (1987) in his book \textit{The
Managerial Decision-Making Process} stated that "The Delphi technique provides
for the systematic solicitation and collection of judgements on a particular designed
sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarised information and opinions
derived from earlier responses".\textsuperscript{157} Mondy et al (1990) in their argument for this
technique said "The Delphi technique is a formal procedure for obtaining consensus
among a number of experts through the use of a series of questionnaires".\textsuperscript{158}
Moorhead and Griffin (1992) concluded that "The Delphi technique is a method of
systematically gathering judgements of experts for use in developing forecasts".\textsuperscript{159}
Similarly, Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) defined this technique as "A forecasting aid
based on a consensus of a panel of experts, arrived at in steps".\textsuperscript{160}

However, the Delphi technique is particularly designed for people who are
geographically scattered, desirous of anonymity or do not want to meet face-to-face
for group decision making because of extreme differences of opinion they may have
about the decision problem.\textsuperscript{161} In addition, the size of the respondents group can be
small or large. Hellriegel and Slocum (1992) pointed out that the group size can
range from only a few to 140 participants. They added that a range of fifteen to
twenty persons is an advisable number for a fairly narrow problem. However, the
actual and effective size will depend on the objectives that need to be
accomplished.\textsuperscript{162}

Participants in the Delphi technique can, however, be categorised into two groups.
One is the respondents group, which is composed of individuals who are experts on

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{156} Quade, E.S., 1975, p. 191.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Harrison, E.F., 1987, pp. 278-279.
\item \textsuperscript{158} Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 185.
\item \textsuperscript{159} Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 510.
\item \textsuperscript{160} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1992, p. 285.
\item \textsuperscript{161} Harrison, E.F., 1987, p. 287; and Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 510.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1992, p. 285.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the topic under consideration. The other is the analysts group which is composed of a steering group or an exercise manager, whose responsibility is to analyse, summarise and recycle information among respondents.163

5.6.5.1 The Steps of the Delphi Technique Process:

The Delphi technique process involves the following steps:164

1. The problem is presented to the selected experts through a general questionnaire prepared by the steering group. The participants do not meet face-to-face and may remain unknown to one another until the end of the process.

2. The experts are asked to complete the general questionnaire and to provide potential explanation and opinions regarding the problem under discussion. This is done anonymously and independently. The responses are then sent to the steering group.

3. The steering group analyses and summarises the outcome of all the responses. However, a statistical method, usually the median is used to represent the group response. The result, along with a revised and more specific questionnaire is sent back to the respondents, giving them the opportunity to modify or justify their original opinions.

4. The respondents, individually and anonymously, complete the revised version of the questionnaire and return it to the steering group along with any further explanations or opinions.

5. The last two steps recycle until consensus is reached. In most cases, after a few rounds of questioning, the consensus moves close to the actual solution. However, unless additional rounds seem advisable, the median of the third round responses may be taken as representing the group position as to what the decision should be. Figure 5.3 illustrates these five steps.
5.6.5.2 Advantages of the Delphi Technique

Quade (1975)\textsuperscript{165} highlighted some of the advantages of the Delphi Technique as follows:

1. It helps improve respondents' ideas by subjecting their views to the criticism of others.

2. It helps reduce irrelevant or redundant ideas through a series of revised questionnaires.

3. It avoids the psychological drawbacks (e.g. shyness, show-up or personal conflict) associated with unstructured face-to-face decision making techniques. There is no opportunity for personal conflict among participants as there is no face-to-face interaction.

4. It avoids oral arguments and therefore produces documented records that can be referred to at any time.

5. The attention of the participants is focused directly on the problem under discussion.

6. The statistical, usually the median, way of defining the group judgement reduces the pressure problems for conformity that may exist in the face-to-face decision making techniques.

7. As a democratic technique, it encourages and develops the implementation of the participative decision making approaches.

\textsuperscript{165} Quade, E.S., 1975, pp. 191-195.
8. The anonymous debate among participants has proved to be superior to the traditional face-to-face debate in arriving at a group consensus. Anonymity minimises the effect of inter-personal influences on the decision making process. It prevents the respondents from being influenced by the personalities and status of the other participants and allows for the sharing of information simultaneously.

9. It ensures that the ideas of every participant play a role in determining the final decision, solution or recommendation.

10. Generally, the end result of the Delphi process is a consensus solution.

Moorhead and Griffin (1992) stated that "The Delphi technique is useful when experts are physically dispersed, anonymity is desired, or the participants are known to have difficulty communicating with one another because of extreme differences of opinion".166

5.6.5.3 Disadvantages of the Delphi Technique:

The Delphi technique has a number of disadvantages associated with making decisions. Quade (1975)167 highlighted some of these disadvantages as follows:

1. It may not develop the stimulation and richness of ideas that come from the face-to-face interaction techniques (discussion and debate).

---

2. It is generally limited to important and futuristic decisions or planning.

3. The choice of participant for the panel may bias the outcome of the technique.

4. The exchange of information is time-consuming.

5. Although participants might need further explanation of some of the elements of the questionnaire, the structure of this technique makes it difficult to achieve such clarification. It does not allow for direct communication between participants.

6. The construction of unambiguous questions that do not require further explanation is extremely difficult.

7. Unless the number of participants is small, summarising all the responses and designing verbal feedback presents problems of time, money and effort.

8. Since all responses need to be compiled and summarised, certain participants will find that their ideas have not been represented in the revised version of the questionnaire(s), which may negatively affect their co-operation.

9. In this technique, there is a lack of personal communication between the respondents' group and the analyst group. This increases the possibility of misunderstanding.
5.7 SUMMARY

In this chapter, some effort has been taken to clarify the concept of participation in managerial decision making and to understand why participation is important for employees, both the subordinates and the managers.

The concept of what is now known as participation in decision making is almost as old as the methods of the ancient civilisation nations. There are several hints to indicate that these ancient nations were aware of the importance of participation and in favour of its implementation. Participation received greater and greater welcome during the twentieth century of management development. It has been frequently recognised, by many writers and analysts, as one of the important motivating factors in the field of management. To some of them, it is the answer to most managerial and decision problems. Moreover, today's subordinates want to have some say in what they do at work, how, and when; they want to get meaningful feedback on their efforts; they want to be informed about and to participate in decisions affecting their current jobs and future. However, the degree and range of subordinates' participation is a matter for debate but the concept and its importance are agreed.

This chapter presented the definitions, classifications, justifications, barriers, and techniques of participation that were most often given by other writers and analysts in this field of study. It also highlighted some of the major variables that need to be considered in the analysis of participation programmes.

For the purpose of this study, participation in decision making is defined as the degree of involvement of the concerned subordinates in the making of certain types of managerial decisions which may affect their current jobs and future. As

illustrated in Figure 5.1, this definition covers all forms of the participative decision making styles. By this definition, participation in decision making is seen as a means by which subordinates could be developed and prepared for positions of more responsibility in the organisation. It also may enable management to make decisions that are more acceptable than would have been the case without it. Giving subordinates a voice in making these decisions can help to win their support and acceptance for the implemented choice.

Figure 5.1 illustrates the classification of decision making styles in general and the participative styles in particular. The degree of subordinates' participation can be ranged from a superficial participation (AII style), through consultation (CI or CII styles), to joint decision making (GII style). However, participation in this study does not necessarily mean the full involvement of all subordinates in all types of decisions. The focus, here, is on the degree of involvement of the concerned subordinates in certain types of decisions. For the validity of this study and for the specific nature of the Saudi security institutes (as they are police institutions), top secret decisions and crisis decisions are excluded. However, the degree to which subordinates should be encouraged to participate in decision making depends on the characteristics of the situation, individual, and the type of the decision. In other words, no single decision making style, whether autocratic, consultative, or totally participative, is best for all subordinates, situations, and decisions. Vroom and Jago (1988)\(^{169}\) presented a model that is precise about the degree and style of participation in decision making that is appropriate in different situations.

The chapter, then, examined the justification for and the barriers to participation. In this regard, participation is justified by a number of factors, including legitimacy effect, redistribution of power, provision of information, better use of skills and knowledge, openness of communication channels, training and learning aspects,

\(^{169}\) Vroom, V.H. and A.G. Jago, 1988, p. 184
improvement of morale and satisfaction, more confidence and more responsible attitudes, increasing the quality of the decisions, and accepting the reality of today's life. Despite these justifications, there are a number of barriers which constrain the effective use of participation in decision making. Some of these include management authority and prerogatives, data confidentiality, lack of responsible attitudes, lack of skills and interest, cost of time, complexity of the task, pressure from individuals and informal groups, traditional and cultural aspects, and misunderstanding or misuse of the participation concept.

Also, this chapter highlighted some of the major techniques that can be used when implementing a participative decision making style. These techniques include conference technique, committee technique, brainstorming technique, nominal group technique, and the Delphi method technique. Several of the important requirements for successful implementation of these techniques in managerial decision making were also mentioned.

Finally, it is important to stress that participation in decision making is not of itself a magical remedy to managerial problems and conflicts, but if it is used effectively it may provide an opportunity to avoid unnecessary problems and to co-ordinate the conflicts of interest and opinion of both the employees and the management. In addition, participation is a continuous process that must be accepted, supported, and maintained by management. It cannot simply be introduced and then be left to look after itself. Where this occurs more resistance and failure will result than if it had not been introduced in the first place.

The following chapter (Chapter 6) outlines the methodology and procedures used for this study. The methodology instrument consists of the use of a survey questionnaire to obtain empirical data from subordinate-managers currently employed in the main Saudi security educational institutes and centres. This is to identify their managerial
decision-making styles, the degree of participation they may have in the decision making process and their understanding and attitudes towards the concept of participation. The questionnaire was designed to answer the main questions and hypotheses of this research. The chapter also identified the way in which the questionnaire forms were distributed and collected, the variables and factors affecting responses, the characteristics of the target sample, and the statistical tests and procedures used to carry out the analysis process of this study.
CHAPTER SIX

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters survey the development and the importance of management decision-making styles in general and the participative decision-making approaches in particular with special emphasis made on the implementation of these approaches in Saudi managerial practices. Having established the minimum requirements necessary for the efficient participation in managerial decisions, we now turn to the method adopted in assessing the extent to which they are present in the Saudi managerial context.

The present chapter (Chapter 6) includes the survey methodology which was used to collect needed data to answer the central research questions and test the hypotheses of this study. The methodology and procedures used were designed to fit the actual objectives of the study and the circumstances surrounding it. The methodology utilised in this study is a combination of descriptive survey and empirical research carried out during a three month field trip study conducted in Saudi Arabia in the Summer of 1996.

However, obtaining empirical data can be done in many different ways. The most common methods include observations, in-depth interviews, content analysis and questionnaires. The method used to collect primary data for this research was the questionnaire instrument. This method was viewed as being the preferred instrument for this study because a large number of respondents could be contacted with less expense in time and money. At the same time, respondents could complete
the questionnaire when it was convenient for them. Confidentiality also increases the return rates and the reliability of the responses. If the participants suspect that they can be identified or that their responses may be used in a punitive manner, they will not express their actual thoughts, but they will often choose to tell a researcher what they feel that he or she wants to hear.\(^1\)

de Vaus (1993) said, "The most widely used technique is the questionnaire. Questionnaires can be filled out by the respondent and returned to the researcher or administered by interviewers. The questionnaire is a highly structured data collection technique whereby each respondent is asked much the same set of questions. Because of this, questionnaires provide a very efficient way of creating a variable by case matrix for large samples."\(^2\) He also added, "Despite shortcomings questionnaires have the great advantage of generating a systematic variable by case matrix, of enabling coverage of a large, representative sample and of being relatively efficient."\(^3\)

In short, the present chapter begins by describing both the research central questions and the hypotheses formulated for the purpose of designing the survey instruction. Further details are then presented with regard to the data sources of the study. This is followed by a presentation of the survey instrument in terms of design, structure and validation of the questionnaire, together with the statistical techniques and tests employed in the analysis and interpretation of the survey data and findings. Finally, the chapter recalls the main features of the geographical and personal context of the survey and the various related managerial concepts covered by the survey questionnaire. Furthermore, the population, the sample, the distribution and collection process, the data analysis procedures for conducting this research are also discussed in this chapter.

---

3. Ibid., p. 105.
6.2 RESEARCH CENTRAL QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

As pointed out in Chapter One, a major difficulty facing the Saudi researcher is the scarcity of reliable data on the participative decision-making approaches of the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. Thus, as no comparative study on the issue of Participative Management (PM) in the Saudi police sector has come to the researcher's knowledge, the approach used in this study is mainly exploratory and descriptive in nature and takes, as a starting point, a number of questions and hypotheses on the current managerial situation of the Saudi security educational institutes and centres.

However, this study will try to provide answers to the following main research questions:

1. How does the concept of participation in managerial decisions developed through the human civilisations' history?

2. What are the major decision-making methods, styles and techniques that may be implemented by the decision makers when making their managerial decisions?

3. Who should be involved in the decision-making process and in what type of managerial decisions?

4. Do subordinate-managers increase or decrease their participation in some stages of the decision-making process than in others, how and why?
5. To what extent do the types of managerial decisions and the styles of making these decisions interact or relate to one another?

6. How do the level of education, training, experience, age, position, managerial span, Western education and the field of education affect the decisions of the subordinate-managers?

7. What are the respondents’ attitudes towards the items of job-satisfaction and participative decisions in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres?

8. What are the justifications for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making styles in general and in the Saudi context in particular?

The following hypotheses were designed to answer some of the above central research questions:

Hypothesis 1: The dominant decision-making style in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres is the semi-consultative style (CI).

Hypothesis 2: The non-programmed decisions are more participative than the programmed decisions.

Hypothesis 3-A: The subordinate-managers who are highly educated implement the scientific decision-making approach more than those who are not.
Hypothesis 3-B: The participation of the upper-level subordinate-managers in programmed decisions significantly increases in the first stages of the decision-making process.

Hypothesis 3-C: The participation of the lower-level subordinate-managers in the non-programmed decisions decreases with each advance stage of the decision-making process.

Hypothesis 4: There are significant relationships between the decision-making style and the span of management; the managers with wide span of management are expected to be more participative in their decisions than those with a narrow span of management.

Hypothesis 5: There is a correlation between the degree of participation in managerial decisions and the position of the manager; the high-level manager is more participatory in his managerial style than the low-level manager.

Hypothesis 6: There are significant relationships between the decision-making styles and the educational qualifications of the decision maker; the more educated the manager is, the more participative his decision-making styles.

Hypothesis 7: There are significant relationships between the decision-making styles and the place (country) where the decision-maker received his higher education; those who received their higher education from Western countries are expected to be more participative in their managerial decision-making styles than those who did not.
Hypothesis 8: There are significant interactions between the decision-making styles and the training qualifications of the decision makers; those who have managerial training qualifications are more participative in their decision-making styles than those who have none.

Hypothesis 9: There are significant relationships between the decision-making styles and the experience of the decision maker; the more experienced he is, the more participative his decision-making style.

Hypothesis 10: It is assumed that the managers' job-satisfaction and their perceptions of participation in making managerial decisions would tend to vary with age, qualification, position, span of management, experience, and country of higher education.

Hypothesis 11: In the Saudi security educational institutes and centres the subordinate-managers are more familiar with the practice of Committee and Conference techniques than with the practice of the other techniques presented by this study.

6.3 DATA SOURCES

The following sources of data have been utilised and examined by this study:

1. Primary Sources

Primary sources have included a formal survey via a structured questionnaire and informal interviewing with the head director (or his assistant) of each
one of the security educational institutes. During the early stage of this study, the researcher conducted short informal interviews with several administrators and academicians in the King Fahad Security College. These interviews were used as an explanatory device to guide the researcher in formulating the items of the questionnaire. Furthermore, on-site observations and the researcher's long-time experience as a police officer and administrator in the King Fahad Security College for more than 17 years have also been utilised.

2. **Secondary Sources**

Secondary sources include survey data such as government-published documents pertaining to the basic law of government in Saudi Arabia, the law of the council of ministers, the law of the Shura (consultative) Council, and the law of the provinces.

Documents of internal rules pertaining to the administrative functions, duties, and affairs of the security educational institutes and centres in Saudi Arabia have also been surveyed. The official documents and reports of the country have been helpful since the literature on Saudi's participative management is scarce. These documents have covered many aspects of administrative reform and development.

Western and Middle Eastern literature pertaining to management decision-making, in general, and participative decision-making styles in particular has also been reviewed. This literature includes books, theses, journals, and newspaper editorials. Quotations from the Holy Quran and The Sunna have also been cited as needed. The review of literature has covered many aspects of interest, focusing primarily on the areas of participative management,
decision-making styles, management in developing countries, management in Saudi Arabia and other countries with similar administrative reform and development.

6.4 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT AND VALIDITY

During the planning stage of this research, it was found that there was very little reliable information and literature about the managerial decision-making styles of the Saudi public managers in general and those who work in the police sector in particular. Therefore, it became obvious that the use of a self-completion survey questionnaire technique was the most appropriate instrument to obtain the information needed for testing the hypotheses and answering the main questions of this research. This instrument was also used because of its practical effectiveness. It represents a relatively inexpensive means of collecting data, provides a rapid turn-around time, has the advantages of reaching a considerable number of respondents and increasing the generalisation of the data, and gives the respondents more freedom to express their opinions. However, this study utilises the survey questionnaire technique in accordance with the procedures and guidelines described by de Vaus (1993).4

Because the original questionnaire was designed in English and the native language of the target sample is Arabic, the questionnaire needed to be translated from English into Arabic. A de-centering technique has been used in the translation process.5 In the Summer of 1995, the researcher developed the first draft of the Arabic translation of the questionnaire. It was then checked by an English language expert from the English Department of King Fahad Security College in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. It was also approved by an Arabic language expert at the same

---

4 For more details see de Vaus, D.A., 1993, pp. 80-105.
5 For more details about this technique please see Werner, O. and Campbell, D. 1970.
college and some amendments were made. Furthermore, and to ascertain a consistency in meaning between the Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire, the Arabic version was submitted to one of the Translation Department staffs at King Fahad Security College to be translated back from Arabic into English. It was then compared with the original English version and no significant difference was noted. Using methods such as the decentering technique, which means translating from the original language of the questionnaire to the target language and back again from the target to the original language, a researcher can check differences of the concepts under investigation and between the two versions and ascertain a consistency in meaning of translation.6 Dowling et al (1994) mentioned that sufficient equivalence to be reached if the differences between the original and the target translation are few.7 Furthermore, an effort was made to ensure that the questionnaire's items were relevant, valid and easily understood. These items were tested through a pilot study carried out in the following ways:

1. With respect to the validity of the research instrument (English version) and to eliminate ambiguities and inadequate wording, five Saudi doctoral students at Loughborough University of Technology, who had held faculty positions in Saudi universities, reviewed the first draft of the questionnaire and some amendments were made accordingly. The questionnaire was referred to a group of specialists in the field surveys and statistical analysis to examine the objectivity of the questionnaire items. The items were rephrased according to the comments of the respondents. After several revisions and taking into account the experts' recommendations, the questionnaire was printed in its original and final English version.

---

6 Ibid.
2. Another validity and objectivity test was made, but this time for the Arabic version of the questionnaire. This was also to test the relevancy of the questionnaire's contents, structure, and to ascertain whether it was meaningful in terms of Saudi culture and employment environment. Therefore, the Arabic version of the questionnaire was referred to a group of specialists in field survey and public administration. In accordance with the referees' comments and amendments, some of the questionnaire's items were re-phrased and re-organised.

3. Furthermore, and prior to the distribution of the questionnaire forms, eight copies of the Arabic version were given to eight administrators in different managerial positions who were expected to be part of the study population followed by face-to-face interviews with the researcher to discuss the questions and to hear the respondents' comments as to the clarity of the questions, their relevance, etc. Participants were requested to review the questionnaire, answer the questions, and provide any comments for changes regarding the clarity and understanding of the questionnaire items. The results of this pre-test suggested that there was little need for revision and showed that the questionnaire items were clear and understandable. In addition, none of the participants involved in the pre-test indicated any degree of difficulty in interpreting the items as presented. The pre-test of a sample questionnaire can provide an assessment of its difficulty, and give a rough estimate of the time and cost that will be involved. Kidder (1981) summarised the benefits of a questionnaire pre-test by stating that "The pre-test is a tryout of questionnaires to see how they work and whether changes are necessary before the start of the full-scale study. The unforeseen problems in the administration of the questionnaire, such as the phrasing and

---

sequences of questions or its length. It may also indicate the need for additional questions or the elimination of others."9

However, the positive reaction of the respondents towards the questions and their comments throughout the pilot study process were taken as an indication that the questionnaire was reliable, meaningful and valid. Therefore, the questionnaire was printed in its final Arabic form and a total of more than 400 copies were prepared for the distribution and collection process (see Appendix C).

6.4.1 Design and Structure of the Instrument

As stated previously, this study uses survey research through the use of a self-completion questionnaire that has been administered by the researcher, on-site, during a three month field trip to Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire was designed to include major areas of the subject under investigation and to cover a wide spectrum of issues essential in testing the study hypotheses and in answering the questions raised. All the important and relevant factors in designing a questionnaire were taken into account and careful consideration was given to the wording of the items of this instrument to avoid ambiguity and ensure consistency. The items of the questionnaire were structured and designed based on the researcher's managerial experience, the research questions and hypotheses, and the literature review; especially the work of Heller (1971), Vroom and Yetton (1973), Gharaybah et al (1981), Babbie (1973) & (1986), Vroom and Jago (1988), Alshalan (1991), and de Vaus (1993).

The questionnaire is comprised of a covering letter and three main sections. The covering letter explains the aim of the study and assures the respondents of the confidentiality of their answers. In addition, each section of the questionnaire has

---

clear instructions on how to answer their included items. A full description of each (included) managerial style or terminology has been provided at the beginning of the related section. However, the three main sections of the questionnaire will be summarised as follows:

Section I - A & B

This section included Questions 1-11 which were the demographic questions answered by all the respondents. It includes their age, marital status, employment status, level of education, position, experience, etc. (See Appendix-B). This was necessary to measure the association between the dependent and independent variables related to participation in the managerial decision-making process. However, Question 8 is also used as a check point to indicate whether the respondents fulfil one of the requirements of this study or not. Subordinate-manager, here, includes the type of employee who is working as manager and subordinate at the same time. According to Likert, this type of manager can be thought of as a leader by the subordinates whom he is responsible for and, simultaneously, as a subordinate by the superiors that he is responsible to.10 However, the responses which did not fulfil this requirement (subordinate-manager) were excluded.

Section II - A

This section includes Questions 12-22 which aim to measure the actual decision-making style of the subject managers. It has been developed by the researcher based on the literature, especially the work of Heller (1971), Vroom and Yetton (1973), Muna (1980), Vroom and Jago (1988), and Alshalan (1991). The first ten questions of this section (Q12-Q21) were classified by the researcher according to Simon’s

classification into programmed and non-programmed decisions. Each question is followed by five alternative options representing the different decision-making styles which were ranged according to a power-sharing continuum scale starting with no participation (AI = 1) and ending with joint participation (GII = 5). The scale is mapped in Figure 7.1 in the following chapter (Chapter 7). The statements of the scale are:

- Decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style).
- Get only information from the relevant subordinate(s) and then I decide (AII style).
- Make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (GI style).
- Make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII styles).
- I join the decision-making with the relevant subordinates together as a group and then we decide (GII style).

Each respondent was asked to choose only one style for each question which he actually used the most often. The questions were categorised according to Simon's classification into programmed and non-programmed decisions as follows:

**Non-programmed decisions**

1. The decision to develop a new plan (Q. 12).
2. The decision to partly amend a plan (Q. 13).
3. The decision to completely cancel a plan (Q. 14).
4. The decision to reorganise your area of responsibility (Q. 15).
5. The decision to implement new rules in your area of responsibility (Q. 16).
Programmed Decisions

1. The decision to change some of the procedures followed by your subordinates (Q. 17).
2. The decision to increase employees who work in the department of a subordinate (Q. 18).
3. The decision to promote an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Q. 19).
4. The decision to transfer an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Q. 20).
5. The decision to nominate a person to work in the department managed by your subordinate (Q. 21).

Section II - B

This section was developed by the researcher and it includes Questions 23-26. These questions were designed to identify mainly the manager's involvement in each stage of the decision-making process. Based on the decision-making stages illustrated in Figure 4.1, each respondent was asked one statement about each stage. This section was designed in a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from very high = 5 to very low = 1. However, Question 23 is used as a check point to ensure that the respondent is the type of manager who is in charge of making managerial decisions. The respondents who said they did not make any type of decision were excluded. For more details see Section II - B in Appendix B.

Section II - C

This section deals with five decision-making techniques that may help in practising the participative decision-making styles efficiently (Questions 27 - 41). The
researcher implies statements in terms of Yes/No answers to some questions and Likert-type five point scale to some others. The scale is ranged from very useful = 5 to not at all useful = 1. The aim of this section is to ascertain whether the subject managers are familiar with these techniques and have practised them before, and what their opinions are about the usefulness of their application in the decision-making process (see Appendix B).

Section III

This section includes Questions 42 - 68 which aimed to identify the attitudes of the subject managers towards their job satisfaction and the participative decision-making aspects. These questions were developed by the researcher based on the literature and were also designed in a five point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree = 5 to strongly disagree = 1. Finally, Question 67 and Question 68 are open-ended questions which asked the respondents to write from their managerial experience any comments relating to the justification or barriers of the practice of the participative decision-making approaches in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres.

6.4.2 Format and Measurement of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in this research was constructed and formatted according to the criteria recommended by Babbie (1986) and de Vaus (1993). In formulating the first draft of the questionnaire, great care was taken not to discourage the participants from completing the questionnaire. It was attractively presented to facilitate ease of response, especially as it was composed of a reasonable number of questions. Data were treated confidentially and participants were promised that their names or titles would not be mentioned. It was felt that such measures would eliminate any threat to the participants that might jeopardise anonymity and cause bias in their responses. The questionnaire was also divided into sections informing
the participants of the nature of information requested. This was done in order to encourage and motivate the participants to continue and complete answering the questions.

Moreover, as little specialist terminology as possible have been used and most of the questions were close-ended, in view of the advantages usually associated with this type of questions. The close-ended questions require little active input, such as a Yes/No or a tick of the appropriate box. They also ensure greater co-operation on the part of the participants. In this regard, responses were measured by either ticking the appropriate box on power-sharing continuum scale for some questions, and on Likert-type scale for the other type of questions. Some yes/no questions were also used. The rating scale questions were used to improve flexibility for the participants and to ensure that there was a possible variation in scores for every item or question asked. However, a few open-ended questions were necessary because they would enable participants to give some of their impressions, and to express their answers in more than a statement, an advantage that most rating scale questions do not provide (see Sections II and III in Appendix B).

6.5 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted on the administrative population of the following Saudi security educational institutes and centres:

- General Security Institutes and Centres (G.S.Is.).
- Borders Guard Institute (B.G.I.).
- Aljawazat Institute (A.I.).
- Special Security Forces Training Centre (S.S.F.T.C.).
These are government controlled institutions established and financed through the Ministry of Interior which applies the same employment roles, procedures and regulations to all the administrative populations of these institutions depending on their employment status. The administrative population includes a big majority of Saudi policemen employees with a small minority of Saudi civilian employees.

The administrative population of these institutes and centres were chosen for this study because, first, the Ministry of Interior, in particular King Fahad Security College, is the researcher's sponsoring agency and is to receive the benefit of any research done by its employees. Secondly, the researcher has been a faculty and administrative member at one of these institutions, namely King Fahad Security College, for more than seventeen years. According to the researcher's knowledge and experience, this type of investigation is needed for the future development of the college as well as the other educational security institutes and centres. Thirdly, the demands on these institutes and centres has been great during recent years. They are mainly responsible for producing, training, and re-training all the Saudi police force. Any development made within the administration will improve their educational and managerial programs which will have a positive reflection on their graduated, trained, and re-trained policemen in particular and as a result the security of the whole country in general. Finally, according to the researcher's knowledge, this sector has not been directly investigated in the past.

Prior to setting out the representative population for this study, the researcher met with the head director of each organisation in order to make sure that they would give their permission and support for distributing and collecting the questionnaire forms. In the meetings, the researcher explained the nature and purpose of the
study, submitted a copy of the questionnaire, answered any questions necessary to clarify the process, and then asked for permission to distribute and collect the questionnaire forms. Some head directors gave their permission immediately, while others asked for a short period of time to read the questionnaire again and think about it. By the end of one week, all the necessary permissions were obtained.

Because of the specific nature of this study, it was decided that the population would be drawn only from the administrators who met the following criteria:

1. Saudi full-time administrators.
2. Working as superior and subordinate simultaneously (subordinate-manager).
3. In charge of making managerial decisions.

These criteria will ensure that the target population of the study is directly linked to the decision process as well as the participation concept, which is the main concern of this investigation. However, Questions 7 and 8 in the first section and Question 23 in the second section of the questionnaire were designed to ensure that the respondents met with the population criteria as stated above (see Appendix B).

Throughout several meetings with each head director (or his assistant) of each institution, an approximate number of the representative population in each institution was defined. The total number of the population who met with the previous qualifications and criteria in all of the six institutions was approximately 396 administrators. Table 6.1 illustrates the approximate number of the representative population by institution.
Table 6.1: Population Size by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F.S.C.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S.Is</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D.I.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G.I.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.F.T.C.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal meetings with the head director (or his assistant) of each Institute and centre in the Summer 1995.

KFSC = King Fahad Security College
GSIs = General Security Institutes and Centres
CDI = Civilian Defence Institute
BGI = Borders Guard Institute
A.I. = Aljawazat Institute
SSFTC = Special Security Forces Training Centre

6.6 SAMPLING

There is agreement among researchers that studies using survey research should employ a relatively large sample to help ensure a satisfactory response rate that will allow the results to be generalised. Given the above guidance, the decision was made to select 86% of the representative population of each institution as the target sample for this study (see Tables 6.1 and 6.2). To ensure more representativeness, a stratified and simple random sample method was used for setting out the target sample size. However, with the help of the head director (or his assistant) of each institution, the researcher defined the size of the target sample using the total number of the representative population at each institution as the base. In other words, a random sample of subordinate-managers who fulfil the criteria
requirements of this study was drawn from each institution according to its proportion in the total representative population of this study.

This approach produced a sample size of 340 subordinate-managers to whom the questionnaire forms would be distributed, and which represented 86% of the total representative population. Table 6.2 contains the size of the target sample and its distribution among the six institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2 The Target Sample Size by Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F.S.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S.Is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.F.T.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KFSC = King Fahad Security College  
GSIs = General Security Institutes and Centres  
CDI = Civilian Defence Institute  
BGI = Borders Guard Institute  
A.I. = Aljawazat Institute  
SSFTC = Special Security Forces Training Centre

Since the target sample was drawn in accordance with the proportion of the total representative population of this study, the sample showed a large difference between the King Fahad Security College and the other institutions. Actually, the majority of the target sample were from King Fahad Security College (38%) and
that is to be expected because King Fahad Security is the largest and the only security college in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Table 6.2).

The target sample also represents the managers who are Saudi full-time administrators, working as superior and subordinates simultaneously, and heads of either section, unit, department, general department or any other equivalent positions. Any participant who did not fulfil the criteria requirements of this research as stated in the previous section was excluded.

Of the total of 340 questionnaires which were distributed 248 questionnaires were returned to the researcher, of which 46 were found to be unusable, leaving a total of 202 for analysis purposes. The main reasons for the non-response were that the managers were too busy or the subject was too sensitive. This gave a response rate of 73 percent which was considered adequate for analysis, especially when we consider that many people who use a postal method rarely get more than a 50 percent response rate. Although a careful analysis of the unusable questionnaire forms was not conducted, it was observed that the questions which were avoided or partially answered were directly related to the questions or statements relating to the superior of the respondent. For example, Questions 22, 63 and 64 of the excluded questionnaire forms were only partially answered or not answered at all.

However, Table 6.3 illustrates the distribution of the sample according to the characteristics of the respondents. In short, this table shows that 74.7% of the sample are in their middle age, between 30 to 50 years, more than 77% of the sample hold at least a university degree, and 85% of the sample have received training of more than one year's duration as maximum to less than four months as a minimum. In addition, the sample distribution shows that more than 86% of the
Table 6.3 Distribution of the Sample According to the Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (Q. 1):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status (Q. 2):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (Q. 4):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field of Study (Q. 5):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training (Q. 6):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position (Q. 7):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General department</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Span of Management (Q. 8):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-50 employees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 employees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial Experience (Q. 9):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Higher Degree (Q. 10):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Training (Q. 11):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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respondents had 1 to 15 years of managerial experience. Furthermore, the data illustrated in the table shows a variety in the sources of education, training and field of study. This increases confidence in the sample responses and as a result increases the validity and reliability of the present study. However, these variables will be discussed in more detail in the following two chapters.

6.7 DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION PROCESS

Depending on the sample size, three hundred and forty (340) questionnaire forms were prepared for the distribution and collection process. Table 6.4 presents a summary number of the questionnaire forms that were distributed at each institution.

However, two different methods were used for carrying out the distribution and collection process. The first one was the personal method which was applied at King Fahad Security College, whereas the second was the drop off and pick up method which was used at the other five institutions. At King Fahad Security College, the researcher passed on the questionnaire forms to each one of the participants personally. This was because the researcher, as an administrator and faculty member of the college, knew his colleagues and their managerial positions which helped him to identify and meet with the right and representative sample. In the other five institutions, the questionnaire forms were distributed and collected by using the drop off and pick up method. Copies of the questionnaire forms were given to the head director of each institution or his deputy to distribute them to the representative sample. The responses were then returned to the head director's office in order to be picked up by the researcher.

In three weeks time the majority of the distributed questionnaire forms were collected and classified according to which institution they were related. Two hundred and forty-eight (248) forms were collected which represents a response rate
of 73% of the sample and 63% of the total population. However, twenty (20) copies of the responses were excluded because of their incompleteness, incorrectness, inadequateness, and/or unrepresentativeness. Also it was found that the civilian employees represent a very small minority in each institution and they work only in a unique type of job; mainly financial or educational jobs. Therefore, another twenty-six (26) copies of the responses were excluded because the respondents were civilian employees who did not meet the criteria of the population of this study.

Table 6.4 Number of Questionnaire Distributed and Number Returned as Complete by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>*Questionnaire forms distributed</th>
<th>*Questionnaire forms returned as complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F.S.C.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S.Is.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D.I.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G.I.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.F.T.C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KFSC = King Fahad Security College  
GSIs = General Security Institutes and Centres  
CDI = Civilian Defence Institute  
BGI = Borders Guard Institute  
A.I. = Aljawazat Institute  
SSFTC = Special Security Forces Training Centre

The final sub-total of the responses that are regarded as complete and to be included for the data analysis is two hundred and two (202) copies, which represent 59% response rate of the sample and 51% of the total population. These copies were coded serially, starting from (001) and ending with (202), according to the time of
Table 6.4 presents a summary of the number of questionnaire forms that were distributed and the number of responses that were regarded as complete and to be used for analysis purposes. Actually, the majority of the respondents were from King Fahad Security College (38%) and that is to be expected because King Fahad Security College is the largest and the only security college in Saudi Arabia.

6.8 DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected for this study were coded and then transcribed into a personal computer for compilation and statistical analysis. The questionnaire items were edited and coded, using a COBOL coding form for the purpose of computer processing and for producing the highest attainable level of accuracy. The statistical analysis was carried out on a personal computer, using the latest versions of SPSS for Windows (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The data collected for this research were analysed through the use of descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive analysis of the data was performed by using frequency distribution of several items of the questionnaire in order to provide answers to the research central questions, clarify some points or arguments, and summarise patterns in the responses of the sample managers. Inferential analysis of the data was carried out by testing the research hypotheses through the use of several statistical tests. In this regard, means, standard deviations, correlation and frequency distributions were used. Differences were tested for significance by means of the T-test, the Mann-Whitney test, the one way ANOVA test and the Scheffé multiple comparison test. Correlation coefficients were also used to test the strength or weakness of the relationship between selected independent and dependent variables. In addition, the Chi-square, the Cramer's V correlation coefficient and the Kruskal-Wallis statistics procedures were employed in order to assess each hypothesis examined through the
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cross-tabulation approach. The open-ended questions were analysed and classified qualitatively according to the frequencies of their mentioning, and percentage of respondents.

However, the research questions (Q. 1, 2 and 3) about the theoretical basis of management decisions and the development of the concept of participation in managerial decisions have been analysed through qualitative methods in Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5. Other research questions and their related hypotheses are examined, analysed and discussed in the following three chapters (Chapters 7, 8 and 9). These chapters examine the main characteristics and variables of the field survey carried out among the Saudi police officers who occupy managerial positions in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres located in and around the city of Riyadh, the Capital of the Kingdom, with the aim of obtaining empirical evidence on the difficulties facing the implementation of participative decision-making styles in these organisations.

6.9 SUMMARY

In short, the main purpose of this chapter has been to discuss and present the main elements of the research methodology. The chapter began by describing the elements and the major justifications of the methodology approach, followed by the hypotheses and the central research questions. Further details were then presented with regard to the data sources, the survey instrument and the design and format of the questionnaire. This is followed by details of the population, the sampling, the distribution and collection procedures, and finally the data analysis process.

A one-form questionnaire was designed and tested to collect information for evaluating the research central questions and hypotheses. The questionnaire was designed carefully taking into account all important factors relevant to the subject of
the research and to the structure of the questionnaire. The Saudi security educational institutes and centres were chosen for the population of this study. They are located in or around the city of Riyadh, the Capital of the Kingdom. In the Summer of 1996, the researcher travelled to Saudi Arabia in order to carry out the field work of this study. In Saudi Arabia, the questionnaire was translated into Arabic for the convenience of the respondents as their language is Arabic. Its validity and objectivity was tested. Both the population and the target sample were defined and a pilot study was conducted. Then the questionnaire forms were distributed to and collected from the target sample. Two hundred and two (202) response forms were regarded as complete and to be included for the data analysis. This represents a response rate of 59% of the sample and 51% of the total population.

Moreover, a number of libraries and research centres were visited in the Riyadh region of Saudi Arabia to obtain some of the resources and references necessary for this study. In particular, the researcher visited the Ministry of Planning, King Faisal Research Centre, the Library of Public Administration Institute, the Library of King Saud University, the Library of Emam Mohammad Ben Saud Islamic University, and King Fahad National Library.

However, it was not easy to carry out this mission because of the specific nature of the research. On the one hand, participation in decision-making is a sensitive subject for managers as well as subordinates, especially in a developing country. On the other hand, it is difficult to gain access to police institutions due to security reasons and to the confidentiality of information. However, the researcher's identification as a police officer and a member of King Fahad Security College assisted him in gaining access to these institutions and in obtaining most of the information needed. Also, without the help of some friends and colleagues of the researcher, who helped in distributing and collecting the questionnaire forms, the response rate would have been much lower.
Chapter 7, "Examining the Decision Making Styles, Techniques and Process: Data Analysis and Findings I", presents an analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire regarding the decision-making styles of the managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. It also examines the degree of their involvement in the process (stages) of making management decisions and the techniques that may enable them to practise this process more effectively.
CHAPTER SEVEN

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS I: EXAMINING THE DECISION MAKING STYLES, TECHNIQUES AND PROCESS (STAGES)

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of the questionnaire survey regarding the decision-making styles of the managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. It also examines the degree of subordinates' involvement in the process (stages) of making programmed and non-programmed decisions. Finally, it also highlights some of the major techniques that may enable employees to participate effectively in the decision-making process.

It was presented in Chapter 3 and in Chapter 5 that there are several decision-making styles. These styles include autocratic style (AI), semi-autocratic style (AII), semi-consultative style (CI), consultative style (CII), joint decision-making style (GII), delegation style (DI) and abdication style (ABI). Figure 5.1 illustrates these styles on a continuum scale of two extreme ends. At one end, managers may decide autocratically without any subordinates participation (AI style); at the other end, subordinates may decide unilaterally without the intervention of their managers (DI and ABI styles). Between these two extreme points there is a range of participative points in which the decision maker can be more or less participative. So the range can be from a superficial to an extensive involvement in the decision-making process. In other words, it can range from provision of information (AII style), through consultation (CI or CII styles), to joint decision making (GII style). This point will be discussed in more detail in Section 7.3.
Furthermore, the decision-making process and five of the major participative techniques are discussed and examined in this present chapter. As it was illustrated in Chapter 4, the decision-making process is composed of eight sequential stages for the non-programmed decisions and seven stages for the programmed decision (see Figure 4.1). The subordinates' participation in each one of these stages and for each decision type (programmed and non-programmed) will be discussed and examined in Section 7.4. The participative techniques will be discussed and examined in Section 7.5.

In brief, however, there are four general aims of this chapter. The first aim is to represent the characteristics of the low-level and high-level managers which may increase the reliability of both the responses and the study. The second aim is to examine the managerial decision-making styles of the sample managers according to the decision type (programmed an non-programmed), the third aim is to examine the degree of subordinates participation in the decision-making process for each type of decision and the final aim is to highlight five of the major techniques that may enable employees to participate effectively in the decision-making process. These aims are discussed in the following sections sequentially.

7.2 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

According to the respondents' current positions, they were divided into four groups. These groups included the Section managers, the Unit managers, the Department managers and the General Department managers. The first two groups (Unit and Section) were classified as low-level managers whereas the last two groups (Department and General Department) were classified as high-level managers. Table 7.1 shows the respondents distribution according to their current managerial positions.
Table 7.1 The Sample Distribution According to Management Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Department</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 7.2 to 7.9 represent the distribution of the low-level and high-level managers according to different variables. Such tables will be used to demonstrate the representation of the sample of the population which increases the reliability of the responses and also the present study.

7.2.1 Sample Distribution According to education level, country and background (field)

Table 7.2 illustrates the distribution of the sample according to managerial position and level of education. It shows that the sample contained 73 managers who occupy high-level positions (General Department or Department), representing 36.3 percent of the sample, while 63.7 percent of the sample were occupying low-level positions (Units or Sections). From the table, 21.9 percent of the sample were educated below university level, 53.7 percent held university degrees, 19.4 percent held Master degrees and 5.0 percent held doctorate degrees. Such data demonstrates the high educational level of the respondents. 78.1 percent of the sample held at least university degrees which would indicate that the respondents are more rational to the enquiries and as a result increase the reliability of the responses.
Table 7.2 Current Position by Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Qualification</th>
<th>Below University</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 shows distribution of the sample according to country of education. The figures in this table show that the majority of the respondents obtained their degrees from Saudi Arabia (84.6%), 13.9 percent from the United States of America and a small proportion (1.5 percent) from the United Kingdom and other European countries.

On the other hand, participants do not report any other Arab countries, Islamic countries or Eastern countries. This means that the respondents could be classified into two distinct groups: Western and Saudi educational background. Such a variety increases the validity of the responses since the sample contains different educational backgrounds which enables the subject matter of this study to be evaluated from different perspectives.

Table 7.3 Current Position by Country of High Education Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of High Education</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>European Countries</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4 displays the distribution of the sample according to the field of study in which the respondents were granted their higher educational degrees. The figures show that 80.9 percent of those who answered this question got their degree in the humanities field (Religion, Philosophy, History, Arts, Psychology, Sociopsychology, Criminology, etc.), 13.4 percent held their degrees in the administration field (public and business administration) and 5.7 percent held their degrees in the science field. Such variety increases confidence in the responses since the sample combines different educational backgrounds which enables the respondents to evaluate the subject matter of this study from different perspectives.

Table 7.4 Cross Tabulation of Current Position by Educational Field Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Field</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Sample Distribution According to Age:

Table 7.5 displays the distribution of the sample according to managerial position and age. The table shows that the sample contains 45 managers below 30 years of age (22.4%), 90 managers of 30 to 40 years of age (44.8%), 60 managers of 41 to 50 years of age (29.9%) and 6 managers of more than 50 years of age (3.0%). The data in this table shows that 74.7 percent of the sample are in their middle age (30 to
Responses of middle aged managers may be considered as being important because of their maturity, experience, knowledge and understanding of managerial policies and functions. Age, therefore, was viewed as being a factor in the overall credibility of the responses; mature managers would have significant experience in managerial practices compared with younger managers who perhaps had not been in the position for any length of time and in most cases would have limited experience in managerial functions and practices. However, the small proportion of older managers (3.0%) may be attributed to retirement reasons. The retirement rules in the Saudi police sector is usually based on joint factors such as age, number of years of government employment, military rank and other political reasons. Therefore, it is common to be retired at the age of 50's.

Table 7.5 Current position and Age Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>&lt; 30 yrs</th>
<th>30-40 yrs</th>
<th>41-50 yrs</th>
<th>&gt; 50 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3 Sample Distribution According to Managerial Experience

Table 7.6 displays the distribution of the respondents according to years of experience in management positions. The figures show that 9.5 percent of the sample had less than one year's experience as a manager, 43.8 percent had 1 to 5 years experience, 42.3 percent had 6 to 15 years experience and 4.5 percent had
more than 15 years experience in management positions. These figures confirm that the majority of the sample had a good deal of experience in their current jobs, so reflecting their long accumulated experience in managerial jobs and activities. Such experience, therefore, enables the respondents to be familiar with the subject matter of this study and to answer the questionnaire more fairly. This increases confidence in their responses.

Table 7.6 Current Position and Current Experience Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.9 Managerial Experience</th>
<th>&lt; 1 yr</th>
<th>1-5 yrs</th>
<th>6-15 yrs</th>
<th>&gt; 15 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4 Sample Distribution According to the Span of Management

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of the sample according to the number of employees each manager supervises in his department. From Table 7.7 and Table 7.1 it is obvious that the respondents of our sample are the type of employees who are working as manager and subordinate at the same time. According to Likert, this type of manager can be thought of as a leader by the subordinates whom he is responsible for and, simultaneously, as a subordinate by the superiors that he is responsible to.1 This, however, may increase the credibility and reliability of their

---

responses as they have the opportunity to deal with different types of management decision-making styles as superior in some cases and subordinates in others.

### Table 7.7 Current Position by Span of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>&lt;15</th>
<th>15-50</th>
<th>&gt;50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.5 Sample Distribution According to Period and Country of Training

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of the sample according to the period of training. The table indicates that the sample contains 28 managers who had no training (13.9%), 62 managers with less than four months of training (30.8%), 74 managers who had received training of 4 months to one years duration (36.8%) and 37 managers who had received training of more than one years duration (18.4%).

### Table 7.8 Current Position by Periods of Training Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.6: Periods of Training</th>
<th>No Training</th>
<th>&lt; 4 months</th>
<th>4-12 months</th>
<th>&gt; 1 yr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this table it appears that the majority (86.1%) of the sample had received training of less than four months as a minimum to more than one year's duration as the maximum, while 13.9 percent of the sample had received no training. This indicates that most of the sample were trained to handle their particular jobs. Being majority trained will enable the respondents to judge more fairly the subject matter of this study and increase the reliability and confidence of the responses.

Table 7.9 shows that 80.3 percent of the sample obtained their training in Saudi Arabia, 2.9 percent in Arab and Islamic countries, 7.6 percent in the United Kingdom of Britain and European countries, 7.5 percent in the United States of America and 1.7 percent in Eastern countries. Such a variety in the sources of training increases confidence in the participants' responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where most of training was acquired</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Arab &amp; Islamic countries</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>European countries</th>
<th>Eastern countries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the data collected about the population sample shows that more than 77.0 percent hold at least a university degree, 85.6 percent have received training of more than one year's duration as maximum to less than four months as minimum,
and 74.7 percent are between the ages 30 to 50 years. In addition, the survey data shows that almost 47.0 percent had 6 to more than 15 years experience in management positions, while more than 86.0 percent had 1 to 15 years of managerial experience. Furthermore, the data distribution shows a variety in the sources of education, training and field study backgrounds. The above data suggest that the respondents are more rational and familiar with the enquiries and to be more familiar with the subject of this study, which enables them to judge the subject matter and answer the questionnaire more fairly. Such data, therefore, increases confidence in their responses and as a result increases the validity and reliability of the present study.

7.3 MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING STYLES

This section tries to identify in part the managerial decision-making styles and the level of participatory decisions among the subject managers of the Saudi educational security institutes and centres. Therefore, this section will include the analysis and findings of the questionnaire survey regarding the managerial decision-making styles in both the programmed and the non-programmed decisions, the dominant decision-making style of the sample and, finally, the personal variables affecting these styles.

Questions 12 to 21 (see Appendix B) aimed to measure the managerial decision-making styles of the sample managers who work in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. These questions have been categorised according to Simon's classification into two types of managerial decision. The first category is the non-programmed decisions which includes Question 12 to Question 16. The second category is the programmed decisions which includes Question 17 to Question 21. As discussed in the methodology (Chapter 6), each one of these decisions was

---

2 For more details, please see Chapter 4.
followed by five options of managerial styles and the sample was asked to choose only one style for each question. Those options include: autocratic style (AI), semi-autocratic style (All), semi-consultative style (Cl), consultative style (CII) and joint decision-making style (GII). These styles were explained and described in the previous chapters.\textsuperscript{3}

These questions and variables were measured by a 5-point power-sharing continuum scale (Likert Scale Equivalent) with two extreme ends. Between these two extreme ends there is a range of participative points (styles) in which the decision-maker can be more or less participative. However, the scale makes use of the assumption that its styles are separated by equal intervals. This assumption allows the researcher to use the mean scores and to analyse the differences among the scores. However, the researcher excluded the delegation style (DI) and the abdication style (ABI) from the power-sharing continuum scale shown in Figure 5.1 as he believes that these two styles go beyond the limit of effective participation. Therefore, the continuum scale for this study is composed of five decision-making styles which include AI, All, Cl, CII and GII styles (see Figure 7.1). The following values were assigned to components of the scale: AI style (autocratic) = 1; All style (semi-autocratic) = 2; Cl style (semi-consultative) = 3; CII style (consultative) = 4; and GII style (joint decision-making) = 5. Thus, a high mean score suggests that a manager allows his subordinates to share his decision-making power thereby increasing the influence of his subordinates on the outcome of the decision; and vice versa, a low mean score indicates a lower degree of subordinates' participation and, consequently, more manager control over the outcome of the decision. However, the first two styles (AI and All) were classified as authoritative styles whereas the last three styles (Cl, CII,

\textsuperscript{3} For more details, see Chapter 3 and Chapter 5.
Figure 7.1 Scale of Subordinate Participation in Managerial Decision
GII) were classified as participative styles. The one-way ANOVA tests and the parametric two independent samples T-test were used to measure the total participation mean scores and the significant difference between groups. The analysis and the findings of this section are discussed as follows:

7.3.1 In the Area of the Non-programmed Decisions

**Question No. 12** In your area of responsibility, what is your managerial decision-making style to develop a new plan? The sample responded to this question with an approval rate of 74.3% to the participative styles (CI, CII and GII) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mature managers (> 40 years) and those working in high-level positions responded more participatively to this question. In addition, those highly trained (> 1 year) and those who were granted their higher educational degree from the West responded also more participatively to the above question. It is also noticeable that as educational attainment and years of management training increased, the responses become more participative. However, such approval rate and high standard deviation suggest that non-programmed decisions are highly participative (Hypothesis 2). This may be attributed to the fact that non-programmed decisions are complex, ambiguous, unique and uncertain of outcome. The above results
suggest also that variables of position, age, period of training and studying in the West had a significant impact on such responses, which strongly supports our Hypotheses 5, 7 and 8, since those managers would have experienced different management styles, so their opinion carries more weight. However, even the impact of education seems to support our assumption regarding this variable. Hypotheses 4, 6 and 9 were disproved as the significance score was more than 0.05 level. For more details, see Appendix A, Table A-1. However, these hypotheses will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Question No. 13  What is your decision style to partly amend an existing plan?
66.3% of the sample responded to this question in a participative way as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high level managers responded more favourably to the participative styles with regard to this question than the low-level managers did. In addition, those with administration studies (business or public) and those who were granted their higher degree from the West responded significantly to this question and they are more in favour of the participative styles than other managers of their group. Furthermore, mature managers (> 40 years), those with a Ph.D. degree and those with more than one year of training responded more participatively to the above question. This may be because those with more training and education expect a high standard of
performance and more participation from their employees in management activities. For this non-programmed decision, the sample was more participative and the independent variables of age, position, period of training, field of study and studying in the West had a significant impact on the responses. Such results support our Hypotheses 5, 7 and 8 and suggest that non-programmed decisions are highly participative ones (Hypothesis 2). However, Hypotheses 4, 6 and 9 failed to achieve the level of 0.05 significance (see Appendix A, Table A-2). These hypotheses will be examined and discussed in more detail in Section 7.3.4 of this chapter.

Question No. 14  What is your managerial style to completely cancel a plan? 66.8% of the sample were in favour of the participative styles (CI, CII, GII) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high standard deviation reflects greater discrepancy in the answers that occurred in respect of the above question. The respondents with Western educational backgrounds and those of 41 years of age or more responded more participatively to this question and such variations are statistically significant. In addition, the high level managers responded also more participatively to this question than the low-level managers. This may be attributed to their direct involvement with departments
under their authority which allowed them to sense and experience more the problems of the autocratic management styles. The variation in responses suggests also that as educational attainment and the period of training programmes increased, implementation of the participative decision-making approaches increased. This may be attributed to the fact that those managers with more years of training and education had a greater understanding, skills and knowledge in developing their employees, by giving them an opportunity to participate in management activities and decisions. The above results, however, support our Hypotheses 5, 7 and 8 regarding the significant impact of position, studying in the West, and training on the managers' decision-making styles. The variables of management span, educational qualification and management experience had no significant impact on the sample responses and therefore Hypothesis 4, Hypothesis 6 and Hypothesis 9 were disproved (for more details about the statistical analysis, see Appendix A, Table A-3). The findings regarding these hypotheses will be examined and discussed in more detail in the following sections of this chapter.

**Question No. 15** What is your managerial decision style to re-organise your area of responsibility? The sample responded to this question with approval of 70.6% to the participative styles as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>A-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Such approval and high standard deviation may explain the high tendency that the sample possesses towards participative decision-making styles and suggests that variables of position, age, period of training, study field and studying in the West had a significant impact on such responses. The above result supports our Hypotheses 5, 7 and 8 and suggests that job position, age, training, field of study and studying in the West had a significant impact on the managers' decision-making styles. The more they got the more participative they are in their managerial decision. In this regard, Hypotheses 4, 6 and 9 were disproved as the significance score was more than .0.05 level (for more details see Appendix A, Table A-4). This will be examined and discussed in more detail in the following sections.

**Question 16** What is your managerial decision style to implement new rules or procedures in your area of responsibility? The sample was in favour of the participative styles since the approval rate was 63.9% as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>A-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As educational attainment, years of experience and period of training increased, the responses became more participative. In addition, those working in high-level positions, those with Western educational backgrounds, and the more mature
managers responded more participatively to this question. The responses of such managers carry more weight since they have experienced several types of management styles and are aware of the benefits of involving subordinates in management decisions. From the above results, it is obvious that variables of age, job position, Western education, and period of training had a significant impact on the sample responses. Such results may explain the high tendency towards participative styles and this supports our assumption regarding the significant impact of these variables on the managers' decision-making styles (H.5, H.7 and H.8). Even the assumption regarding the impact of education on the managers' decision-making styles (Hypothesis 6) was not significantly approved; there is a clear indication that when educational attainment increased, responses became more participative (see Appendix A, Table A-5).

In order to examine all the non-programmed questions (Q.12 - Q.16) as one variable the SPSS "Compute Procedures" were conducted. Based on this process and on both the One-Way ANOVA and the T-test, Table 7.10 was established. Table 7.10 summarises the relationship between the previous five non-programmed decisions as one group and each one of the eight independent variables. From the figures in this table, it appears that there is a significant relationship between the non-programmed decisions category and the variables of position, age, training, study in Western countries and the study field. The means and the sample's high standard deviation may explain the respondents high tendency towards participative styles when dealing with non-programmed decisions. Such results once again support our previous discussion and approve the assumptions of Hypothesis 5, Hypothesis 7, and Hypothesis 8. An alternative explanation may be attributed to the fact that non-programmed decisions are more complex, unique, poorly structured, conceptual and uncertain of the outcome. The decision makers need more information, new ideas, suggestions and opinions. Therefore, they tend to involve the relevant subordinates
in such important activities. However, the impact of educational qualification, experience and span of management on the managers' decision style was insignificant and this disproves Hypotheses 4, 6 and 9. These questions and hypotheses will be examined and discussed in more detail in the following sections (Sections 7.3.3 and 7.3.4).

Table 7.10 Summary of the total participation of all the non-programmed decisions (Q. 12- Q.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>All non-programmed decisions</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>3.3502</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Experience</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Management</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Higher Education</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of study</td>
<td>3.3873</td>
<td>1.0570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of cases
NS = Not significant

7.3.2 In the Area of the Programmed Decision

Question No. 17  What is your managerial style to change some of the rules or procedures followed by your subordinates? The sample responded less participatively to this question since the approval rate of the participative styles (CI, CII and GII) was 35.8% according to the following.
For this question, the sample was more autocratic and the variables of age, training, experience, management span, Western education and study field had no significant impact on responses. The above results suggest that programmed decisions are less participative. This may be attributed to the fact that programmed decisions are routine, clear and certain of outcome. However, the respondents with high-level positions and those with Ph.D. degrees seem more participative in their decision making styles and such a variation is statistically significant. Such results support our assumptions regarding Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 5 and Hypothesis 6. For more details about the statistical results, see Appendix A, Table A-6. More analysis will be conducted in Section 7.3.4 of this chapter.

**Question No. 18:** What is your managerial decision-making style to increase the number of employees working for your subordinate? The sample was in moderate agreement with participative styles with an approval rate of 55.7% as follows.
Such approval rate and high standard deviation suggests that the sample was divided in its response to the above question and that variables of position, age, training and study in the West had a significant impact on the responses. In this regard, Hypotheses 5, 7 and 8 appear to be statistically significant. For more details about the statistical results, see Appendix A, Table A-7. More analysis will be conducted in Section 7.3.4 of this chapter.

**Question No. 19:** What is your managerial decision-making style to promote one of the employees working for your subordinate? The sample responded more autocratically to this question since the approval rate of the participative styles was 25.4% only, as shown below.
The above results suggest that the respondents were more autocratic when dealing with programmed decisions. This may be attributed to the fact that this type of decision (programmed) is well structured, repetitive, clear and more specific. The information needed is also readily available and managers are required to follow exact rules and procedures. However, those respondents over 50 years of age and those with Ph.D. degrees responded more participatively to this question and such a variation is statistically significant. Variables of training and management span had no significant impact on the responses. The above results support Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 5, Hypothesis 6 and Hypothesis 7. For more details about the statistical results, see Appendix A, Table A-8. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 7.3.4 of this chapter.

**Question No. 20:** What is your managerial decision-making style to transfer one of your subordinate's employees? The sample responded less participatively to this question since the approval rate of the participative styles was 33.3% according to the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>A-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the sample responded to this question in an autocratic decision-making style. However, as age, educational attainment, period of training and years of management experience increased, the responses became more participative. Those
working in high-level positions, those with a Western higher education and those with an administration study background responded more participatively to this question and such differences are statistically significant. These results support our assumptions regarding Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 5 and Hypothesis 7. Hypothesis 6 was disproved as the impact of educational qualification failed to reach the 0.05 level of significance. Hypotheses, 4, 8 and 9 were also disproved. For more details about the statistical results, see Appendix A, Table A-9. The findings of the above hypotheses will be examined and discussed in more detail in Section 7.3.4 of this chapter.

**Question No. 21:** What is your managerial style to nominate an employee from another department to work in the department managed by one of your subordinates? The sample responded to this question with modest approval of 45.8% to the participative styles according to the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent</th>
<th>Reference Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>A-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant 0.05 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Management Experience</th>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Country of Higher Degrees</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such an approval rate and high standard deviation suggests that the sample was divided in its response to this question. Variables of job position, age, Western education and study field proved a significant relationship between each one of them and the sample responses. Such results suggest that the sample is more autocratic in its programmed decisions compared to the non-programmed decisions. However, the rejection of the participative styles regarding such programmed decisions may be
attributed to the fact that programmed decisions are more clear, well structured, routine and certain of outcome. However, the assumptions of Hypotheses 2, 5 and 7 were confirmed to be statistically significant. For more details about the statistical figures, see Appendix A, Table A-10. In Section 7.3.4 these hypotheses will be examined and analysed in more detail.

In order to examine all the programmed questions (Q. 17 - Q. 21) as one variable, the SPSS "Compute" procedure was conducted. Based on this process and using the One-Way ANOVA test and the T-test, Table 7.11 and Table 7.12 were created. Table 7.11 summarises the relationship between all the five programmed decisions cumulatively (as one variable) and each one of the independent variables. The significant figures in this table support our hypotheses relating to the relationship between the independent variables and the degree of participation in making programmed decisions.

**Table 7.11 Summary of the total participation of all the programmed decisions (Q. 17 - Q. 21) as one category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>All non-programmed decisions</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2.5458</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.9029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.8431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.9108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Experience</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.9218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Management</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.9202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of H.E.</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of study</td>
<td>2.5586</td>
<td>.9177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of cases
NS = Not significant
H.E. = Higher education
Such results support our previous discussion and prove the assumptions of Hypotheses 5, 6 and 7. Hypotheses 4, 8 and 9 were disproved as the number of employees, the period of training and years of experience had no significant impact on the responses.

Table 7.12 Comparison Between Programmed and Non-Programmed Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Non-programmed Decisions</th>
<th>Programmed Decisions</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>3.3502</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.1065</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.0035</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.0710</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.1175</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Management</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Higher Education</td>
<td>3.3515</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education</td>
<td>3.3873</td>
<td>1.0570</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of cases
NS = Not significant

Table 7.12 shows the total participation score for each decision category (programmed and non-programmed) for each one of the eight independent variables. By comparing the results of these two types of decision, it is obvious that non-programmed decisions are more participative than programmed decisions (Hypothesis 2). Variables of job position, age, study in the West and field of education had a significant impact on the sample responses for both the two types of decision (programmed and non-programmed). The results approved also Hypothesis
5 and Hypothesis 7 as the level of management and studying in the West had a significant impact on the responses. However, Hypothesis 6 and Hypothesis 8 were partly approved. The former one was significantly approved with the programmed decisions and disproved with the non-programmed decisions. While the latter one was proved to be significant with the non-programmed decisions and disproved with the programmed decisions. The years of experience (Hypothesis 9) and the span of management variables (Hypothesis 4) had no significant impact on the decision style for both categories (programmed and non-programmed decisions). However, these variables and hypotheses will be analysed and discussed in more detail in Section 7.3.3 and Section 7.3.4.

7.3.3 The Dominant Decision-Making Style:

In order to analyse the data of this section and to determine the dominant decision-making style of the subject managers, two approaches were used to achieve this purpose.4 The first approach uses the percentages of the responses in each style for each of the ten questions (Q.12 - Q.21), for each decision category (programmed and non-programmed decisions) and for the total of all the questions. This approach is used to examine some of the research hypotheses and to emphasise the point that managers rarely employ only one decision-making style irrespective of the type of decisions (programmed or non-programmed). The second approach makes use of the power sharing continuum scale (Figure 7.1) and the assumption that its styles are separated by equal intervals. This assumption allows the researcher to use the mean scores and to analyse the differences among the scores.5 Table 7.13 shows the percentages of the sample in each style for each question for each category and, finally, for the total of all the questions. It is clear from the table that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were utilised on all decisions.

4 Similar approaches with some modifications were used by Heller (1971), Muna (1980) and Alshalan (1991).
5 For more details about the scale, please see Section 7.3.
From Table 7.13 and Figure 7.2 it can be seen that the dominant decision-making style of the sample managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres is the semi-autocratic decision-making style (30.1%) compared to the joint decision-making style (20.0%), consultative style (17.6%), semi-consultative style (16.2%), and autocratic style (16.2%). However, the respondents were asked in a direct way to describe their superior’s decision-making style (Q.22). The distribution of their responses to this question, as shown in Table 7.14, supports our current results that the dominant decision-making style of the sample managers is the semi-autocratic style (AII).

Table 7.13 Distribution of Managerial Decision Making Style According to the Decision Type N = 202

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Styles</th>
<th>AI %</th>
<th>AII %</th>
<th>CI %</th>
<th>CII %</th>
<th>GII %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-PROGRAMMED</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMED</td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.2 The Sample's Decision Making Style

- Autocratic (AI)
- Semi-autocratic (AII)
- Semi-consultative (CI)
- Consultative (CII)
- Joint decision-making
Table 7.14 Distribution of the Superior's Decision-Making Styles According to Their Subordinates' Judgement (Q.22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AII</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this reason, Hypothesis 1, which stated that the dominant decision-making style of the respondents is the semi-consultative style (CII), is disproved. Actually, this result indicates that the sample managers employ the semi-autocratic style (AII) more than the other styles. However, this finding concurs with the findings of Malaika (1993) relating to the decision-making style of the Saudi managers. He found that authoritarian styles in decision-making is high/very high among Saudi managers (69%), among government organisations (96%) and among non-government organisations (62%). He also added that, "Those who are not authoritarian in their decision-making in the non-government organisations are not necessarily team players. They may be 1,1 leaders in terms, of the Blake and Mouton typology (a minimum concern for both productivity and people)."6 This result also concurs with what Badawy (1980) found, that Arab business managers are highly authoritarian in their decision-making styles with authority focused at the top.7 On the other hand, this result disagrees with the findings of Alshalan (1991)8 and Muna (1980)9 that the decision-making style of the Saudi managers is the consultative style. However, one possible explanation for such differences may be attributed to the fact that the respondents of our sample are managers with a military

---

background. They are police officers and may work in an authoritarian environment. Therefore, they might be unfamiliar with the participative style, or they may not believe in its benefits for the work place.

Taking the decisions' categories independently, the table (Table 7.13) showed that the non-programmed decisions (Q.12 - Q.16) have been made by the joint decision-making style (26.8%) more than the other decision-making styles. However, the consultative style (23.0%) came in the next order. The semi-autocratic, the semi-consultative and the autocratic styles were shown to have less importance in terms of the non-programmed decisions, 21.8%, 18.6% and 9.8% respectively (see Figure 7.3). Such results indicate that the managers allow their subordinate(s) to participate in the non-programmed decisions and to have more influence on the outcome of these decisions. Taking the non-programmed decisions independently showed that the decision to develop a new plan (Question 12) is mostly being done by the joint decision-making style (31.2%). The next most used style is the consultative style (24.8%). In Question 13, regarding the decision to partly amend a plan, the table showed that the joint decision-making style is used more often (23.8%), followed by the semi-consultative style (23.3%). In Question 14, regarding the decision to completely cancel the plan, the table showed that the joint decision-making style is still the most used style (29.7%) followed by the consultative style (20.8%). The decision about re-organisation (Question 15) is being done by the joint decision-making style (26.9%) and the next most used style is the consultative style (24.4%). Finally, the decision to implement new rules or procedures (Question 16) is being done by the consultative style (25.7%), but the next most used style is the semi-autocratic style (24.3%). However, a possible explanation of such results is that the non-programmed decisions are more complex, unique, poorly structured and uncertain of outcome. Because of their relative ambiguity and complexity, these decisions usually require more information than one individual has. In such situations, subordinates may have substantial information that can be more beneficial
for the manager to use in his non-programmed decisions. Furthermore, non-programmed decisions usually have critical results that may affect the whole workforce and organisation. This might cause the joint decision-making style (GII) and the consultative style (CII) to be the dominant styles in this set of non-programmed decisions, 26.8% and 23.0% respectively (see Table 7.13 and Figure 7.3).

In terms of the programmed decisions category (Q.17 - Q.21), it is obvious that the dominant style is the semi-autocratic style (38.4%) compared to the other styles. However, the next most used style is the autocratic style (22.5%) followed by the semi-consultative style (13.7%), while the joint decision-making style (13.2%) and the consultative style (12.2%) are used less often (see Figure 7.3). Therefore, the consultative style (CII) and the joint decision-making style (GII) were shown to have less importance in terms of programmed decisions, 12.2% and 13.2% respectively. The semi-autocratic style (AlII) and the autocratic style (AI) were used on a large scale, 38.4% and 22.5% respectively. This suggests that the sample managers do not tend to allow their subordinates to be involved in their programmed decisions to a great degree. However, taking these programmed decisions independently showed that the decision to change any of the existing rules or procedures (Question 17) is being done mainly by the semi-autocratic style (53.7%). The next most used style is the consultative style (21.4%) while autocratic (10.9%), semi-consultative (8.5%) and joint decision-making style (5.5%) are used less often.

In Question 18, regarding increasing the number of employees in the department of a subordinate, the table showed that the semi-autocratic style is used most often (26.9%), followed by the consultative style (20.9%). The decision to promote an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Question 19) is still being done in the semi-autocratic style (41.3%), but the next most used style is the autocratic style (33.3%). In Question 20, regarding transferring an employee who...
Figure 7.3 The Sample's Decision-Making Styles According to Decision Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Non-programmed decisions</th>
<th>Programmed decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AII</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that the managers showed a preference for programmed decisions in non-programmed situations.
works in the department of a subordinate, the table showed that the semi-autocratic is the style most often used (36.8%), followed by the autocratic style (29.9%). Finally, the decision about nominating an employee to work in the department of a subordinate (Question 21) is still being done in the semi-autocratic style (33.3%), and the next most used style is the autocratic style (20.9%). A possible explanation for such results may be attributed to the fact that programmed decisions are usually repetitive, well structured, clear and can be handled with a high degree of certainty. The information is more available and the rules are already established for the managers to follow. It is also possible to argue that managers in this type of decision, especially in developing countries, do not want to sacrifice their leadership power which usually gives them control over others and a more prestigious status in their organisation.

Based on the continuum power scale which was discussed earlier in this chapter, the decisions' mean scores were conducted. Thus, a high score indicates that a manager allows his subordinate(s) to share his decision-making power, thereby increasing the influence of his subordinate(s) on the outcome of the decision. In comparison, a low score implies a lower degree of subordinate participation and, consequently, more manager control over the outcome of the decision. Table 7.15 presents the respondents mean scores divided by the decision types. Taking these decisions independently the table shows that the non-programmed decisions have the biggest participation mean scores, while the mean scores of the programmed decisions are the lowest. The decisions about planning (Q.12) and re-organising (Q.15), for example, achieved the highest mean scores, 3.589 and 3.428 respectively, while the decisions about promoting (Q.19) or transferring an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Q.20), have the lowest mean scores, 2.164 and 2.358 respectively. It is obvious from this table, as previously discussed, that the total mean score of the non-programmed decisions (3.351) is more than the total mean score of the programmed decisions (2.549). This suggests that the managers allow
their subordinates to share their non-programmed decision-making power, thereby increasing the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the non-programmed decisions. On the other hand, the managers take more control over the programmed decisions, thereby decreasing the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the programmed decisions. Such results are consistent with our previous findings and support the proposition of Hypothesis 2 which assumed that non-programmed decisions are more participative than the programmed decisions (see Sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2).

### Table 7.15 Mean Scores of Subordinates' Participation Divided by Types of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Decision</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Programmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>3.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>3.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>3.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>3.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>3.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>3.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>2.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>2.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>2.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>2.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>2.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>2.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the managerial decision-making styles of the non-programmed decisions and the programmed decisions can be summarised as follows:

1. It is clear from Table 7.13 that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were utilised on all decisions. This emphases the argument that managers rarely employ only one decision-making style irrespective of the type and nature of the decisions.
2. It is also clear from Table 7.13 and Figure 7.2 that the semi-autocratic style (30.1%) was predominantly employed by the respondents for this specific set of questions. Therefore, Hypothesis 1, which assumed that the dominant decision-making style of the sample managers is the semi-consultative style (CI), is disproved.

3. The non-programmed decisions were most often made by the joint decision-making style (26.8%) followed by the consultative style (23.0%) in the next order (see Figure 7.3). The programmed decisions were most often done by the semi-autocratic style (38.4%) followed by the autocratic style (22.5%). Furthermore, the total mean scores of these two types of decision (non-programmed and programmed) were 3.351 and 2.549 respectively (see Table 7.15). For these reasons, Hypothesis 2, which stated that non-programmed decisions are more participative than programmed decisions is supported.

4. The autocratic style (AI) has 9.8% in the total of all non-programmed decisions, whereas it has 22.5% in the total of all programmed decisions (Table 7.13). This indicates that the managers tend to use less autocratic styles in making non-programmed decisions.

5. The semi-autocratic style (AII) has 21.8% in the non-programmed decisions category whereas it has 38.4% in the programmed decisions category. This means that the sample tends to use the more autocratic style with the programmed decisions than with the non-programmed decisions (see Figure 7.3). However, this style was predominantly employed by the managers for each one of the programmed decisions (see Table 7.13).
6. The semi-consultative style (CI) has 18.6% in the non-programmed decisions category whereas it has only 13.7% in the programmed decisions category (Table 7.13). This seems to suggest that the managers allow their subordinates more influence in the non-programmed decisions and less influence in the programmed decisions.

7. The consultative style (CII) has 23.0% in the non-programmed decisions category while it has 12.2% in the programmed decisions category (Table 7.13). This indicates that the sample managers are more consultative in their non-programmed decisions than in their programmed decisions.

8. The joint decision-making style (GII) has 26.8% in the non-programmed decisions category while it has 13.2% in the programmed decisions category. This seems to suggest that the managers tend to increase the participation and the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the non-programmed decisions and to take control over the outcome of the programmed decisions. However, this style is the one most often used with the non-programmed decisions category (Table 7.13).

7.3.4 The Variables Affecting Managerial Decisions

Data were collected on a variety of independent variables such as the job position, education, managerial experience, training, study in the West, and span of management. It will be beneficial to extend the analysis to include the independent variables which may have an impact on the managers' decision-making styles. The intention here is to find out how much of the variance in the managers' decision styles can be explained, and to which variable(s) it can be attributed. Each variable has been measured by using the weighted mean of participation. This process was accomplished by using the power-sharing continuum scale and the assumption that
its five styles are separated by equal intervals (AI = 1; AII = 2; CI = 3; CII = 4; and GII = 5). Thus, a high mean score suggests that a manager allows his subordinate(s) to share his decision-making power thereby increasing the influence of his subordinate(s) on the outcome of the decision (see the continuum scale for this study as it was displayed in Figure 7.1). The Pearson correlating coefficient, the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the Scheffé multiple comparison test, and the parametric two independent samples T-tests were used in this regard.

The one way ANOVA tests were used for measuring the statistical significance among variables with several group means, whereas the parametric T-test was used for measuring the significance and comparing the mean of the sample divided into two groups. However, one of the advantages of the one-way ANOVA test is that a Scheffé multiple comparison test can be conducted to give a conservative estimate of group means which are significantly different from one another. The Scheffé test compares each possible pair of means and indicates which ones show statistically significant differences. Each one of the independent variables is tested and analysed separately according to its level of significance. This process was accomplished by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program as follows:

7.3.4.1 Managerial Position

Looking at Table 7.16, there are differences between the means of participation degree and the two levels of management position (low-level and high-level). This analysis aims to show whether the position of a manager will affect his style of making managerial decisions in terms of participation degree. It is clear from the table that the group of managers who occupy high-level positions have higher participation scores than those who occupy low-level positions.

In the non-programmed decisions category, the total participation mean scores show that the high-level managers are more participating in their decision-making style.
than the low-level managers (3.7 and 3.1 respectively). However, the decision to
develop a new plan (Question 12) and the decision to re-organise the manager's
department (Question 15) seem to achieve the highest degree of participation (3.6
and 3.4 respectively). A possible explanation is that such non-programmed
decisions are more complex, uncertain of the outcome, unstructured, strategic and
the managers need more ideas and information, thereby asking for their
subordinates' involvement.

However, the Pearson correlation coefficient between management positions and the
total participation score of the non-programmed decisions (3.3) is significant at .001
level. Also, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed significant
differences between low-level and high-level managers in the total participation
mean score of the non-programmed decisions, $F (1,199) = 11.83, p < .001$ level.
Furthermore, F-value of each one of the non-programmed decisions are significant;
Question 12 at level .05, Question 13 at level .01, Question 14 at level .05, Question
15 at level .05 and Question 16 at level .001.

Table 7.16 Mean Score of Managers' Power Sharing Degree According to
Their Managerial Position (N = 201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type</th>
<th>Non-Programmed</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>All Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 ALL</td>
<td>Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>3.4 3.0 3.1 3.3 2.9 3.1</td>
<td>2.4 2.8 1.9 2.0 2.5 2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.9 3.6 3.6 3.7 3.7 3.7</td>
<td>2.8 3.3 2.6 2.9 3.1 2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managers</td>
<td>3.6 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.2 3.3</td>
<td>2.6 3.0 2.2 2.3 2.7 2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>r = r = r = r = r = r =</td>
<td>r = r = r = r = r = r =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>a b a a c c c</td>
<td>a a c c b c c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.17 .22 .16 .15 .29 .24</td>
<td>.14 .17 .27 .30 .22 .30 .30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA (F 1,199)</td>
<td>5.77 9.95 5.45 4.43 17.92 11.83</td>
<td>a a c c b c c</td>
<td>5.40 19.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = $P < .05$
b = $P < .01$
c = $P < .001$
Turning to the programmed decisions category, the table showed that high-level managers are also more participative than low-level managers in all the five programmed decisions, independently and jointly. However, the decision to promote an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Question 19) seems to be the least participatory decision (2.2). A possible explanation is that such a decision as programmed decision, is repetitive, unambiguous and certain of outcome. The managers need file information and reports rather than opinions or judgement. They may also have to follow ready established rules and procedures to make such programmed decisions. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient between managerial position and the total participation score of the programmed decisions is significant at .001 level and the ANOVA test also showed there was a significant difference between the low-level managers and the high-level managers in the total participation, $F(1,199) = 20.40, p < .001$ level. Furthermore, all the F-values of the programmed decisions are significant. Question 17 at level .05, Question 18 at level .05, Question 19 at level .001, Question 20 at level .001, and Question 21 at level .01. Therefore, the levels of management positions seem to be significantly different in participation means both in the non-programmed and programmed decisions category. For all the above results, Hypothesis 5, which stated that the high-level manager is more participatory in his decision-making style than the low-level manager, is supported. In terms of categorising all managerial decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category, it is obvious from the table that Hypothesis 5 is also supported because there are significant differences between the level of management and the total participation scores of all the decisions according to ANOVA, $F(1,199) = 19.48, p < .001$ level. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient was also shown to be significant in this regard at the .001 level.
7.3.4.2 Educational Qualifications

Table 7.17 shows the mean scores for participation for each educational level, for each decision and for each category of decisions (programmed and non-programmed). The aim is to ascertain whether the educational level of a manager affects his style of making managerial decisions in terms of participation and the decision type.

Table 7.17 Mean Score of Managers' Power-Sharing Degree According to their Level of Education (N = 202)

| Decision Type | Level of Education | Non-Programmed | | Programmed | | All Decisions |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|               |                   | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | ALL | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | ALL |
| Under University | 3.4 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| University     | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| Master         | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.1 |
| Doctorate      | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| All Managers   | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.9 |

Pearson correlation coefficient

| Decision Type | Level of Education | Non-Programmed | | Programmed | | All Decisions |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|               |                   | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = | r = |
| Under University | a       | .15 | .19 | .11 | .03 | .09 | .14 | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   |
| University     | b       | .15 | .09 | .15 | .09 | .15 | .07 | .15 | .16 |
| Master         | .15 | .19 | .11 | .03 | .09 | .14 | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   |
| Doctorate      | .15 | .19 | .11 | .03 | .09 | .14 | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   |
| All Managers   | .15 | .19 | .11 | .03 | .09 | .14 | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   | a   |

ANOVA F (3,198)

| Decision Type | Level of Education | Non-Programmed | | Programmed | | All Decisions |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|               |                   | 1.84 | 2.52 | 1.15 | .26 | 1.36 | 1.53 | a   | 2.79 | 1.16 | a   | 3.23 | 2.26 | .84 | 3.42 | 2.69 |

Note: a = p < .05
b = p < .01

In terms of the non-programmed decisions, it is obvious from the table that the highly educated groups (Master and Ph.D.) are more participatory in their decision-making style compared with the other groups. The total participation mean score of
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the Master and Ph.D. groups is 3.6 and 3.8 respectively, whereas the total score of the university and under university groups is 3.3 and 3.2 respectively. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed a significant relationship between the level of education and the total participation score of non-programmed decisions category at .05 level. But the ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference between the levels of education and the total participation of this category $F(3,198) = 1.53, p > .05$ level. For this reason, Hypothesis 6, which stated that the more educated the manager the more participative his decision making style, is not significantly supported in terms of the non-programmed decisions.

Turning to the programmed decisions category, the table showed that highly educated managers (Ph.D. and Master) are also more participative in their decision-making style compared to the other two groups (university and under university). However, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed a significant relationship between the level of education and the total participation of the programmed decisions at .05 level. Also, the ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference between the groups and the total participation of the programmed decisions category, $F(3,198) = 3.42, p < .05$ level. Therefore, Hypothesis 6, which stated that the more educated the manager the more participative his decision-making style, is supported. However, the Scheffé multiple comparison test also showed that the group with a Ph.D. degree of education had a significantly higher mean (3.4) than the group with below university education (2.5). A possible explanation is the fact that highly educated managers may have had the opportunity to learn about and practise Participative Management (PM) and believe in its benefits for the whole organisation, so they involve, to a greater degree, their subordinates in management activities and decisions.

Finally, in terms of dealing with all the managerial decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category, it is clear from the table that the highly educated
groups (Master and Ph.D.) are more participative in their decision-making styles than the other two groups. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was again supported because there is a significant difference between level of education and the total participation score of all decisions according to ANOVA, \( F(3, 198) = 2.69, p < .05 \) level. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient was also shown to be significant at the .05 level.

### 7.3.4.3 Study in the West

In the past, the Saudi Government was heavily dependent on Western universities to be the appropriate place for educating Saudi graduate and postgraduate students and to some extent this is still true today. However, today there are several Saudi public universities inside the country and there are people who keep asking for encouragement for these universities to conduct (to run) different postgraduate studies (Master and Ph.D.) and limiting the external scholarships on the country's needs and on some specific fields of study such as medicine, sciences and so on. However, the managerial style in Western society seems to be more participative than the Arabian society, therefore studying in the West might affect the manager's decision-making style. The argument here is that the group of Saudi managers who graduated from Western universities would have a chance to learn and even more to deal with actual Participative Management (PM) policies and practices inside and outside their universities, while the other group may not have the same opportunity. Therefore, it may be useful to compare managers who achieved their highest education degrees from Saudi universities with those managers who achieved their degrees from Western universities.

The sample was divided according to the countries from where the respondents gained their higher educational degrees (Question 10). As the answers to this question were limited by the respondents to Saudi Arabia, UK, USA and a few other
European countries, the sample was categorised into two main groups (Group 1 - those managers who graduated from Saudi universities and Group 2 - those managers who graduated from Western universities). This process of categorisation was accomplished by using the SPSS recode and compute procedures.

Table 7.18 Mean Score of Managers' Power Sharing Degree According to the Country of Higher Education (N = 202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type</th>
<th>Non-Programmed</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>All Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 ALL</td>
<td>Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.1 3.2</td>
<td>2.5 2.9 2.0 2.2 2.6 2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>4.1 3.8 3.8 3.9 3.8 3.9</td>
<td>2.8 3.5 3.0 3.0 3.4 3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managers</td>
<td>3.6 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.2 3.3</td>
<td>2.6 3.0 2.2 2.4 2.7 2.5</td>
<td>2.5 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>r = r = r = r = r =</td>
<td>r = r = r = r = r = r =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>b a a a a b</td>
<td>a c b b c c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.19 .18 .14 .17 .17 .20</td>
<td>.08 .16 .28 .21 .22 .27</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA F(1,200)</td>
<td>b b a a a b</td>
<td>a c b b c c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.41 6.81 4.20 5.99 6.26 8.73</td>
<td>1.28 5.09 17.07 8.96 10.35 15.65</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = p <.05  
b = p < .01  
c = p < .001

Table 7.18 indicates that managers who graduated from Western universities tend to share more of their power with subordinates when compared to the other group of managers in all the programmed and non-programmed decisions. Let us start with the non-programmed decisions category. The data shows that managers who have studied in the West have higher participation mean scores than those who have not (3.9 and 3.2 respectively). However, the Pearson correlation coefficient shows a significant relationship between the total participation score of the non-programmed decisions and the Western study at .01 level. Also the ANOVA shows a significant
variation between the two groups, $F(1,200) = 8.73, p < .01$. Turning to the programmed decisions category, it is obvious from the table that the group of managers who have studied in the West have higher participation scores than those who have studied only in the Saudi universities (3.1 and 2.4 respectively). The Pearson correlation coefficient shows significant correlation between the degree of participation (dependent variable) and studying in the West (independent variable). The ANOVA also indicates a significant variation between the two groups in the total participation of the programmed decisions, $F(1,200) = 15.65, p < .001$ level. Furthermore, in regard to all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category, the data also shows that managers who studied in the West tend to share more of their decision-making power with subordinates when compared to the other managers' group (3.5 and 2.8 respectively). The Pearson correlation coefficient shows significant correlation at .001 level and the ANOVA also shows there was a significant variation between the two groups in the total score of participation, $F(1,200) = 14.61, p < .001$. For all of these reasons, Hypothesis 7, which stated that the managers who received their higher educational studies at Western universities are more participative in their decision-making style than those who did not, is proved. An alternative explanation for this result may be attributed to the fact that in Western universities there are more opportunities for students to learn about Participative Management (PM) approaches from theoretical and practical perspectives. Therefore, they may be influenced by their educational background and by the concept and practice of participative management. On the other hand, it should be noted that not all employees are equally interested in participation. The traditional and organisational values of the managers may negatively affect their decision-making styles. If employees have been raised in a non-participative culture and learnt to function autocratically, there will be a great deal of resistance to the introduction of participation and to the involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process. Elbing (1978) said, "In some cultures, in fact, the employee has had no prior family, school, or social experience in
participation and is not prepared for it". However, it is possible also that our sample was influenced by their organisational background as police officers in police organisations.

7.3.4.4 Period of Managerial Training

Table 7.19 shows the mean of participation for each period of managerial training in each decision type. In the non-programmed decision category, the higher mean among groups is 3.8 and belongs to those managers who had more than one year's period of managerial training programmes. On the other hand, the lowest participation mean score is 2.7 and goes to those managers with no training programmes. The Pearson correlation coefficient for all the non-programmed decisions were significant at .001 level and also the ANOVA showed significant differences between the period of training and the total degree of participation, $F(3,198 = 6.08, p < .001$ level. Furthermore, the Scheffe multiple comparison test showed that Group 3 (4-12 months) and Group 4 (> 1 year), which have the highest total participation scores (3.4 and 3.8 respectively), are significantly different from Group 1 (no training) which has the lowest total participation score (2.7) related to the non-programmed decisions category. For all these reasons, Hypothesis 8, which stated that managers who have managerial training qualifications are more participative in their decision-making style than those who are not, is supported in terms of the non-programmed decisions.

In terms of the programmed decisions, the table shows that there are differences between the means of participation and the different periods of managerial training. As the period of training is increased, the responses to all the questions become more participative. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient between the periods of training and the total participation is significant at .05 level but the
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ANOVA test showed there was no significant difference between the periods of managerial training and the total participation scores, $F(3,198) = 2.23$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 is not significantly supported in terms of programmed decisions.

### Table 7.19 Mean Score of Managers' Power Sharing Degree According to their Managerial Training Periods (N = 202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type</th>
<th>Non-Programmed</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>All Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>$r = .22$</td>
<td>$r = .29$</td>
<td>$r = .23$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA F (3,198)</td>
<td>$a = 6.68$</td>
<td>$b = 5.01$</td>
<td>$a = 3.30$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless the ANOVA showed that there is a significant difference between the training groups and the degree of participation regarding the decision to increase the number of employees who work in the department of a subordinate (Question 18), $F(3,198) = 3.47$, $p < .05$ level. The Pearson correlation coefficient is also significant in this regard.

Furthermore, when all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) were computed and re-tested as one category, the total participation mean scores seem to
be higher as the period of managerial training gets higher. In this regard, Table 7.19 shows that the Pearson correlation coefficient is significant at .001 level and also the ANOVA showed significant differences between the training groups and the total participation of all the decisions as one category, F(3,198) = 5.08, p < .01 level. For this reason, Hypothesis 8 is supported accordingly. A possible explanation is that those managers with more years of managerial training had a greater understanding, skills and knowledge in developing their subordinates by giving them the opportunity to participate in management activities and decisions. It can also be said that those who did not attend any training programme will be less convinced of the key role of the participative management styles.

7.3.4.5 Managerial Experience

Managerial experience is very important to the success of management and plays an essential role in the overall manager decision-making styles and their implementation. One objective of this section is to find out whether the experience of a manager affects his managerial style in terms of subordinates participation in the decision-making process. Table 7.20 shows the participation mean scores for each group of managerial experience for each category of decisions (non-programmed and programmed) and for all the decisions as one category. Looking at the table it is clear that there are differences between the means of participation and the different periods of managerial experience. However, the total participation score for all the decisions as one category indicates that the least experienced group (< 1 year) is the more participative group (3.1) compared to the other groups.

In terms of the non-programmed decisions category, it is obvious that the first group (< 1 year) contains the highest participative score in the total participation for this category (3.5). However, the Pearson correlation coefficient is not significant at .05
level and the ANOVA indicated that neither is the difference between the groups significant, F(3.198) = .20, p > .05 level.

**Table 7.20 Mean Score of Managers' Power Sharing Degree According to the Years of Managerial Experience (N = 202)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type</th>
<th>Non-Programmed</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>All Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15 years</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA F (3,198)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = p < .05

Turning to the programmed decisions category, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed no significant correlation between the total score of participation and the periods of managerial experience at .05 level. Also the ANOVA showed no significant difference between the groups, F(3.198) = .61, p > .05 level. Furthermore, in regard to both the programmed and non-programmed decisions as one category, it is obvious that the first group (< 1 year of experience) contains also the highest participative score in the total scores of participation (3.1). The Pearson correlation coefficient is not significant and the ANOVA also showed no significant difference between the periods of managerial experience and the total participation, F(3,198) = .22, p > .05. For all the above reasons, Hypothesis 9, which stated that
the more experienced the manager is, the more participative his decision-making style would be, is not supported.

However, even though there is no statistically significant difference between groups, the managers with the least experience (< 1 year of managerial experience) seem to be the more participative group in the non-programmed decisions, but not in the programmed decisions. One probable explanation is that the less experienced managers lack the knowledge and the skills to handle the non-programmed decisions as they are complex and uncertain of outcome, so the managers rely on their experienced subordinates to help them in reaching such non-programmed decisions. However, in regard to the programmed decisions, the less experienced managers may feel that these decisions are well structured, clear and certain of outcome, so they make these decisions with the minimum participation of their subordinates.

7.3.4.6 The Span of Management

To examine the effect of management span on the manager's decision-making style, the sample was divided into three main groups. Group 1 includes managers who have less than 15 subordinates under their supervision, Group 2 those managers who supervise 15 to 50 subordinates and Group 3 includes managers who have more than 50 subordinates under their supervision. Actually the number of respondents who answered that they have less than 15 subordinates under their supervision was 126, while those with 15-50 subordinates was 45 and those with more than 50 subordinates was 31 (Table 6.3). This analysis aimed to show whether the managers' span of management affects their decision-making style.

Table 7.21 shows that there are differences between the means of participation and the different level of management span for each one of the non-programmed and programmed decisions. In terms of the non-programmed decisions, the Pearson
correlation coefficient showed no significant relation between the span of management and the total participation mean score. Also, the ANOVA showed there is no significant difference between the level of managerial span and the total participation for the non-programmed decisions, \( F(2,199) = 1.08, p > .05 \) level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Type</th>
<th>Non-Programmed</th>
<th>Programmed</th>
<th>All Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-50 employees</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 employees</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( r = )</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r = )</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( F(2,199) )</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a = p < .05 \)

Therefore, Hypothesis 4, which stated that the managers with a wide span of management are more participative in their decision-making style than those with a small span of management, is not supported in terms of the non-programmed decisions. In terms of the programmed decisions, this hypothesis is not supported either because there is no significant difference between level of management span and the total participation score according to ANOVA, \( F(2,199) = .27, p > .05 \). Also, the Pearson correlation coefficient was shown to be insignificant at the .05 level. Furthermore, this hypothesis is not approved either when dealing with all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category because there is no
significant difference between the span of management and the total participation for all decisions according to ANOVA, $F(2,199) = .31, p > .05$. The Pearson correlation coefficient was also not significant in this regard at the .05 level.

However, what is interesting in this analysis is that the managers with a small span of management (<15 subordinates) seem to be more participative in their decision-making style than those with a large span of management (> 50 subordinates). This result is contrary to the literature which argues that the span of management is one of the important factors that may affect the degree of subordinates' participation in management decisions. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) write, "A manager who has a small span of management can maintain close control over the workers and stay in contact with daily operations. If the span of control is large, close control is not possible."11 Furthermore, Mondy et al (1990) argue that, "Narrow span of management presents closer supervision of personnel ..... Wide spans result in relatively ....greater freedom for the individual employee."12 However, one can only speculate that such contradiction may be attributed to the influence of some other independent variables such as educational qualification, managerial training, experience, country of higher education, and personal values and tradition. Another probable explanation is also the fact that the police sector in Saudi Arabia is highly influenced by the military rules, procedures and regulations.

7.4 THE DECISION-MAKING METHODS AND THE PROCESS OF MAKING MANAGERIAL DECISIONS

As stated earlier in Chapter 4, managers can use one, or a combination of methods to make their managerial decisions. Some of the major methods presented in the

---

12 Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 245
literature are the experienced based method, the observation and imitation based method, the attempt and amend based method and scientific management based method. However, decision-making methods and decision-making styles are not synonymous. There are several differences between these two sets. For example, the decision-making method is general and it can involve one or more decision styles or decision methods; whereas the decision-making style is specific and it cannot involve any other decision styles.\footnote{For more details, see Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.}

The respondents were given these four options of decision-making methods and asked to choose only one method that they most often used in making their decisions. Table 7.22 shows the distribution of the respondents according to the decision method they most often used.

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Decision Method & Frequency & Valid Percent \\
\hline
Experience & 59 & 29.2 \\
Observation and Imitation & 8 & 4.0 \\
Attempt and Amend & 32 & 15.8 \\
Scientific management & 103 & 51.0 \\
\hline
TOTAL & 202 & 100.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\caption{Distribution of Managers According to the Decision Method}
\end{table}

This section aims to investigate managers' decision-making methods according to their level of education and to assess their participation in the stages of the decision-making process of the two types of decisions (programmed and non-programmed) according to their managerial position at the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. The following two sub-sections report the analysis and the findings of the
research intended to test Hypotheses 3A-C, presented in Chapter 6. The first sub-section deals with Hypothesis 3A which stated that subordinate-managers who are highly educated implement the scientific decision-making approach more than those who are not. The second sub-section reports the analysis and the findings of Hypothesis 3B and Hypothesis 3C regarding the degree of participation in each stage of the decision-making process.

7.4.1 The Scientific Decision-Making Approach

The Scientific decision-making approach is one of the important methods which can be used effectively in making managerial decisions through the implementation of orderly stages that make up the decision-making process. This method concentrates on the decision-making process as an essential way to reach management objectives and the desired outcome. The purpose of this section is to investigate the relationship between manager's level of education and the implementation of the scientific decision-making approach.

Table 7.23 shows the distribution of the sample according to the decision-making methods that have been used by the managers according to their level of education. From the table it is obvious that the majority of the respondents use the scientific decision-making approach in making their decision (51%). When cross-tabulating the decision-making methods (Question 24) by the managers' level of education (Question 4), it was found that the highest percentage (69.4%) who use scientific management are managers with a high level of education (Ph.D. and Master). Table 7.23 shows the cross-tabulation results of decision-making methods by educational level.

---

Table 7.23 Decision Methods by Level of Education (observed frequencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Methods</th>
<th>Below University</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Higher Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation &amp; Imitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt &amp; Amend</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Approach</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | **100.0%**       | **100.0%** | **100.0%**    | **100.0%** |

$x^2$ value = 13.37909 with 6 dF. Significant at .05 level

The question this table is designed to answer is whether a manager's level of education affects his decision-making methods. The observed differences between the figures of this table seem to indicate that it does. For example, the highly educated managers are the group who use the scientific method most in making their decisions (69.4%) followed by the university group (46.3%) and then those below university degree with 42.2%.

To assess the observed relationship, we are going to compute the expected relationship between the level of education and decision-making methods. An important part of this process lies in the right hand column in the preceding table. It indicates that 29.2% of the whole sample use the experience method, 4.0% uses the observation and imitation method, 15.8% use the attempt and amend method and 51.0% of the whole sample uses the scientific approach method. If there were no relationship between the level of education and the decision-making methods, we should expect to find 51.0% of the highly educated group using the scientific
decision-making approach, 51.0% of the university group using the scientific approach, and so forth. Let's now work out what the table would look like if there was no association between the variables (Table 7.24). The table shows that none of the expected frequencies is less than 1, or more than 20% are less than 5. Therefore, the prescribed minimum requirements for the valid use of Chi-square have been fulfilled.  

Table 7.24 Decision Methods by Educational Level (expected frequencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Methods</th>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below University</td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>Higher Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Limitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt and Amend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Approach</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 \text{ value} = 13.37909 \text{ with 6 dF. Significant at .05 level} \]

From the preceding two tables (Table 7.23 and Table 7.24) it is obvious that the earlier results did not match the perfect expected model of no relationship between these two variables. In other words, the results seem to indicate that there is an association between manager's level of education and the scientific decision-making approach. The managers who are highly educated implement the scientific decision-making approach more than those who are not. In order to measure the significance level of this association the Chi-Square and the Cramer's V correlation co-efficient

\[ 15 \text{ Kinnear, P.R. and C.D. Gray, 1995, p. 165.} \]
statistics procedures were conducted and it was found that $P = 0.0374$. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation coefficient between the two variables at 0.05 level and an observed relationship reflects a similar relationship in the population rather than arising from sampling error. Furthermore, the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was also computed. This test indicates significant differences between the groups of educational level ($p < 0.05$). For all the above reasons, Hypothesis 3A, which stated that highly educated managers implement the scientific decision-making approach than those who are not, is supported.

7.4.2 Participation in the Stages of the Decision-Making Process

The stages of the decision-making process are presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core elements of the decision-making process. Figure 4.1 illustrates the stages of this process, starting with the observation of the problem and runs through the process until the best possible decision is chosen, implemented, and monitored. As stated previously in Chapter 4, and as it is mapped in Figure 4.1, the decision-making process deals with two types of managerial decisions which are programmed and non-programmed decisions. They share the first three and the last three stages of the decision-making process (see Figure 4.1). In practice, however, the stages in the decision-making process are rarely recognised as distinct stages by the decision body. They are recognised as a series of interrelated and dynamic stages. The framework depicted in Figure 4.1 illustrates the dynamic nature of the decision-making process with both the inter-relatedness of the stages and their sequential organisation.

However, the decision-making process is affected seriously by the size of the decision body. If the decision is taken by a single decision maker decision body, an autocratic decision-making style is more likely to be implemented and the
subordinates will not participate effectively in the decision-making process. On the other hand, if the decision is taken by a multi-decision maker decision body, a participative decision-making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Participation in the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. In respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction. Such participation will generate more ideas and more interests and help to accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives.

The purpose of this section is to investigate managers' participation in the stages of the decision-making process according to the manager's position (high-level and low-level) and decision type (programmed and non-programmed). The data was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very low, 2 = low, 3 = average, 4 = high and 5 = very high). A parametric two independent samples T-test was computed to measure participation mean scores and to assess whether significant differences existed between the two levels of management positions.

In terms of the stages of making programmed decisions, the T-test detected that participation of low-level managers is greater than upper-level managers' participation in stages 1 through 7, but significantly different only for stage 4 (applying ready-stated rules and procedures), 5 (choosing the final course of action), 6 (implementing and supporting the chosen action) and 7 (evaluating and monitoring the implemented decision). Table 7.25 and Figure 7.4 show that low-level managers participated more in the stages of the programmed decision than do the high-level managers.
Table 7.25  Means of managers’ participation in the stages of making programmed decisions (Q.25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Low-Level</th>
<th>High-Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the same table shows there was a significant difference between the two levels of managers and the total participation score for the seven stages of the programmed decision. The total participation mean score for lower-level managers was 3.71, for upper-level managers 3.38 and the computed P was .015, which is less than .05 significance level.

Figure 7.4  Managers’ participation in the stages of the programmed decision process
The results in Table 7.25 further show that high-level managers participated most in Stage 1 (observation), and more in stage 2 (recognising and diagnosing the problem) than in stage 3 (setting objectives and determining the type of decision to be taken). Participation in stages 4, 6 and 7 continued to decrease with a significant difference between the two position groups. However, stage 5 (choosing the final course of action) had significantly the lowest participation mean score. The total participation mean scores for the seven stages were also significantly different at .05 level (see Table 7.25). Furthermore, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test was also conducted to show the effects and interaction between these two factors. The ANOVA confirms the patterns that were displayed in Table 7.25 and Figure 7.4: the stages and position factors both have significant main effects and the interaction between the factors is also significant (see Table 7.26). Therefore, Hypothesis 3B, which stated that participation of upper-level managers in the process of making programmed decision decreases with each advance stage of the process, is statistically supported.

Table 7.26 The Results of the Repeated-Measure ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level by Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to the stages of making non-programmed decisions, the T-test detected that high-level managers' participation in each stage of the non-programmed decision type process is significantly greater than low-level managers' participation. Table
7.27 and Figure 7.5 show the differences between the upper-level and lower-level managers' participation in the stages of making the non-programmed decision type.

Table 7.27 Means of Managers' Participation in the Stages of Making Non-Programmed Decisions (Q.26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Low-Level</th>
<th>High-Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Programmed Decision Stages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.5 Managers' participation in the stages of the non-programmed decision process
The results presented in Table 7.27 further show that low-level managers participated most in stage 1 (observing the problem) and more in stage 2 (recognising and defining the problem) than in stage 3 (setting objectives and determining the decision type). However, participation in stages 4, 5, 7 and 8 continued to decrease with a significant difference between groups totally and independently. Stage 6 (choosing the final course of action) had the lowest participation mean score among the eight stages with a significant difference between the two levels of management position (p = .000). Furthermore, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test was also conducted to display the effects and interaction between these two factors. The ANOVA strongly confirms the patterns that were discernible in Table 7.27 and Figure 7.5: the stages and position factors both have significant main effects and interaction between the factors is also significant (see Table 7.28). Therefore, Hypothesis 3C, which stated that the lower-level managers' participation in the process of making non-programmed decisions is decreased with each advance stage of the process, is supported.

### Table 7.28 The Results of the Repeated-Measure ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.01</td>
<td>112.01</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level by Stage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, what is interesting is that stage 5 (choosing the final course of action) in the process of making a programmed decision and stage 6 (choosing the final course of action) of the process of making a non-programmed decision achieved the lowest participation mean score for each level of management and in each type of decision (see Table 7.25 and Table 7.27). One alternative explanation is the possibility of
superiors' intervention in this critical stage of the decision-making process which influence subordinate managers to degrade their participation scores. Mondy et al (1990) and Van de Van and Delbecq (1971) argued that some managers with strong personalities who occupy high-level managerial positions might dominate the decision-making process, causing less insistent and lower-level managers to go along with them.\footnote{Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 19.}

Another possible explanation is the fact that some managers avoid responsibility and therefore do not want to be involved in this stage (choosing the final course of action) which is one of the important and critical stages. They might feel it is so much easier to let the final decision be made by others and criticise management for its failure than to participate in making the decision and taking the responsibility for it.\footnote{Bowditch, J.L. and A.f. Buono, 1994, p. 404; and Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 628.} Finally, it is also possible that some members of the decision-making body or the internal pressure groups influence the discussion and drive the final decision the way they want regardless of other participants opinions. Such situations, however, exist in most developing countries including Saudi Arabia. These types of problem will limit the effectiveness of participation, empty this concept of its real meaning, and discourage other subordinates to be involved in the process. Therefore, management should be aware of such problems and must encourage its employees (managers and subordinates) to overcome these problems and to participate effectively in the decision-making process.

\section*{7.5 TECHNIQUES FOR EMPLOYING A PARTICIPATIVE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS}

As a result of the growing importance of the participative decision-making approaches, several techniques have been developed which enable subordinate-managers to participate more effectively in the process of creating alternatives and
making decisions. The literature is rich in this area and covers many techniques which can overcome some of the problems and barriers of employees' participation in the managerial decision-making process (see Chapter 5). This section concentrates on five major techniques that can be used when implementing a participative decision-making process. These techniques include conference technique, committee technique, brainstorming technique, nominal group technique (NGT) and the Delphi method technique. The questionnaire of this research contains some questions about familiarity of the sample managers with these techniques. The respondents were asked whether they had ever heard of the technique, and if yes, have they ever used it and, finally, what they thought about its usefulness in their organisations. Each of these techniques and questions were analysed as follows.

The first technique for enabling employees to participate in making managerial decisions is "conference". This technique refers to a specified form of participation in the managerial decision-making process and requires a face-to-face meeting. It is used to exchange views or pass on information which may or may not lead to a conclusion or a final decision. The manager may or may not use its outcome. Table 7.29 shows that 83.1% of the respondents have heard of this technique and of those who had, 81.4% have experienced it as a superior or a subordinate. However, there are two possible explanations for the high percentage (81.4%) of the actual use of this technique. One explanation is that familiarity with this technique (83.1%) led to high practice of it. Another possible explanation may be attributed to the fact that this technique does not enforce managers to use its outcome. Therefore, they may use this technique to cover their authoritative managerial styles and to appear as modern and participative managers. However, the above frequencies and percentages support our assumption that conference technique is one of the most used techniques by managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres (Hypothesis 11).
Table 7.29  Frequencies and Percentages of Managers' Responses Towards the Conference Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Heard of this technique</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Experienced this technique as a superior or a subordinate</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second technique for enabling employees to participate in management decisions is the committee technique. With today's organisations becoming increasingly large and complex, the committee technique becomes more important and more widely used in the practice of making managerial decisions and is considered to be a useful technique for participating in decision making. It requires a face-to-face meeting and is formed to exchange information and advice, and most often leads to a compromise conclusion. Most committees have specified duties and authority, and accordingly make recommendations or decisions on actions of some kind or another. Table 7.30 shows that 90% of the respondents have previously heard of this technique and of those who had, 80.7% have experienced this technique in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. However, the high familiarity with, and experience of, this technique were to be expected as the committee technique is one of the more common techniques that are found in all types of organisations, i.e. government, educational institutions, religious, business firms, etc.
Table 7.30 Frequencies and Percentages of Managers' Responses Towards the Committee Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Previously heard of the Committee Technique</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Experienced Committee Technique as a superior or a subordinate</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third technique is "brainstorming". Previous literature refers to this technique as a participative technique which requires a face-to-face interaction. Participants are not allowed to criticise any contributed idea, as this may squelch not only that idea but also any other ideas in the mind of each of the participants. Only after the last idea has been recorded do the participants begin to evaluate and choose from among the generated ideas. Often the final result of a well-conducted set of brainstorming sessions is a solution or decision that is effective and superior to anything that would have resulted from a non-participative decision-making approach. This technique is seen to be useful for all types of decisions, but it is more effective when the problems are simple and well defined. It may also be applied at any stage of the decision-making process, but is most successfully applied at the alternative generating stage of the decision-making process.\(^\text{18}\)

Table 7.31 shows that 72.6% of the respondents have previously heard of this technique and of those who had, 67.1% have experienced it in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. This may indicate that familiarity with this technique led to practice of it. Some of the respondents make written comments indicating their admiration of this technique. For example, one of the respondents said, "Maybe I don't know this technique by name, but I used to practice it a long time ago and it really works". Another one said, "That's what we need in our department". He also added, "I believe this

technique will stop most of the hidden agendas and unhealthy arguments that we used to have in most of our committees' meetings".

Table 7.31 Frequencies and Percentages of Managers' Responses Toward the Brainstorming Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Previously heard of the brainstorming technique</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. Experienced brain-storming technique as a superior or a subordinate</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth technique is called the Nominal Group Technique (NGT). This technique offers another means of implementing the participative decision-making process. In this technique, participants meet together face-to-face but discussion or inter-personal communication between them is not allowed. During the meeting they act independently to minimise the effect of personal and inter-personal factors on the types of ideas or suggestions each participant might present. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) defined this technique as a generate-discussion-vote cycle process that the participants should follow in writing until they reach an appropriate decision. However, the Nominal Group Technique can be used in different stages of the decision-making process and more particularly in stages such as identification of the problem, generation of the available alternatives, evaluation of the presented alternatives, and choosing the appropriate course of action. A full discussion of this technique was presented in Chapter 5 of this research. Table 7.32 indicates that only 36.3% of the respondents had previously heard of this technique and of those who had, only 31.5% have experienced it in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. This degree of familiarity and experience is considered to be low. However, the top
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man syndrome and self-orientation are still strong characteristics of Saudi management. Therefore, the Nominal Group Technique will be a very useful means to minimise the negative effects of power and status differences among participants in a face-to-face meeting. It prevents the respondents from being influenced by the personalities and ranks of other participants and allows for the sharing of information simultaneously.

Table 7.32 Frequencies and Percentages of Managers' Responses Towards the Nominal Group Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Previously heard of the Nominal Group Technique</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Experienced the Nominal Group Technique as a superior or a subordinate</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last but not the least technique is the Delphi method technique. This technique is another participative decision-making technique which does not require a face-to-face meeting. But, rather, every participant expresses his or her ideas in writing and sends them to the co-ordinator whose responsibility is to analyse, summarise and recycle information among respondents. This process continues until an agreeable decision is reached. A full description of this technique was presented in Chapter 5. Table 7.33 shows that only 36.3% of the respondents had previously heard of this technique and of those who had, only 28.8% have experienced it in their current jobs as a superior or a subordinate. This degree of familiarity and experience is considered to be low. As it is religiously and traditionally difficult, if not impossible, for Saudi managers to share their views with the different gender in a face-to-face meeting, this technique becomes one of the important techniques that

can be used to overcome such problems. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) stated that "The Delphi technique is useful when experts are physically dispersed, anonymity is desired, or the participants are known to have difficulty communicating with one another." This technique also avoids the psychological drawbacks (e.g. shyness, show-up or personal conflict) associated with traditional face-to-face decision-making techniques. Therefore it could be worthwhile to develop and adopt such a technique in the Saudi managerial environment.

Table 7.33 Frequencies and Percentages of Managers' Responses Towards the Delphi Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q39. Previously heard of the Delphi method technique</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40. Experienced the Delphi method technique as a superior or a subordinate</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were also asked about their attitudes towards the usefulness of practising these five techniques in their current departments and organisations. Each question was measured by a 5 point Likert type scale where 1 = not at all useful, 2 = not useful, 3 = don't know, 4 = useful and 5 = very useful. The results of these questions are shown in Table 7.34 where the techniques have been ranked according to their mean scores with the highest mean coming first and the lowest mean coming last. It is obvious from this table that participants feel that the committee technique (mean 4.12) is the most useful one in their organisations compared to the other four techniques. This was followed by the brainstorming technique (mean 4.10), then the conference technique (mean 3.98), then the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) (mean 3.31) and finally the Delphi method technique (mean 3.16) with the lowest usefulness attitude.

Table 7.34 Percentages and mean scores of the managers' attitudes towards the usefulness of the five techniques in their current jobs and organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Very useful (5)</th>
<th>Useful (4)</th>
<th>Don't know (3)</th>
<th>Not useful (2)</th>
<th>Not at all useful (1)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Nominal Group Technique (NGT)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Delphi Method Technique</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to compare the participants' familiarity towards each one of these five techniques, Table 7.35 was reproduced to summarise the frequency distribution of the total responses for the related questions (this table is a reduction of Tables 7.29, 7.30, 7.31, 7.32 and 7.33 shown earlier in this section). The techniques have been ranged according to the percentages of familiarity which placed the committee technique (90.0%) in the first order, followed by the conference technique (83.1%), then the brainstorming technique (72.6%) and lastly the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) and Delphi method techniques with the lowest percentages of familiarity (36.3% each). In terms of the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) and the Delphi method technique, Alshalan (1991) found that Saudi public managers are not familiar with these two techniques (43.5% and 40.4% respectively).22
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Table 7.35  Frequencies and Percentages of managers' familiarity with the five participative techniques (N = 201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nominal Group Technique</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Delphi Method Technique</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the above results, Hypothesis 11, which stated that the subordinate managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres are more familiar with the committee and conference techniques than with the other mentioned techniques, is supported. However, it is obvious from Table 7.34 and Table 7.35 that the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) and the Delphi method technique achieved the lowest percentages and mean scores among the five presented techniques, which may indicate the need for introducing these techniques to the Saudi management process through a short and well prepared training programme. These techniques will help Saudi managers to minimise the shortcomings of the traditional face-to-face meeting techniques. They will also allow each participant to express his ideas freely without fear or hesitancy (see Chapter 5, Section 6).

7.6 SUMMARY

This chapter was devoted to the analysis of the questionnaire survey that was designed with reference to the main hypotheses and questions of this research. Although it was assumed that the hypotheses would be supported, this is not always the case. Several of the hypotheses were found to be supported while some were
only partially supported, and others were rejected. This chapter offered a possible explanation as to why some hypotheses were, and some were not, supported. In addition an explanation is offered for the concordance or the contrary between some of the findings of this study and some of those reported in Muna (1980), Alshalan (1991) and Malaika (1993) studies. The Pearson correlation coefficient, the one-way ANOVA, the Scheffé multiple comparison test, the parametric two samples T-test, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test, the Chi-Square and the Cramer's V tests, the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test and the frequency and percentage procedures were used to accomplish the analysis and the results shown in this chapter.

In the first sections of this chapter the results of the sample profile were presented regarding the managers' demographic and personal variables analysis. These issues were viewed as being important to the overall study to ensure that the respondents were managers with experience and had the knowledge and background for understanding the subject matters and objectives of the research. The sample profile shows that the personal and demographic statistics regarding the respondents varied to a sufficient degree that it gave credibility to the target sample and also to the results of this research. The majority of the subject managers were educated, experienced, trained and aged between 30 and 50 years (see Tables 7.2, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.5 respectively). Furthermore, the data distribution shows variety in the sources of education, training and the study field. This provided the study with respondents who have a significant amount of knowledge and experience in the management field, which is valuable to research studies of this subject and which enables them to evaluate the matters from different perspectives and suggest proper solutions.

It was found that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were all utilised to answer each one of the ten questions (Q12 - Q21). This emphasised the argument that managers rarely employ only one decision-making style irrespective of the type and nature of the decision. For this specific set of questions, the semi-
autocratic decision-making style (AII) was predominantly employed by the respondents (Table 7.13 and Figure 7.2). Therefore, Hypothesis 1, which stated that the dominant decision-making style of the subject managers is the semi-consultative style (CI), is not supported. Furthermore, the non-programmed decisions were most often made by the joint decision-making style (GII) followed by the consultative style (CII). The programmed decisions were most often done by the semi-autocratic style (AII) followed by the autocratic style (AI) (see Table 7.13 and Figure 7.3). The total mean scores of employees' involvement in making these two types of decision (non-programmed and programmed) were 3.351 and 2.549 respectively (Table 7.15). For these reasons, Hypothesis 2, which stated that non-programmed decisions are more participative than programmed decisions, is supported (see Section 7.3).

The data for this chapter was collected on a variety of personal variables such as managerial position, degree of education, experience, training, studying in the West and span of management. The intention was to find out how much of the variance in the managers' decision making style can be explained, and to which variable(s) it can be attributed. Tables 7.16 to 7.21 summarise the relationship between these independent variables and the variables of both the non-programmed and the programmed decisions (Q12 - Q21). In this regard, it was found that there are significant relationships between most of the independent variables and managers' decision-making styles. Therefore, Hypotheses 5, 6, 7 and 8 were fully or partially supported, whereas Hypotheses 4 and 9 were found to be not significant (see Section 7.3.4 for more details).

When cross tabulating the decision-making methods by the managers' level of education it was found that the highest percentage (69.4%) of the respondents who use the scientific management approach are managers with a high level of education (Ph.D. and Master). In order to measure the significance level of this association the
Chi-Square and the Cramer's V tests were conducted ($p = .0374$). The Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was also computed and the results were significant at $p < .05$ level (Table 7.23). Therefore, Hypothesis 3A, which stated that highly educated managers implement the scientific decision-making approach more than those who are not highly educated, is significantly supported. In terms of the managers' participation in the stages of the decision-making process, Hypothesis 3B and Hypothesis 3C were supported. It was found that participation of upper-level managers in the total process of making programmed decisions is significantly decreased with each advance stage of the process (Hypothesis 3B). It was also found that the participation of the low-level managers in the stages of the non-programmed decision-making process significantly decreases with each advance stage of the process (Hypothesis 3C). These findings and further explanation were stated in Section 7.4.

Finally, this chapter highlights five of the major participative techniques that can be used to enable subordinate-managers to participate effectively in the decision-making process. The respondents were asked about their familiarity with, and practise, of these techniques and how useful they would be to them in their current jobs and organisations. The responses indicated that the subject managers are more familiar with committee and conference techniques than any other techniques (Hypothesis 11). The respondents were less familiar with the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) and the Delphi Method technique (36.3% each). These two techniques also achieved the lowest mean scores regarding their usefulness in the participants current jobs and organisations (3.31 and 3.16 respectively). However, the low mean scores of the usefulness attitudes may be attributed to the managers unfamiliarity with these techniques. Therefore, it will be recommended that Saudi security educational institutes and centres should develop their employees in such areas of training programmes (see Section 7.5 for more details).
The following chapter continues the analysis of the survey questionnaire. The respondents were asked to identify their actual attitudes regarding job satisfaction and participative decision items. In short, the following chapter has four general aims: firstly, to examine the differences between managers satisfaction in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres; secondly to identify the managers actual attitudes towards participative decisions and how they perceive Participative Management (PM); and thirdly to suggest decision-making styles and practices that may be appropriate for the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. The chapter will then be finalised by an analysis of the open ended questions regarding the justification for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making approaches in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. The one-way ANOVA tests will be used to identify statistical significance among different groups, whereas the Scheffé multiple comparison procedures will be used for the purpose of identifying the differences in responses between each individual group. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test will also be used to distinguish the differences in responses for the items of two sample groups only, e.g. high-level and low-level managers.
CHAPTER EIGHT

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS II:
EXAMINING THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPATION IN
MAKING MANAGERIAL DECISIONS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter has four general aims: firstly, to examine the differences between managers' satisfaction in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres; secondly, to identify these managers' actual attitudes towards participative decisions and how they perceive Participative Management (PM), and thirdly, to suggest decision-making styles and practices that may be appropriate for the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. Finally, to highlight the most dominant justifications and barriers of the implications of participative decision making approach in the Saudi organisations.

In this chapter the following demographic details are examined: age of managers, managerial position (high-level and low-level), educational qualification (below university, university, and postgraduate), and years of experience (less than 6, 6-15, and > 15). In addition the span of management (< 15, 15-50 and > 50 employees), and the country of the respondents' higher educational degrees (Saudi Arabia and Western countries) were examined. It was expected that there would be significant differences between groups: for instance, older managers would rate PM and satisfaction items higher than managers under 30 years of age. It is also hypothesised that there will be statistically significant differences between high-level and low-level managers regarding the degree of satisfaction and the importance of participation in making managerial decisions. Such variations within and between the different items of PM and satisfaction will be discussed through the following sections.
An evaluation and analysis was made for all the variables of Q42 - Q66 (see Appendix B, Section III). These variables were measured on a 5-point likert scale (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 undecided, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree).

In order to use the appropriate statistical tests for the analysis of these variables, the Kolmogrov-Simirnov tests for normality and non-normality distribution were conducted. The results indicate that the data was non-normally distributed. It is therefore important to use a test in which assumptions about normality do not need to be made about the sample. According to Zikmund (1991)\textsuperscript{1}, when considering parametric statistical tests, it is usual to refer to tests comparing differences between group means. When considering non-parametric tests, it is valuable to refer to tests comparing differences in central location, since the mean of the sample groups is not calculated by such tests. Kinnear and Gray (1995) argued that when a variable of two groups is non-normally distributed, violated, skewed or it takes only a restricted number of values, it may be preferable to use a non-parametric central location instead of the usual parametric two sample T-tests. Most non-parametric tests use measures such as the median that are resistant to outliers and skewness.\textsuperscript{2} Therefore, the one-way ANOVA tests, Scheffe tests, and Mann-Whitney tests were conducted for the following analysis.

The one-way ANOVA tests were used for measuring the statistical significance among the several group means, whereas the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was used for measuring and comparing the central location of the sample divided into two groups. However, one of the advantages of the one-way ANOVA technique is that a Scheffe multiple comparison test can be conducted to give a conservative estimate of group means which are significantly different from one another.

\textsuperscript{1} Zikmund, W.G., 1991, p.523
\textsuperscript{2} Kinnear, P.R. and C.D. Gray, 1995, p.93.
According to D.A. de Vaus (1993); this technique [one-way ANOVA] tells us whether the differences between our observed sample means are likely to exist in the population from which the sample was drawn. "If the significance level is low (less than 0.05 or 0.01) it means that the variations between the sample means are 'real': they are likely to occur in the population."\(^3\) He also added that, "When we are comparing three or more means, all an F-test can tell us is that at least two means exhibit a real difference from one another. To find out which means differ we can simply look at them or use a Scheffé test. These tests compare each possible pair of means and tell us which ones exhibit statistically significant differences."\(^4\)

The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test, on the other hand, may help to benefit from the large sample opportunity by dividing the samples into only two groups.

### 8.2 AGE, QUALIFICATION, POSITION, SPAN OF MANAGEMENT, EXPERIENCE AND COUNTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION: ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ONE-WAY ANOVA) AND MANN-WHITNEY

One-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) and Mann-Whitney tests were used to identify statistically significant differences based on the respondents' age, qualification, managerial position, span of management, years of experience and country of higher education. Table 8.1 summarises the results, from item Q42 to Q66 (see Appendix B) with significant differences from each one of the six independent variables. Each of the above variables is tested and analysed separately according to its level of significance. This process was accomplished by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) programme.

Table 8.1A summarises the results of the satisfaction items, whereas Table 8.1B summarises the results of the participation items. The items were tested for significance by means and central location of the observed sample. Where there

---

\(^3\) de Vaus, D.A., 1993, p.186.

\(^4\) Ibid.
were no significant differences in any one of the six independent variables on items such as Q49, Q56, Q43, Q48, Q59 and Q60, this indicates that the respondents agreed with these items but they had no impact on the final results.

Table 8.1. Summaries from Q42 to Q66 with Significant Differences for Age, Qualification, Position, Span of Management, Experience and Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Q42</th>
<th>Q43</th>
<th>Q44</th>
<th>Q45</th>
<th>Q46</th>
<th>Q47</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q59</th>
<th>Q60</th>
<th>Q65</th>
<th>Q66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1A. With Regard to Satisfaction Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualific.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.of M.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.of HE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **8.1B With Regard to Participative Decision Items** |
| Variables | Q42 | Q43 | Q44 | Q45 | Q46 | Q47 | Q48 | Q59 | Q60 | Q65 | Q66 |
| Age       | Yes | NO  | Yes | NO  | Yes | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | Yes |
| Qualific. | Yes | NO  | NO  | Yes | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | Yes |
| Position  | Yes | NO  | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | NO  |
| S. of M   | NO  | NO  | Yes | NO  | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | NO  |
| Exper.    | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | NO  | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | NO  |
| C.of HE   | Yes | NO  | Yes | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | NO  | Yes | Yes |

NO: No significant difference between the groups of all variables at 5 percent level.  
Yes: A significant difference between the groups of all variables at 5 percent level.  
S of M: Span of Management; C of H.E: Country of Higher Education  
* Age groups split into two groups (Younger and Mature Managers)
8.3 AGE AND THE PM AND SATISFACTION ITEMS

As indicated in the first chapter, employees in general and managers in particular are the key points for the success of any organisation. Therefore, it is very important to describe and understand the degree of satisfaction the employees have towards their current jobs and how they perceive PM and respond to its fundamental statements or items. This, however, to explore any barriers or justifications of PM, establish new basis for successful participation and prepare Saudi managers to work in participative and effective environment.

One objective of this study was to compare managers' differences of satisfaction and to measure their actual attitudes and opinions towards participative decisions based on age. It was hypothesised that the managers' satisfaction and their perceptions of participation in making managerial decisions would tend to vary with age. In particular, older managers were expected to be satisfied with their current jobs and to rate participative items higher than the other groups, because older managers would have more experience and be more aware of the benefits of participation on account of their long period of management practices.

To examine satisfaction and participation aspects, the sample was divided into four main groups: Group One - managers who were less than 30 years of age, Group Two - 30-40 years of age, Group Three - 41-50 years of age, and Group Four - those over 50 years of age.

Table 8.2 presents an age profile of managers in Saudi security educational institutes and illustrates that 45.0 percent were between 30 to 40 years of age, 29.7 percent were between 41 to 50 years, 22.3 percent were less than 30 years, and only 3.0 percent were over 50 years of age. From this table the majority (74.7 percent) of
managers may be considered to be in their middle age (30 - 50). However, responses of middle age managers were considered as being important because of their experience and knowledge of management policies and practices.

Table 8.2 Sample Distribution According to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Managers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.1 Age and Satisfaction Aspects

Two types of tests (one-way ANOVA and Mann-Whitney) were used for the analysis of the responses regarding satisfaction items in Section III of the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The questions and statement were designed for the purpose of identifying the respondents' actual satisfaction toward their current jobs and organisations. However, the degree of satisfaction may be linked to the degree of participation the respondents have in management decisions. Participation appears to have a direct effect on improving the level of employees' morale, satisfaction and relationship. Hicks and Gullett (1975) said, "Participation in decision making can lead to improved manager-worker relations, higher morale and job satisfaction, and decreased dependence on the leader."\(^5\)

Mondy et al (1990) argued that, "the development of greater employee participation appears to have a direct and immediate effect on employee morale."\(^6\) However, most studies and research in this field of management indicate positive correlation between

---


employees' satisfaction and the degree of participation they have in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{7} Therefore, it is worthwhile to discuss and analyse the respondents' level of satisfaction in their current jobs.

### 8.3.1.1 Age and Satisfaction Items: One-way Analysis of Variance

Based on age, the one-way ANOVA identified five aspects of the satisfaction items which had significant differences among groups (Table 8.1A.). These items include Q52, Q63, Q64, Q53 and Q57 (Table 8.3). The Scheffé multiple comparison test was also used in this analysis. The Scheffé test is conservative in the sense that if the overall F-test is not significant then the Scheffé test will not find as significant any comparison between two individual group means. If the overall F-test is significant, the Scheffé test may indicate that at the 0.05 level there was significant difference between two or more group means.

#### Table 8.3 Differences by Four Age Groups According to Satisfaction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Item</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q52. I have the opportunity to use my own judgement and to try out some of my own ideas</td>
<td>.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63. I felt my superior and I understood each other.</td>
<td>.0182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64. My boss backed me up</td>
<td>.0060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53. I have the opportunity to develop new and better ways to do my job.</td>
<td>.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57. I felt I was getting ahead in my job.</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first item (Q52) there was an overall significant difference in responses among age groups ($P = .0048$). This item assumes that the manager has the opportunity to use his own judgement and to try out some of his own ideas. The

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid.
group means are shown in Table 8.4. Group 1, age less than 30 years, received the highest score mean for this item, followed by Group 2, followed by Group 3, and Group 4 had the lowest mean score. The Scheffé multiple comparison test confirmed that Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 4 at the level of 0.05 significance. This seems to indicate that older managers are less satisfied in their current jobs. Younger managers, however, seem to enjoy their current jobs and to have the opportunity to use their own judgement and to try out some of their own ideas. Such results, however, disprove our previous assumption that older managers are more satisfied in their current jobs than younger managers. One possible explanation for this result may be attributed to the fact that older managers usually occupy high-level managerial positions. The satisfaction of high-level managers is more often to be affected by their participation in the decision making process. The literature indicates that participation in decision making appears to have a direct and immediate effect on employee morale and can lead to higher job satisfaction.8 However, this expectation was supported by the results in Section 8.5 of this chapter.

Table 8.4 Significant Variations of the Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>&lt; 30 yrs</th>
<th>30-40 yrs</th>
<th>41-50 yrs</th>
<th>&gt; 50 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q52</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>4.0778</td>
<td>3.7333</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q63</td>
<td>3.9333</td>
<td>3.9222</td>
<td>3.8667</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q64</td>
<td>3.8444</td>
<td>3.6444</td>
<td>3.6500</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q53</td>
<td>3.6889</td>
<td>3.8111</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q57</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.9889</td>
<td>3.8500</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

Furthermore, the literature suggests that subordinates' satisfaction should be a major goal of management. There is some evidence to suggest that management failures

---

may be linked to poor management of human resources such as preventing employees from participating in the decision-making process and other management activities. By involving employees in the decision process, co-operation among task force members could be maximised, resistance to the new decision could be minimised, and satisfaction and better feeling could be increased within the organisation's members.\(^9\) This highlights the need to encourage and support the implementation of the participative decision making approaches in the Saudi management organisations.

In an attempt to establish managers' opinions about the relationship between subordinates' managers and their superiors, one-way analysis of variance was carried out on the four age groups with regard to items Q63 and Q64. According to item (Q63), where the subordinates' manager and his superior understood each other, Group 1 had the highest mean score, Group 2 the second highest, Group 3 the third highest score, and those in Group 4 received the lowest score, indicating that they do not understand their superiors. The Scheffé test confirmed that Groups 1, 2 and 3 were different from Group 4 at a level of 0.05 significance. Table 8.4 shows that younger managers accepted the idea that they and their superiors understood each other, whereas older managers disproved this assumption. Such a result seems to indicate that younger managers are much more satisfied with their current jobs than older managers.

It was suggested in item Q64 that subordinates' managers were backed up by their superiors. The results in Table 8.4 show that Group 1 (< 30 years) had the highest score for this item, followed by Group 3 (41-50 years), followed by Group 2 (30-40 years, and Group 4 (over 50 years) had the lowest mean score for this item. The Scheffé test indicated that at the 0.05 level there was a significant difference between Groups 1, 3 and 2 compared with Group 4. The results are set out in Table 8.4

where it is clear from the responses of the managers that the agreement on this item was high among the first three groups. This seems to indicate that managers in Saudi Arabia support their younger subordinates. However, the low score in Group 4 suggests that older managers do not feel they were backed up by their superiors. Such feeling and perception might lead to low job satisfaction among this group.

Regarding item Q53, it was suggested that the managers have the opportunity to develop new and better ways to do their job. The results show that Group 4 had the lowest mean, followed by Group 3, and followed by Group 1. However, Group 2 had the highest mean. As presented in Table 8.3, there was an overall significant difference among these groups at 0.05 level (P = .0102). There were also significant differences between the mean scores of Group 4 compared with Groups 2 and 1 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. The low score in Groups 3 and 4 suggests that older managers are less satisfied with their current jobs and do not have the opportunity to develop new ways of making managerial decisions. However, having such perceptions might lead to a lack of knowledge, experience and skills regarding the practising of Participative Management (PM) approaches. This was supported by the results of item Q51 where subordinate managers were assumed to have a great deal of opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and abilities. For this item (Q51), where the sample split into two groups, younger managers had a substantially higher mean than other groups, but it was significant at 0.1032 rather than the preferred 0.05 level.

The last item (Q57) assumes that the managers feel they are getting ahead in their current jobs. For this items there was a significant difference in responses among age groups (P = 0008). From Table 8.4, it appears that Group 4 had the lowest mean, followed by Group 3, and then followed by Group 2. However, Group 1 had the highest mean. The Scheffé test indicated that Groups 1, 2 and 3 were different from Group 4 at a level of 0.05 significance. This in some way indicates that
younger managers are also more satisfied with their jobs when compared to the older managers group. The low score in Group 4 suggests that older managers feel that they do not have the opportunity to develop their managerial skills, knowledge and abilities. However, participation in the decision-making process develops participants' skills, knowledge and understanding and it may increase their satisfaction and prepare them for a higher managerial position. Therefore, participative management approaches must be linked to the strategic evolution of the organisation. This was indicated in the literature by several writers. Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "By participating in the process [decision-making process], the subordinates will be learning how to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher-level positions within the organisation." Pateman (1970) writes, "the major function of participation in the theory of participatory democracy is therefore an educative one, educative in the very widest sense, including both the psychological aspect and the gaining of practice in democratic skills and procedures.... Participation develops and fosters the very qualities necessary for it; the more individuals participate the better able they are to do so." Dowling et al (1994) believe that "Without the growth of human resources as a strategic resource within a corporation, it will be difficult to secure the long-term strategic future of the corporation even though financial resources might be adequate."

8.3.1.2 Age and the Satisfaction Items: Mann-Whitney Procedures

As illustrated and discussed in the previous section, looking at the four age groups separately allows examination and analysis of all possible differences among and between age groups responses (see Section 8.3.1.1).

---

In this section, another attempt was made to find further significance regarding the PM and satisfaction items with the sample split into two subset groups. Using the SPSS recode procedures, the youngest two age groups and the oldest two age groups were combined. In other words, Group 1 (< 30 years) and Group 2 (30-40 years) were classified as young managers, whilst Group 3 (41-50 years) and Group 4 (> 50 years) were classed as mature managers. However, by combining the four groups into two groups, the analysis procedures benefited from the use of larger sample sizes.

As the youngest two groups and the oldest two groups are combined, the analysis will be restricted to a specific type of statistical test. When the dependent variable contains outliers (atypical scores) or its distribution is skewed, it may be preferable to use a non-parametric method for testing differences in the central location instead of the usual parametric t-test. Kinnear and Gray (1995) said, "Most non-parametric methods use measures such as the median, that are resistant to outliers and skewness." Therefore, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was used to measure the significant differences between the two age groups. According to Kinnear and Gray, the Mann-Whitney test can be used to compare differences in central locations (the averages) of the two groups since, in non-parametric statistics, the means of the sample groups are not calculated.

In an attempt to find further significant differences, the satisfaction items were retested for the second time with the sample split into two age groups (young and mature managers). The results indicated that there were three more items which

---

16 Ibid, p. 93.
17 Ibid, p. 238.
showed significant differences between the two age groups. These items include Q61, Q58 and Q51 (see Table 8.1A and Table 8.5).

Table 8.5 shows that younger managers rated all the three satisfaction items considerably higher than their mature manager counterparts. The responses to item Q61 seem to indicate that young managers' satisfaction is higher than the mature managers' satisfaction with regard to the people to whom they report. The difference between the two groups was significant at the 0.05 level. However, this may suggest that mature managers need to be motivated and enabled to participate in management decisions. Top management members in the Saudi security educational institutes needs also to understand that participative decision techniques are increasingly being recognised as one of the major factors that may increase employees satisfaction. This was indicated in literature by several writers. Wren (1994) said, "A great commitment to organisational goals could be obtained and satisfaction enhanced by participation in decision making." Cressey and Williams (1990) argued that, "Participation was seen to be concerned with maintaining amicable relations in the enterprise, possibly as part of a management strategy aimed at encouraging an employee's willingness to take on responsibilities by becoming identified with the company objectives. Participation may, in this sense, be a vehicle for good communication in the enterprise." Participation may also improve attitudes through generating feelings about satisfactory exchange between superior and subordinates for achievement. Armstrong (1993) stated, "If they [employees] can be involved in making those decisions and if they feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the outcome, then they are more likely to accept the decision or change because it is owned by them rather than being imposed by management."

---

According to item Q58, younger managers had a more positive attitude towards their job and the level of responsibility it gave them (Table 8.5). This seems to indicate that mature managers are less satisfied with their current jobs. These differences between mature managers and young managers may have arisen because of the possibility that some top management members, especially in a developing country, such as Saudi Arabia, tend to cover the skills and abilities of the motivated mature managers. They may also avoid involving mature managers in management activities and encourage younger managers since they pose no danger of taking over their positions in the foreseeable future. This may explain why the scores of the mature managers group were lower than the scores of the young managers group.

Malaika (1993), in his PhD research, found that 94 percent of the 114 Saudi top senior managers (from both public and private sectors) were highly individualistic and authoritarian in decision making; mainly in the objective and planning areas. He added, “The highly authoritarian style did not necessarily mean that the Saudi managers were task oriented. It was an authoritarian style for maintaining self-esteem and fulfilling personal interests.... The use of formality was very high when

---

Table 8.5 Young Managers and Mature Managers Regarding Significance of the Satisfaction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q61. I like the people to whom I report.</td>
<td>4.0368</td>
<td>3.6515</td>
<td>.0459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58. I enjoyed the feeling of responsibility my job gave me.</td>
<td>3.8444</td>
<td>3.4697</td>
<td>.0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51. There is a great deal of opportunity to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities.</td>
<td>4.0296</td>
<td>3.6212</td>
<td>.0484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

---

an issue went against their personal interest, or when it threatened their position and authority.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, top management members in each one of the Saudi security educational institutes need to understand that participation management approaches are increasingly being considered as a major factor of success or failure in today's organisations. In his argument for and against participation Armstrong (1993) writes that, "It [participation] recognises the reality of life today, in which traditional authoritarian patterns of behaviour are being steadily eroded."\textsuperscript{23}

Item Q51 stated that managers have a great deal of opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and abilities. In this regard, younger managers scored higher than mature managers. Once again, this may be attributed to the increased evidence that younger managers are more satisfied in their current jobs and have a great deal of opportunity to participate in management activities. As indicated earlier in this chapter, there were significant differences between young managers and older managers in regard to essential PM and satisfaction items. As evidence, the results of item Q53 and Q57 support this argument (see Section 8.3.1.1).

Table 8.6 shows those items (Q52, Q63, Q64, Q53 and Q57) which were presented earlier in Table 8.3. These items, however, are broken down into two groups instead of four (young and mature managers) and retested for the second time. The statistical test for this time was the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test. The results in Table 8.6 show that there were only three items (Q52, Q53 and Q57) that were significant at the 0.05 level. These results indicate that there was a tendency for respondents in the young managers group to score higher than respondents in the mature managers group regarding satisfaction items.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, pp. 294-295.
\textsuperscript{23} Armstrong, M., 1993, p. 717.
The significant differences for items Q52, Q53 and Q57 in Table 8.6 were not further discussed because they had been examined in relation to Table 8.3 and Table 8.4 (see Section 8.3.1.1). However, the significant results obtained from items Q63 and Q64 in Table 8.3 were due to a large difference between the scores for Group 4 compared with Groups 1, 2 and 3 (see Table 8.4). When the data for Group 1 and Group 2 and for Group 3 and Group 4 were compiled for the analysis presented in Table 8.6, there was a balancing out of the data which resulted in a non-significant result when comparing the means of the young managers and mature managers groups.

Table 8.6 Retest of the Items that have been Listed in Table 8.3 According to Young and Mature Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Listed in Table 8.3</th>
<th>Means Variation by</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Managers</td>
<td>Mature Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>4.1185</td>
<td>3.6364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63</td>
<td>3.9259</td>
<td>3.6970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64</td>
<td>3.7111</td>
<td>3.5152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>3.7704</td>
<td>3.4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>3.9926</td>
<td>3.7273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not significant

Table 8.7 shows responses to items (Q61, Q58 and Q51) which have already been tested in Table 8.5 and broken down into two groups (young and mature managers). These items in Table 8.7, have now been split back to their previous four age groups (< 30, 30-40, 41-50 and > 50) and retested (one-way ANOVA) for the second time. The results in Table 8.7 indicate that none of these items was significant at the 0.05 level.
Responses in Table 8.7 show that there is a tendency for scores in each of the items to be higher in young managers groups than in the mature managers group. However, these differences are not significant when considered overall. When Group 1 and Group 2 were combined to form the young managers group, and Group 3 and Group 4 were combined to form the mature managers group, there were significant differences between these two groups (see Table 8.5). However, the large sample size available for the Mann-Whitney test of a difference between the two groups (young and mature managers) contributes to achieve the observed significant results for all these three items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.7 Retest of the Items that have been Listed in Table 8.5 According to Four Age Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items listed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Table 8.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not significant

8.3.2 Age and the Participative Decision Items

In an attempt to establish managers' opinions about their attitudes towards participative decision styles and processes, the following analyses were conducted.

As indicated in the first chapter, managers are the key area to be studied. Therefore, it is worthwhile to describe and understand their attitudes towards participative decisions and to know how they respond to basic statements of PM from a decision making perspective. This may help to establish a new basis for PM and prepare
Saudi organisations and managers to work in a participative decision making environment.

Two types of test (one-way ANOVA and Mann-Whitney) were used for the analysis of the responses regarding participative items in Section III of the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The items were designed for the purpose of identifying the respondents' actual attitudes towards participative decision making styles and practices.

8.3.2.1 Age and the Participative Items: One-Way Analysis of Variance

Based on age, the one-way ANOVA identified six participative items which had significant differences among groups (Table 8.1B). These items include Q42, Q44, Q46, Q47, Q65 and Q66. Table 8.8 presents these items and their level of significance. The Scheffé multiple comparison procedures were also used for the purpose of identifying more significant differences in responses between the individual groups.

Table 8.8 Differences by Four Age Groups According to Participative Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q42. Subordinates' participation in the decision making process does not decrease the role of their superiors.</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Participative decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision.</td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Participative decision style decreases considerably the cost of making a decision.</td>
<td>.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47. Participative decision-making style increases subordinates' acceptance of the decision.</td>
<td>.0184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66. Managers prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position with a lower level of responsibility.</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the first item (Q42) there was a significant difference in responses between age groups (Table 8.8). This item assumes that subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of the director manager. The groups means are presented in Table 8.9. From the table it is obvious that Group 3, age 41-50, achieved the highest mean score for this item, followed by Group 4 with a slight difference, followed by Group 2, and Group 1 had the lowest score. There was a significant difference between mean scores of Group 3 compared with Group 1 and Group 2 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This seems to indicate that older managers support the above preposition and tend to prefer that participative decision-making styles be employed in their current organisations.

**Table 8.9 Significant Variations of the Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>&lt; 30 years</th>
<th>30-40 years</th>
<th>41-50 years</th>
<th>&gt; 50 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q42</td>
<td>2.6889</td>
<td>3.1319</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q44</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>2.9341</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q46</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td>3.8791</td>
<td>4.0500</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q47</td>
<td>3.8667</td>
<td>4.0659</td>
<td>4.3167</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q65</td>
<td>2.3111</td>
<td>2.7444</td>
<td>3.1333</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q66</td>
<td>2.9333</td>
<td>3.4778</td>
<td>3.7667</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

Furthermore, the literature suggests that participative management should be a major goal of organisations' management, whether private or public. There is some evidence to suggest that management failures may be linked to poor participation in the decision making process. Subordinates' participation in managerial decision
making has been recognised by many writers as an important motivating factor. To some it is the answer to most human problems in decision making. They argue that it motivates participants to accept more readily a decision and also to implement it more effectively as they feel that they are part of the process of making it. Adair (1988) stated that the successful managers often work as senior partners with their subordinates. They build up a group team to meet both individual and organisational needs. They encourage subordinates to participate in making decisions on matters of mutual interest. The aim being to produce solutions to the problems which will be of benefit to all concerned.

Item Q44 suggests that the participative decision making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision. Group 1 had the lowest mean, followed by Group 2, and then followed by Group 3. However, Group 4 had the highest mean score. The Scheffé test indicated that Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 3, at the level of 0.05 significance. This in some way indicates that participative decisions were considered essential for older managers. Such results support our assumption that mature managers are more willing to participate in their decisions than young managers. However, the literature classified participative decisions as time-consuming. The exchange of information, ideas and suggestions among both subordinates and managers, as well as effort spent on reaching an agreeable decision, is time-consuming. Mondy et al (1990) said, "Sometimes, to reach a decision more quickly, or to reach a decision which all group members will accept, groups sacrifice rather than optimise; that is, they select a satisfactory but not the best solution."

However, an explanation of the mature managers' high score regarding this item may be attributed to the high tendency they may have towards participation in general. This could also happen if the employees work in a non-participative organisation and environment.

---

It was suggested in item Q46 that the participative decision style decreases considerably the cost of making a decision. The results show that Group 4 had the highest score, followed by Group 3, followed by Group 2, and Group 1 had the lowest score. As presented in Table 8.8, there was overall significant differences between these groups at 0.05 level. The high score in Groups 3 and 4 suggests that older managers do accept the above assumptions and prefer participation to exist in their organisations. However, Table 8.9 shows that all the four groups accepted the idea that participative decision-making styles decrease the cost of making a decision. This seems to indicate that Saudi managers have a positive attitude towards PM in general and participative decision making in particular.

Furthermore, research supports the idea that employees participation in the decision-making process often decreases the cost and results in the most effective decision. Wren (1994) writes, "By involving the worker in change, resistance was lowered, new social structures could emerge, and the cost of change in terms of turnover and relearning skills could be minimised."26 Cressey and Williams (1990) state that, "participation was seen as an aid to corporate effectiveness, to enable cost savings through the rational and agreed use of resources."27

Item Q47 assumes that the participative decision-making style increases subordinates' acceptance of the decision. Group 4 had the highest score, Group 3 the second highest score, and Group 2 the third highest score, and those in Group 1 received the lowest score. As presented in Table 8.8, there were significant differences between these groups at 0.05 level. The Schefé test indicated that at the 0.05 level, there were no significant differences between any two individual groups. These results are set out in Table 8.9 where it is clear from the responses of the

managers that the agreement on this item was high among the four groups. This seems to suggest that the respondents are aware of the importance of participative management (PM). Table 8.9 shows that all groups accepted the assumption that participative decision making styles increase subordinates' acceptance of the final decision choice. Literature in this field of management supports the idea that subordinates' participation in the decision making process increases their acceptance of the decision. Armstrong (1993) said, "If they [subordinates] can be involved in making these decisions and if they feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the outcome, then they are more likely to accept the decision or change because it is owned by them rather than being imposed by management." Elbing (1978) stated that one way of creating or increasing the acceptability of a decision is to allow the employees involved in the matter to participate in choosing among the alternative decisions available.

In an attempt to establish managers' opinion about the degree of responsibility they prefer, one-way analysis of variance was carried out on the four age groups with regard to items Q65 and Q66. For item Q65, Group 1 (less than 30 years) had the lowest mean score, followed by Group 2 (30-40 years), followed by Group 3 (41-50 years), and Group 4 (over 50 years) had the highest mean score. The Scheffé test confirmed that Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 4 and that Group 3 was different from Group 1, at the level of 0.05 significance. The low scores in Groups 1 and 2 may suggest that younger managers do not prefer a high level of responsibility and feel more comfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what to do and how to do it. In contrast, the older managers groups seem to prefer more responsibility and more freedom to use their own judgement and skills in doing their jobs.

---

For item Q66, Group 4 achieved the highest mean score, followed by Group 3,
followed by Group 2, and then Group 1 with the lowest mean score. There was a
significant difference between the mean scores of Group 1 and Group 3 using the
Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This in some way indicates that
older managers prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position
with a lower level of responsibility. According to the literature, one way of
increasing employees' responsibility is by involving them in the decision-making
process. Participation is seen as a means of giving employees the opportunity to
develop responsible attitudes and confidence both by discovering themselves through
the participative process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their
current jobs and organisation.30 A justification for this argument is offered also by
Vroom and Deci (1992), who said, "proponents of Participative or Theory Y
Management advocate that subordinates should play an active role in setting the
goals, choosing how to achieve them, and then evaluating their own performance.
Such an approach is useful not only as a means of fostering subordinates' internal
motivation and commitment to the job but also as a strategy for employee
development. By participating in this process, the subordinates will be learning how
to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher level
positions within the organisation."31

8.3.2.2 Age and Participative Items: Mann-Whitney Non-parametric Test

Almost all the procedures followed in Section 8.3.1.2 were repeated here in this
section. This was done in order to find further significance regarding participative
items with the sample split into two age groups. The Statistical Package for Social
Sciences (SPSS) was again used to conduct these procedures. The SPSS 'recode'
program was used to recategorise the four age groups into only two age groups

30 Bennett, R., 1991, p. 344; Diana, M., 1992, pp. 66-67; and Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990,
pp. 195-196.
(young and mature managers). In this regard, Group 1 (< 30 years) and Group 2 (30-40 years) were combined to form the young managers group, whilst Group 3 (41-50 years) and Group 4 (> 50 years) were combined to form the mature managers group. However, by combining the four groups into two groups, the analysis procedures benefit from the use of large sample sizes.

As the youngest two groups and the oldest two groups are combined, the analysis will be restricted to a specific type of statistical test. Therefore, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric procedures were used to measure the significant differences between these two new age groups due to non-normality distribution reasons. However, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test can only be used to compare differences in the central location of two sample groups since the means of the groups are not calculated by this test.32

The participative items which were presented previously in Table 8.1B were retested for the second time with the sample split into two groups (young and mature managers). The results indicate that there are no more new items with significant differences between the groups. Table 8.10 shows these items (Q42, Q44, Q46, Q47, Q65 and Q66) which were presented earlier in Table 8.8 and Table 8.9. These items were broken down into two groups (young and mature managers) and retested for the second time by using the Mann-Whitney test. However, the results in Table 8.10 show that five of the six items continue to show significant differences between the two age groups at the 0.05 level. In this section there will be no further discussion of statements significant in Table 8.10 because they have already been discussed in relation to Table 8.8 and Table 8.9 (see Section 8.3.2.1).

However, the significant results presented in Table 8.10 and Table 8.8 indicate that there was a tendency for respondents in the mature managers group to score higher than respondents in the young managers group regarding participative items.

**Table 8.10 Retest of the Items that have been listed in Table 8.8 Relating to Young and Mature Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Listed in Table 8.8</th>
<th>Mean Variation by</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Managers</td>
<td>Mature Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q42</td>
<td>2.9853</td>
<td>3.7424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q44</td>
<td>2.9118</td>
<td>3.6061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q46</td>
<td>3.7426</td>
<td>4.0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q47</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.3636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q65</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q66</td>
<td>3.2963</td>
<td>3.8030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not significant

8.4 PM ASPECTS AND EDUCATION QUALIFICATION

The level of education was assumed to have a strong impact on items regarding managers' satisfaction and their actual attitudes towards participative decisions. It is generally accepted that today's subordinates and managers are more educated, highly skilled and more experienced than ever before. They cannot be managed by the old authoritarian decision making styles. Today's employees want to participate in all matters affecting them. They want to have some say in what they do at work, how and when; they want to get meaningful feedback on their efforts, they want to be informed about and be involved in decisions and activities affecting their current jobs and future. Their satisfaction and commitment towards their job and organisation will be affected seriously by such factors. In this regard Wren (1994)
said, "A greater commitment to organisational goals could be obtained and satisfaction enhanced by participation in decision making."\(^{33}\) Therefore, it is worthwhile to compare managers' responses according to their level of education. The respondents were divided into three groups: Group 1 - managers below university; Group 2 - those with university degree; and Group 3 - those who had higher education (Master and PhD).

The distribution results according to the level of education achieved by the sample managers from Saudi security educational institutes are displayed in Table 8.11. There were 45 managers (22.3 percent) with below university degrees, while a higher number of the managers, 108 (53.5 percent) held a university degree and 49 managers (24.2 percent) had postgraduate degrees (Master or PhD). This indicates that most of the managers in our sample have a high educational level which increases the credibility of this study as educated persons are more familiar with research studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesised that there would be substantial differences between those with postgraduate education level and those with university or below university level; and these differences are reflected in the managers' attitudes with regard to satisfaction and participation items. It was also hypothesised that the importance of PM would be rated significantly high by managers with postgraduate or graduate

educational level, and low by those with qualifications below university level. The following sections highlight and examine these hypotheses in detail.

8.4.1 Educational Qualification and the Satisfaction Items: One-way Analysis of Variance

The relationship between the level of education and PM aspects was examined by using the one-way ANOVA test. It was hypothesised that there would be a significant relationship between the level of education and PM aspects and practices. For instance, the level of education would have a strong impact on managers' satisfaction towards their current jobs and organisations. Managers with a high level of education (Master and PhD) are assumed to have a high level of satisfaction compared to those with university level of education or those below university degree level.

When looking at the PM items from a satisfaction perspective, the one-way ANOVA identified four items which had significant differences according to the respondents' level of education (see Table 8.1A). As illustrated in Table 8.12, the four satisfaction items which had significant differences among the groups are Q51, Q52, Q55 and Q62.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q51. There is a great deal of opportunity to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities.</td>
<td>.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52. I have the opportunity to use my own judgement and to try out some of my own ideas.</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55. I had considerable decision-making power</td>
<td>.0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62. I got considerable cooperation from the subordinates I worked with.</td>
<td>.0315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before considering the differences between groups, it may be beneficial at this stage of the analysis to highlight the general result that can be drawn from Table 8.13. Table 8.13 shows that managers with higher education had the lowest score in all the four items, while managers with qualifications below university level had the highest score in items Q51, Q52 and Q62. This is discussed in more detail as follows.

For item Q51, a manager has a great deal of opportunity to develop his knowledge and skills, Group 3 had the lowest score, followed by Group 2 and then Group 1 with the highest score. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 1 and Group 3 using the Scheffe multiple comparison test at the level of 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.13 Significance of Educational Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

The responses displayed in Table 8.13 suggest that managers with university or below university qualification agreed that their current jobs gave them a great deal of opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and managerial abilities, while higher educated managers (PhD and Master) disagreed with the assumption. They believe that they do not have the opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and abilities. This result can be used as an indicator of managers' feelings and satisfaction towards their jobs and organisations. The mean scores suggest that highly educated managers in the Saudi security educational institutes are the less satisfied group. Therefore, it
is worthwhile that managers with low mean scores need to be encouraged and to be
able to participate in the decision making process in their organisations.

As stated earlier, the literature indicates a positive relationship between employee
education and measures of participation, morale and satisfaction. Cressey et al
(1988) pointed out that, "The growth of education and diffusion of information in the
society are other factors which will enhance the capacity and desire of larger sections
of working population to be involved and will consequently increase the chances of
participation."34

In short, this is a real situation with which top managers, especially those in
developing countries, have to deal with. Therefore, it is better for the Saudi security
educational institutes to develop and implement participative decision making
approaches in an orderly and planned way by themselves rather than for it to be
imposed upon them by government legislation or because of the pressure of
environment and society, which is of course a reflection of today's reality of life.
Armstrong (1993) in his argument for and against participation said, "It
[participation] recognises the reality of life today, in which traditional authoritarian
patterns of behaviour are being steadily eroded."35

Similarly, the differences between education groups regarding the managers'
opportunity to use their own judgement and to try out some of their ideas and
decisions were confirmed as statistically significant at 0.05 level (item Q52). For
this item, Group 3 with higher education had the lowest score, followed by Group 2,
those with university level. Group 1, those below university level, achieved the
highest scores (see Table 8.13). The Scheffé test confirmed Group 1 and Group 2
were different from Group 3 at a level of 0.05 significance. The results of item

34 Cressey et al, 1988, p. 88.
(Q52) and item (Q51) seem to prove the earlier hypothesis that there would be significant differences between groups regarding managers' responses towards satisfaction items. But they also disprove the hypothesis that highly educated managers (PhD and Master) will rate their responses higher than those with below university qualifications.

One explanation for Group 3 having the lowest mean is the possibility that those managers with higher education were not satisfied enough by the degree of participation they have in the decision making process. Another alternative explanation is that managers who hold either MBA or a PhD may feel that their superiors are controlling them and preventing them from getting ahead and taking part in real management activities because of the fear that the educated managers may take their place in the future. However, in developing countries it is common to find such confrontation between managerial levels.

As stated earlier, today's organisations need to understand and practise PM policies and procedures if they are to achieve their goals and objectives successfully. The literature indicated that participative decision making approaches are important to help managers (whatever their level of education) to handle their jobs effectively and cope with unexpected events in the future. In addition, managers would benefit from participation because individual ability alone does not determine success in a different situation. Participation enables individuals (managers and subordinates) to adapt more rapidly to new decisions, become more effective, and have satisfactory attitudes towards their jobs and organisation.

Item Q55 assumes that the managers have considerable decision-making power. For this item, the mean scores of the three groups were very low compared to the previous items in Table 8.13. Group 2 had the highest score, while Group 3 had the lowest. Table 8.12 shows that there was overall significant differences among
groups at the 0.05 level with regard to this item. The low score, especially in Group 3, suggests that highly educated managers in the Saudi security educational institutes do not have the decision-making power to handle their current jobs. This result may explain the decline of satisfaction among the members of this group.

The literature suggests that participation leads to more equitable redistribution of power. It works as a means to redistribute power and influence between the superiors and subordinates. However, the argument used to justify this view of participation is that those who have to implement the decision and live with its consequences should be given more influence and power by involving them in the process of making it. This will increase their commitment to the decision, encourage creativity, uncover the available but unused skills and abilities and increase satisfaction as well. Druker (1961) stated that, "people who have to carry out the decision should always participate in the work of developing alternatives. Incidentally, this is also likely to improve the quality of the final decision by revealing points that the manager may have missed, spotting hidden difficulties and uncovering available but unused resources."

According to Item Q62 which suggests that the manager got considerable cooperation from the employees he worked with, Table 8.12 and Table 8.13 show that there was a significant difference among groups with regard to this item (P = .0315). Group 3 had the lowest score, Group 2 was higher than Group 3, and Group 1 had the highest score. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffe multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. In general, the results in Table 8.13 show that for item Q62 all three groups mean scores were high, which indicates that their response had an impact on this item. This suggests that all the three groups especially Group 1 were satisfied by the co-

---

36 Diana, M., 1992, p. 69.
operation they got from the people they worked with. However, the literature indicates that employees' co-operation is one of the important justifications that can be achieved by participative decision-making approaches. By involving managers and subordinates in the decision-making process, co-operation among task force members could be maximised, resistance to the new decision could be minimised, and satisfaction and better feeling could be increased within the organisational members.38

There was an assumption that there would be a difference between postgraduate managers and graduate managers regarding the PM and satisfaction items. However, there was a difference between the two groups as expected. Graduate managers appeared to be much more satisfied and could accept the ideas contained in items Q51, Q52, Q55 and Q62 more than postgraduate managers. In general, the responses in Table 8.13 indicate that there is a tendency for scores in each of the items to be higher in the graduate and undergraduate managers groups than in the postgraduate managers group. This may suggest that postgraduate managers who are occupying high positions in the Saudi security educational institutes are less satisfied with the responsibilities and incentives offered by their current jobs and organisations when compared to the other two groups. This was approved in Section 8.5.1.

8.4.2 Qualification and the Participate Items: One-way Analysis of Variance

The relationship between the level of education and participative decision items was examined by using the one-way ANOVA test. It was hypothesised that there would be a significant relationship between the level of education and the participative decision making items. The more educated the managers, the more positive attitudes they have towards participative decisions. According to the one-way ANOVA test,

38 Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 627
there were five participative items which had significant differences among the three groups (see Table 8.1B and Table 8.14). These items include Q42, Q45, Q46, Q65 and Q66. Table 8.15 shows that managers with higher education (Master and PhD) had the highest mean score in all the five items, while managers with below university degree had the lowest score.

### Table 8.14 Participative Items by Level of Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q42. Subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of their superior.</td>
<td>.0267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45. Participative decision style is expected to improve considerably the satisfaction and morale of the subordinates.</td>
<td>.0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Participative decision style decreases considerably the cost of making a decision.</td>
<td>.0385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66. Managers prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position with a lower level of responsibility.</td>
<td>.0099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item Q42, the participative decision-making process does not decrease the role of the manager, Group 1 had the lowest score, followed by Group 2 and Group 3 with the highest score. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the level of 0.05. However, the responses shown in Table 8.15 indicate that managers with university and higher education degrees agreed that subordinates participation in the decision making process does not decrease the role of the director managers. Such results prove the hypothesis that educated managers have a positive tendency towards participative approaches.

The differences between the three groups regarding the need for participative decision styles to improve satisfaction and morale of the subordinates were
confirmed as statistically significant (item Q45). Group 3 with higher degrees had the highest score, followed by Group 2. Group 1, those with a lower educational degree, had the lowest mean score. In general, mean scores of the three groups were very high compared to the other items. This indicates that all three groups,

Table 8.15 Significance of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Items</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q42</td>
<td>2.9778</td>
<td>3.1574</td>
<td>3.6327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q45</td>
<td>3.7556</td>
<td>4.0741</td>
<td>4.2653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q46</td>
<td>3.6222</td>
<td>3.7963</td>
<td>4.1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q65</td>
<td>2.4889</td>
<td>2.5185</td>
<td>3.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q66</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>3.3889</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

especially Groups 3 and 2, may think that PM is one of the most appropriate programmes to ensure that the organisation will motivate and satisfy its employees. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. These results, however, support the hypothesis that there would be a significant relationship between the level of education and the participative decision making approaches with the more positive attitudes applying to those who are highly educated.

Item Q46 assumes that the participative decision style decreases the cost of making a decision. Table 8.14 and Table 8.15 show that there was a significant difference between groups at the 0.05 level with regard to this item. Group 1 had the lowest score, Group 2 was slightly higher than Group 1, and Group 3 had the highest score. This result proves the above assumption and at the same time supports our
hypothesis that highly educated managers have a positive tendency and attitude towards participative decision making styles.

In an attempt to establish managers' opinion about the degree of responsibility they prefer and to what extent it may be affected by their educational qualifications, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the three groups with regard to items Q65 and Q66. For item Q65, Group 3 (Master and PhD) achieved the highest score, followed by Group 2 (university degree), and then Group 1 (below university) with the lowest score. The Scheffé multiple comparison test indicated that Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 3 at the level of 0.05 significance. The very low scores in Group 1 and Group 2 may suggest that managers with university education or below seem to be more comfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what to do and how to do it. In contrast, the highly educated managers (Group 3) with the highest mean score seem to be uncomfortable under such circumstances. An alternative explanation to the very low mean score achieved by Group 1 and Group 2 regarding this item may be attributed to the fact that the respondents are police officers with military ranks. They will be judged and may be severely punished for their mistakes. On the other hand, managers who are highly educated (Master and PhD) may feel more confident and therefore ask for more responsibility. It is more common for the highly educated managers to be mature, experienced and carry high military rank. These aspects may justify the high mean score that was achieved by those managers who hold either Master or PhD degrees (Group 3). For item Q66, Group 3 had the highest score, followed by Group 2, and Group 1 had the lowest mean score. The Scheffé test confirmed Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 3 at the level of 0.05 significance. The results of this item are similar to the previous ones. In this regard the highly educated managers (Group 3) seem to prefer managerial positions with a high level of responsibility rather than a position with a low level of responsibility.
There was an assumption that there would be a difference between postgraduate managers and graduate managers regarding their attitudes towards the importance and implications of participative decision making styles in their current organisations. There was a difference between the two groups as expected. Postgraduate managers were much more aware of the aspects contained in items Q42, Q45, Q46, Q65 and Q66 than graduate managers. However, it is worthwhile for managers with low mean scores to be encouraged and given the opportunity to participate effectively in management decisions and activities. This will increase their knowledge, develop their skills, and prepare them for future events and positions. Adair (1988) argued that the successful managers often work as senior partners with their subordinates. They build up a group team to meet both individual and organisational needs. They encourage subordinates to participate in making decisions on matters of mutual interest. The aim being to produce solutions to the problems which will be of benefit to all concerned. In this regard, Mondy et al (1990) writes, "When a group makes a decision, additional knowledge and skills are brought into play, which tends to result in higher quality decisions. In addition, since individuals are involved in making the decision, generally become committed to it, group consensus expedites acceptance of the decision by the group. Therefore, both individual and group commitment to the decision is increase."

8.5 PM ASPECTS AND MANAGERIAL POSITION (LOW LEVEL AND HIGH LEVEL): MANN-WHITNEY TEST

In this section the differences between the two levels of managerial positions with regard to PM and satisfaction items are analysed. Managerial positions were divided according to low and high level position groups. The SPSS recode procedures were used to conduct and to identify these two groups. General department and

---

department positions were classified as high level positions whereas section and unit positions were classified as low level positions (see Appendix B).

As stated earlier, when the dependent variable of two groups is non-normally distributed or skewed, it is better to use a non-parametric procedure for testing differences in central location instead of the usual parametric t-test. As this is the case and to identify further significant items, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was conducted to identify significant differences between the two groups' members with regard to their views on PM and satisfaction items.

It was hypothesised that managers in high-level positions would rate PM and satisfaction items higher than managers in low-level management positions. The explanation for this assumption is that most of the high-level managers in Saudi Arabia have been working in their organisations for a long period of time. This suggests that high level managers may be more experienced and have more knowledge than the other group. Such experience and knowledge may increase the probability of more satisfaction and participative decision-making styles.

8.5.1 Managerial Position and Satisfaction Items

Table 8.16 contains satisfaction items with significant differences for low and high level management positions. These satisfaction items include Q52, Q54 and Q62. However, the evidence regarding satisfaction of the high-level managers was unambiguous as low-level managers rated satisfaction items higher than high-level managers (see Table 8.16).
Table 8.16 Managerial Satisfaction by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Low-Level</th>
<th>High-Level</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q52. I have the opportunity to use my own judgement and to try out some of my own ideas.</td>
<td>4.2031</td>
<td>3.5278</td>
<td>.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54. I have the opportunity to try my own methods or styles of doing the job.</td>
<td>3.5469</td>
<td>3.1806</td>
<td>.0349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62. I got considerable co-operation from the employees I worked with.</td>
<td>4.3203</td>
<td>4.0278</td>
<td>.0137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

For item Q52, there were significant differences between low-level managers and high-level managers at the 0.05 level of significance using the Mann-Whitney test (Table 8.16). The scores of high-level managers were lower than the scores of the low-level managers. Table 8.17 shows that low-level managers responded to this item with an approval rate of 86 percent (strongly agree and agree), while the approval rate of high-level managers was only 66.7 percent. In total forty-two respondents (21 percent) had no opinion, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the above item. However, such percentages or approval rate may indicate that high-level managers in the Saudi security educational institutions are less satisfied with the opportunity they have towards using their own ideas and judgement in making decisions.

However, the literature indicates that the existence of PM is essential to help and enable managers at all levels to use their own ideas and judgement, make active decisions and ensure that skills and knowledge are available at the time they will be needed. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) stated that Participative Management is, "A way of thinking about the human resources of an organisation. Employees are viewed as valued human resources capable of making substantive and valuable
contributions to organisational effectiveness. Employees are allowed the opportunity to participate in decisions."41

Item Q54 examines managers' opportunity of using their own decision-making methods and styles. According to managerial position groups, there was a significant difference between high-level managers and low-level managers with regard to this item. High-level managers scored 3.1806, while low-level managers scored 3.5469. This seems to indicate that the satisfaction of high-level managers is lower than the satisfaction of low-level managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = -3.3248 at 0.05 level of significance = .0009

However, employees' involvement in the decision-making process has frequently been recognised by writers as an important motivating factor. To some, it is the answer to most human problems in decision making.42 Stoner (1982) said, "there is strong evidence that commitment to a decision is usually increased when employees are involved in the decision making process."43 He also added that "Subordinates' involvement increases their self-esteem; they take pride in their demonstrated value

---

Therefore, it is worthwhile to motivate and enable high-level managers to use their own methods and decision making styles in doing their jobs. A greater commitment to organisational goals could be obtained by applying this approach. Such an approach is useful not only as a means of increasing motivation and satisfaction but also as a strategy for employees development. By involving them in the decision making process, they will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisation and will be learning how to develop responsible attitudes and confidence both by discovering themselves through this process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their current jobs and organisation.

The last item, Q62, examines the degree of co-operation the manager got from his employees. For this item Table 8.16 shows that both groups (high and low-level managers) had a satisfactory mean score regarding the co-operation they got from the employees they worked with. The Mann-Whitney test indicates that the difference in responses was significant at the 0.05 level (p = .0137). Even the fact that high-level managers rated this item very high, their score was still lower than the score of low-level managers. This result, however, disproved our previous hypothesis that high-level managers would rate satisfaction items higher than managers in low-level management positions. It may also suggest that there is some kind of unstable relationship between high-level managers and top management members in the six organisations.

Nevertheless, the high mean scores of both groups (high-level and low-level managers) shows that Saudi managers are aware of the importance of co-operation between managers and employees. Thus, it is worthwhile for top management in each of the six institutes to take advantage of this co-operative environment to motivate and implement participative decision making approaches in their

44 Ibid.
organisations. The involvement of employees in the decision making process retains and increases the opportunity of more employees' co-operation and satisfaction. In a growing number of organisations, the participation approach is seen as an important factor for success and development. It is to the benefit of all concerned (management and employees). However, top management should ensure that such participation remains relevant to the organisation's objectives as well as responding to the individuals need for participation in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{45}

It was hypothesised that high-level managers would respond more positively to the importance of PM and satisfaction items than the low-level managers. Instead of low-level managers scoring lower than their high-level counterparts on the items listed in Table 8.16, they actually scored significantly higher. This result seems to disprove the above hypothesis. There are three possible explanations: first, low-level managers are usually less sensitive in asking for more participation and involvement in the decision making process. In comparison, high-level managers are more critical in asking for more managerial privileges and this may affect their degree of satisfaction. Finally, the satisfaction of high-level managers, especially General Department managers, may be affected by the existence of an unstable relationship with top management members. Three items of the survey questionnaire (Q49, Q63 and Q64) were designed to examine the relationship between respondents and their superiors. Item Q49 states that superiors were willing to listen to their subordinates suggestions. For this item Table 8.18 shows that Section managers responded to this item with an approval rate of 80 percent (strongly agree and agree), Unit managers with an approval rate of 78.6 percent, Department managers with an approval rate of 79.6 percent, while the approval rate of General Department managers was only 33.3 percent. Similar results were concluded from Table 8.19 and Table 8.20 regarding items Q63 and Q64. The approval rate of general department managers with regard to these two items was only 29.2 percent and 37.5

\textsuperscript{45} Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, pp. 626-627.
percent respectively. In short, the results of these three items may reflect the existence of an unstable relationship between general department managers and top management members.

Table 8.18 Superior willing to Listen, by Current Position (Q49 by Q7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>General Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree and Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree and Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = 5.6687 at 0.05 level of significance = .0010

Table 8.19 Superior and Subordinate understood each other, by Current Position (Q63 by Q7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>General Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree and Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree and Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = 11.7486 at 0.05 level of significance = .0000
Table 8.20 Superior Backing up Subordinate, by Current Position (Q64 by Q7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>General Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree and Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree and Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = 7.2716 at 0.05 level of significance = .0001

8.5.2 Regarding Participative Items

According to Mann-Whitney non-parametric tests, Table 8.1B shows that there are three participative items with significant differences for low and high level management positions. These items include Q42, Q44 and Q65. However, the evidence was very clear as high-level managers rated their attitudes towards participative items higher than those managers who occupy low-level positions (see Table 8.21).

Table 8.21 Managerial Attitudes Differences, by Managerial Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>Low-level</th>
<th>High-level</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q42. Subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of their superior.</td>
<td>3.0547</td>
<td>3.5205</td>
<td>.0159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Participate decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision.</td>
<td>2.9766</td>
<td>3.4110</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>2.5703</td>
<td>3.2778</td>
<td>.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)
For item Q42 where the participative decision making process is expected not to decrease the role of the director managers, there were significant differences between low-level managers and high-level managers at the 0.05 level of significance using the Mann-Whitney test (Table 8.21). The scores of high-level managers were also higher than the scores of the low-level managers. Table 8.22 shows that almost 70 percent (strongly agree and agree) of the high-level managers supported this item preposition, while the approval rate of low-level managers was only 49.2 percent. However, such approval may suggest that high-level managers in Saudi security educational institutes are more willing to participate their views and decisions than the low-level managers do.

Table 8.22 Participative Decision does not Decrease the Role of the Manager (Q42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = -2.4101 \text{ at 0.05 level of significance } = 0.0159 \]

Item Q44 states that the participative decision making process increases the speed of making a decision. The Mann-Whitney test indicates that the difference in responses to this item was significant at the 0.05 level. For this item Table 8.21 shows that high-level managers had the highest score, while low-level managers had the lowest. This difference between the two groups shows that high-level managers are more aware of the importance of participative decisions. This supports our previous argument that high-level managers have tendency and a positive attitude towards
participative decisions. Therefore, it is worthwhile for top management in the Saudi security educational institutes to motivate this trend and give high-level managers the opportunity to develop such participative approaches in their organisations.

Item Q65 assumes that managers feel more uncomfortable when they are told exactly what to do and how to do it. According to the managers' level there was a significant difference between high-level managers and low-level managers with regard to the above preposition. High-level managers scored 3.2778, while low-level managers scored 2.5703. This difference between the two groups suggests that high-level managers are much more aware of the need for subordinates' involvement in management activities and decision making than low-level managers. Nevertheless, the literature indicates that employees in any organisation are not equally in favour of participation. Some subordinates avoid any responsibility and therefore do not want to be involved in the decision making process. They feel that it is so much easier to be told exactly what to do and to let decisions be made by others and criticise management for its failure rather than taking the responsibility for it.46 Mondy et al (1990) said, "Managers must face the fact that some workers do not seek more responsibility and greater involvement in their job."47

8.6 PM ASPECTS AND THE SPAN OF MANAGEMENT (< 15, 15-50 AND > 50 EMPLOYEES): ONE-WAY ANOVA

As the literature shows, span of management is one of the important factors that may affect the degree of employees' participation in the decision making process. In this regard Mondy et al (1990) writes, "Narrow spans of management present closer supervision of personnel but tend to create tall organisational structures with a large number of levels. This may cause difficulties in communication and result in managers and workers at lower levels feeling isolated. Wide spans result in

relatively fewer levels, on flat organisations, and greater freedom for the individual employee."48 However, there have been several arguments about the accepted span of management that can be managed effectively. Some studies limit the span in specific number of employees usually ranging from four to fifteen, while others leave the options open. According to Hellriegel and Slocum (1992), "There is no correct number of subordinates that a manager can supervise effectively."49 They believe that the competence of both the manager and the employees, the similarity or dissimilarity of tasks being supervised, the incidence of new problems in the manager's department and the extent of clear operating rules are the key factors determining the best span of management for a given situation.50

To examine the effect of management's span on the employees' satisfaction and participative items, the sample was divided into three main groups. Group 1 includes managers who have less than 15 subordinates under their supervision, Group 2 those managers who supervise 15 to 50 subordinates and Group 3 includes managers who have more than 50 subordinates under their supervision. Table 8.23 indicates that 126 (62.4 percent) of the managers were supervising less than 15 employees, 45 (22.3 percent) managers had 15 to 50 employees under their supervision and only 31 (15.3 percent) managers had more than 50 employees.

Table 8.23 Sample Distribution According to the Span of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span of Management</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-50 employees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 employees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 Ibid, p. 245.
The differences between groups regarding satisfaction and participative items are examined by using the one-way ANOVA test. The one-way ANOVA test identified several items with significant differences between management span's groups (see Table 8.1). These items were tested and analysed separately in the following two sections.

8.6.1 Management's Span and Satisfaction Items

It was hypothesised that managers with a large span of management will rate satisfaction items higher than those managers with a small span. Based on the three groups of management span (<15, 15-50 and > 50), the one-way ANOVA test identified three satisfaction items with significant differences between groups. These items include Q50, Q63 and Q64 (see Tables 8.1A and Table 8.24)

Table 8.24 Satisfaction Aspects, by Management's Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q50. I had a great deal of responsibility in my job.</td>
<td>.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63. I felt my superior and I understood each other.</td>
<td>.0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64. My boss backed me up.</td>
<td>.0412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item Q50, where a manager had a great deal of responsibility in his job, Group 3 had the highest mean score, followed by Group 2 and then Group 1 with the lowest mean score (see Table 8.25). There was a significant difference between the mean score of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This may indicate that managers with a large span of management seem to be more satisfied than those managers with a small number of employees under their supervision. Proponents of the participation approach argue that it increases
employees' responsibility, confidence, sense of autonomy, satisfaction and commitment to the managerial decision.

Table 8.25 Significant Variation of the Span of Management Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>&lt; 15 employees</th>
<th>15-50 employees</th>
<th>&gt; 50 employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q50</td>
<td>3.4683</td>
<td>3.6222</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q63</td>
<td>3.9360</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q64</td>
<td>3.7280</td>
<td>3.2889</td>
<td>3.8387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

In an attempt to establish managers' opinions about their relationship with their supervisors the one-way analysis of variance test was also carried out on the three groups with regard to item Q63 and item Q64. Item Q63 describes the relationship between superiors and subordinates by stating that they understand each other. For this item, Group 3 had the highest mean score, followed by Group 1 and then Group 2 with the lowest mean score. There was also a significant difference between mean scores of Group 1 and Group 2 using the Scheffe multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This result indicates that the managers in Group 3 (> 50 employees) felt they and their superiors understood each other.

Item Q64, 'my boss backed me up', gave similar results to the above item. Table 8.25 shows that managers with more than 50 employees had the highest score for item Q64, followed by managers who are supervising less than 15 employees. Managers with 15 to 50 employees had the lowest score. There was a significant difference between the groups at 0.05 level of significance (P = .0412). However, the Scheffé test indicated that at the 0.05 level, there was no significant difference between any two individual groups.
In general all groups achieved a satisfactory mean score regarding the above items (Q50, Q63 and Q64), with the highest score going to managers with a large span of management (> 50 employees). The one-way ANOVA test indicated an overall significant difference among the groups of each item at the 0.05 level. The Scheffé multiple comparison test also confirmed a significant difference between Group 3 and Group 1 for item Q50 and between Group 1 and Group 2 for item Q63. Such results support our assumption that managers with a large span of management are more satisfied in their current jobs than those managers with a small span of management.

8.6.2 Participative Decision Items and the Span of Management

It was hypothesised that managers with a wide span of management would be much more in favour of participative decisions than those managers with a small number of employees under their supervision. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) write, "A manager who has a small span of control can maintain close control over the workers and stay in contact with daily operations. If the span of control is large, close control is not possible."51 Wide spans result in greater freedom for the employees.52

Based on the three groups of management's span (< 15 employees, 15-50 employees and > 50 employees) the one-way ANOVA test was used to identify the significant differences between groups. Table 8.1B and Table 8.26 indicate that three participative items were found to be statistically different with regard to the span of management. These participative items include Q44, Q46 and Q65 (see Table 8.26).

Table 8.26 Managerial Thinking Differences by Management's Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Decision Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Participative decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision</td>
<td>.0294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Participative decision styles decrease considerably the cost of making a decision.</td>
<td>.0216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item Q44 where the participative decision making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision, Group 3 (> 50 employees) had the highest score, followed by Group 2 (15-50 employees) and then Group 1 (< 15 employees) had the lowest score (see Table 8.27). There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffé multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This indicates that managers with a large span of management accepted the above preposition. Such results seem to support the hypothesis that managers with a wide span of management are much more in favour of participative decisions than those managers with a small span of management.

Table 8.27 Statement Significant for the Size of Management's Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>&lt; 15 employees</th>
<th>15-50 employees</th>
<th>&gt; 50 employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q44</td>
<td>2.9921</td>
<td>3.2444</td>
<td>3.5806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q46</td>
<td>3.7381</td>
<td>3.8222</td>
<td>4.3548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q65</td>
<td>2.5040</td>
<td>3.1333</td>
<td>3.6452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

For item Q46, participative decision making styles decrease considerably the cost of making a decision, Group 1 had the lowest mean score, followed by Group 2, and
then Group 3 having the highest score. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of Group 3 and Group 1 using the Scheffe multiple comparison test at the 0.05 level. This may indicate that managers with a large number of employees working under their supervision (Group 3) tend to prefer participative decision making styles more than the other two groups. This result also supports the hypothesis that the span of management may affect managers' attitudes towards the participative decision making process and styles with the high rate score going to managers who are supervising a large number of employees. The literature suggests that the cost of implementing a new decision in terms of turnover, absenteeism, complaints, grievances, conflict, ambiguity, and re-learning skills could be reduced by applying the participative approach in making management decisions.53

Table 8.26 and Table 8.27 show that managers who supervise a large number of employees (Group 3) scored significantly higher than the other two groups for item Q65. Group 2 (15-50 employees) was the second highest and then Group 1 (< 15 employees) with the lowest score. The Scheffe test confirmed that Groups 3 and 2 were different from Group 1, at a level of 0.05 significance. This seems to indicate managers with a narrow span of management were comfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what to do and how to do it. In contrast, managers with a wide span of management tend to prefer a flexible and participative managerial environment in which they can implement their own judgement and are not restricted by autocratic rules or procedures. Mondy and others (1990) argue that managers and subordinates who are highly skilled, experienced and motivated generally can operate with wider spans of control and with less supervision.54

From the previous discussion of this section, it was found that managers with a wide span of management were much more in favour of the participative decisions than

---

those with a narrow span of management. The wide span managers group expected that the participative decision making process increases the speed and decreases the cost of making a decision (Items Q44 and Q46). They also feel more comfortable in a situation where they have the opportunity to use their own judgement, skills and decisions (Item Q65). It appears that there were highly positive attitudes towards participative decisions among managers with a wide span of management.

One alternative explanation to these high positive attitudes is that the managers may be driven by their thirst and eagerness for participation in management activities. Another explanation may be attributed to the fact that the decision making capacity of managers with a wide span is more likely to be overloaded. The literature suggests that the manager's decision making capacity is more likely to be overloaded as the ambiguity and heterogeneity of tasks done by the employees increases, as their dispersion from the manager increases communication difficulties, as the amount of any extraneous duties undertaken by the manager increases, and as the interdependence between the work of the employees increases. Figure 8.1 shows some of the important variables that may affect the span of management.

![Figure 8.1 Factors affecting span of management](image)

Source: Butler, 1991, p.70.

---

As illustrated in Figure 8.1, the above variables may affect the wide span of management negatively. If increases in these variables cannot be avoided there will be pressure to employ a narrow span of management in order to reduce manager's decision overload problem.56 Butler (1991) offered a unique strategy that could be used to resolve this problem and maintain wide spans of management at the same time. He suggested that management needs to increase both the competence and co-operation of the employees. Increasing the competence of the employees is particularly to do with improving their skills by training them to carry out their tasks efficiently, while increasing co-operation is concerned with increasing the commitment and morality of the employees to the goals and objectives of the organisation. Increasing employees' competence and co-operation may also help to reduce their tendency to opportunism and increase the manager's abilities to trust the employees to strive towards organisational goals without close monitoring. In addition, increasing the span of management will provide a positive feedback loop to the variables of competence and co-operation as shown in Figure 8.1.57

However, the literature indicated that involving employees in the decision making process is one of the effective ways that can be used to increase employees' competence and co-operation (see Chapter 5). Hicks and Gullett (1975) argued that, "Participation in decision making can lead to improved manager-worker relations, higher morale and job satisfaction and decreased dependence on the leader."58 Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "Such an approach [PM] is useful not only as a means of fostering subordinates' internal motivation and commitment to the job but also as a strategy for employee development. By participating in this process, the subordinates will be learning how to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisation."59

56 Ibid.
8.7 EXPERIENCE AND PM ASPECTS

One objective of this study was to help management in the Saudi security educational institutes to implement PM policies and procedures to prepare for future development. Managerial experience is very important to the success of management and plays an essential role in the overall PM programmes and their implementation. This will not be achieved unless these institutes create a participative environment and motivate and practise programmes that assist employees to develop their skills and enable the organisation to attract, retain and recruit highly experienced managers.

The distribution of the respondents according to the years of experience they have had in their current positions is displayed in Table 8.28. The table shows that 107 (53 percent) of the managers have spent less than 6 years in their current position, 86 (42.5 percent) have been in their position between 6 to 15 years, and only 9 (4.5 percent) of managers had more than 15 years experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers' Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be reasonable to assume that managers with more than 15 years experience would score more highly than those with less than 6 years experience regarding the satisfaction and participative decision items. The awareness of the importance of the
PM approach and its functions and practices in the organisation are likely to correlate to the years spent in the job by experienced managers. These items, however, will be examined in the following two sections.

8.7.1 Experience and Satisfaction Aspects: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Based on experience, the one-way ANOVA test identified two satisfaction items (Q50 and Q54) with significant differences between groups (see Table 8.1A and Table 8.29). The literature suggests that PM programmes increase decision effectiveness, develop interpersonal relationships, promote responsible attitudes and increase employees' satisfaction and commitment to the organisational goals (see Chapter 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q50. I had a great deal of responsibility in my job.</td>
<td>.0413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54. I have the opportunity to try my own methods or styles of doing the job.</td>
<td>.0215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.29 and Table 8.30 show that satisfaction items with significant differences for Group 1 who had less than 6 years experience, Group 2 who had between 6-15 years experience, and Group 3 who had more than 15 years experience. As was shown in Table 8.1A, one-way ANOVA test identified two satisfaction items (Q50 and Q54) which had significant differences between the previous three groups at 0.05 level of significance. Table 8.29 displays these two items and their significance scores.
Item Q50 suggests that managers had a great deal of responsibility in their current jobs. For this item, Group 3 had the lowest score, Group 1 was slightly higher than Group 3, and Group 2 had the highest mean score (see Table 8.30). The Scheffé test indicated that at the 0.05 level there was no significant difference between any two individual groups. However, there was an overall significant difference among the groups at 0.05 level with regard to this item (Table 8.29). This result seems to indicate that managers with more than 15 years experience are less satisfied with their current responsibility and believe that they do not have the adequate responsibility for handling the problems connected with their jobs.

Table 8.30 Means Variations by Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>&lt; 6 years</th>
<th>6-15 years</th>
<th>&gt; 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q50</td>
<td>3.4579</td>
<td>3.8023</td>
<td>3.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q54</td>
<td>3.2430</td>
<td>3.6706</td>
<td>3.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

With regard to item Q54, the manager has the opportunity to try his own methods or decision styles of doing his job. Group 3 had the lowest mean score, followed by Group 1, with Group 2 being the highest. The Scheffé test confirmed Group 2 was significantly different from Group 3 at the level of 0.05. This item gave similar results to the previous one. The highly experienced managers rated their responses lower than the other two groups.

There was an assumption that the mean score would be lower for less experienced managers (< 6 years) in items Q50 and Q54, and higher for those who had more than 15 years experience. This assumption was disproved as those managers who had more than 15 years experience had the lowest mean score. Such results seem to
suggest that highly experienced managers in the Saudi security educational institutes need to be enabled by management to have authority and responsibility in their jobs.

They also need to be given the adequate freedom to practice their own ideas, methods and decision styles in their jobs. In other words, they need to be involved in the decision-making process. As evidence, almost 81.7 percent of the sample responded that a man on his own is a helpless person (item Q48). Furthermore, effective PM is increasingly being recognised as a major determinant to considerably improve the quality of management decisions (item Q43). The sample responded to this item with an approval rate of 79.2 percent (see Table 8.35). The literature indicates that improving employees responsibility, confidence, commitment and satisfaction can be achieved through involving them in the decision making process. Proponents of this movement argue that a participative decision making approach increases confidence and encourages responsible attitudes among work force members both by discovering themselves through the participative process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their current jobs and organisation (see Chapter 5).

However, it is interesting to note that managers with more than 15 years of management experience scored lower than those with less than 6 years experience and that those with 6 to 15 years managerial experience scored higher than these two groups with regard to satisfaction items (see Table 8.30). An alternative explanation for such results may be attributed to the fact that some of the top management members, especially in developed countries, in a movement to protect their managerial positions, may ignore managers of the closest circle (level) and simultaneously encourage managers from the middle and far circles to be involved in management activities as they raise no danger of taking over their position (see Figure 8.2).
8.7.2 Experience and Participative Decision Items: One-way Analysis of Variance

The one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine significant differences among the sample groups. Based on experience, the one-way ANOVA test identified three participative items (Q45, Q47 and Q65) with significant differences among groups (see Table 8.1B and Table 8.31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Decision Items</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q45. Participative decision-making style is expected to improve considerably the satisfaction and morale of the subordinates.</td>
<td>.0493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47. Participative decision-making style increases subordinates' acceptance of a decision.</td>
<td>.0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>.0317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.32 displays these items with significant differences for Group 1 who had less than 6 years experience, Group 2 who had between 6-15 years experience, and Group 3 who had more than 15 years experience. In general, the results in Table 8.32 show that for the first two items (Q45 and Q47) all three groups' mean scores were high, which indicates that their responses had a considerable impact on these two items. On the other hand, the mean scores for Group 1 and Group 2 were low for item Q65 which indicates that their responses may have little impact on this item. However, the literature suggests that management and organisations need participative decision-making approaches to motivate employees, improve their commitment, develop their skills and prepare them for future changes and higher positions. Vroom and Deci (1992) wrote, "proponents of Participative or Theory Y Management advocate that subordinates should play an active role in setting the goals, choosing how to achieve them, and then evaluating their own performance. Such an approach is useful not only as a means of fostering subordinates' internal motivation and commitment to the job but also as a strategy for employee development. By participating in this process, the subordinates will be learning how to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisation."60

Table 8.32 Mean Variation by Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q45</td>
<td>4.0841</td>
<td>3.9302</td>
<td>4.7778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q47</td>
<td>4.0187</td>
<td>4.1628</td>
<td>4.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item # Q65</td>
<td>2.7383</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

60 Ibid., pp. 171-172.
Item Q45 suggests that participative decision making styles are expected to improve considerably the satisfaction and morale of the subordinates. For this item, Group 2 had the lowest score, followed by Group 1 with Group 3 being the highest score (see Table 8.32). Table 8.31 shows that there was an overall significant difference between groups at the 0.05 level with regard to this item (\( P = .0493 \)). The Scheffé multiple comparison test confirmed that there were no significant difference between any two individual groups at the 0.05 level. The results with regard to this item seem to indicate that highly experienced managers are more positive in their attitudes towards participative decision making approaches than those managers with less experience. Highly experienced managers are much more likely to be in favour of accepting the above proposition in which participative decision making styles are expected to improve considerably the employees' morale and satisfaction. However, the literature indicates that participation in making management decisions appears to have a direct effect on improving the level of employees' satisfaction, commitment, willingness and relationship.\(^6\)

With regard to item Q47, the participative decision-making style increases subordinates' acceptance of the decision, Group 1 had the lowest mean score, followed by Group 2 and Group 3 had the highest score. The Scheffé multiple comparison test confirmed significant differences between Group 3 and Group 1 at the 0.05 level. This seems to prove the hypothesis that highly experienced managers are much more positive in their attitudes towards participative decisions than those managers with less managerial experience.

In general, the results in Table 8.32 show that for this item all three groups' mean scores were high and this indicates that all groups agree with the above assumption and understand that the participative decision-making approach increases the opportunity for new management decisions to be accepted by subordinates. As

evidence, almost 80 percent of the sample responded that the participative decision making process increases considerably the quality of management decisions (Table 8.35). Furthermore, the literature in this field of management suggests that there is a need for involving employees in the decision making process in order to increase their acceptance of new decisions and to improve their commitment to the organisation goals. Proponents of this approach argue that, "employees who feel they are part of the process of making a decision will accept it more readily and will be motivated to implement it more effectively." Armstrong (1993) writes, "If they [employees] can be involved in making those decisions and if they feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the outcome, then they are more likely to accept the decision or change because it is owned by them rather than being imposed by management."

Item Q65 proposed that managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it. For this item, Group 3 received the highest score, followed by Group 2 and then Group 1 with the lowest mean score. The Scheffé multiple comparison test indicated that Groups 1 and 2 were different from Group 3 at the level of 0.05 significance. The low scores in Group 1 and Group 2 may suggest that less experienced managers do not accept the above preposition and this seems to indicate that they prefer to be directed and monitored closely by their superiors. On the other hand, the highly experienced managers seem to be much more comfortable in a situation where they have freedom to use their own judgement and make their own decisions.

However, there was an expectation that the mean score would be lower for less experienced managers (< 6 years) in all three items, and higher for those who had more than 15 years of experience. Differences between the more experienced and

---

less experienced managers were the same as expected. Responses in Table 8.32 indicate that there is a clear tendency for scores in each of the items to be higher in the more experienced group than in the less experienced group. Managers who had more than 15 years managerial experience rated their attitudes towards participative items higher than those who had less than 6 years experience. An alternative explanation for this result may be that the years spent in the job by managers are likely to attribute to their awareness of the importance of the participative decision, develop their responsible attitudes and increase their self confidence.

8.8 PM ITEMS AND COUNTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION (SAUDI ARABIA AND WESTERN COUNTRIES): MANN-WHITNEY TEST

In the past, the Saudi Arabia Government was heavily dependent on the Western countries and universities to be the appropriate place for educating Saudi graduates and postgraduate students and to some extent this is still true today. During the Sixth Development Plan (1995 - 2000), government universities will continue to admit Saudi students in conformity with the plan's objectives and strategies. Although the government will continue to be the main provider of the higher education programs to citizens, it will further encourage the private sector to participate in the establishment of private university colleges or technical colleges. However, the future education planning of the Government is to minimise the number of Saudi students who are going abroad for their higher educational studies, and in turn encourage internal postgraduate studies and programs. The external scholarships will be limited to the country's needs and to some specific fields of studies such as medicine, sciences, and so on. Therefore, it may be useful to compare managers who achieved their highest educational degrees from Saudi universities, with those managers who achieved their degrees from Western universities.
It was hypothesised that managers who graduated from Western universities would be more participative in their attitudes towards managerial decisions than those managers who graduated from Saudi universities. There may, however, be differences between the two groups with regard to satisfaction and participative decision items. The main point in this comparison is that the group of managers who graduated from Western universities would have a chance to learn and even more to deal with actual PM policies and practices inside and outside their universities, while the other group may not have had the same opportunity.

The sample was divided according to the countries from where the respondents got their higher educational degrees. As the answers to question 10 (see Appendix 1) were limited to Saudi Arabia, USA, UK and some other European countries, the sample was divided into two main groups (Group 1- those managers who graduated from Saudi universities, and Group 2 - those managers who graduated from Western universities). This process, however, was accomplished by using the SPSS recode and compute procedures. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was also used to identify the difference between responses of the two groups with regard to the satisfaction and participative items.

8.8.1 Country of Education and the Satisfaction Items

Based on the country of higher education, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test identified four items that received significant differences in responses with regard to satisfaction items (Table 8.1A). As illustrated in Table 8.33, managers who graduated from Western universities scored lower than managers who graduated from Saudi universities for the four satisfaction items (Q52, Q55, Q57 and Q58).
Table 8.33 Differences between Respondents According to the Country of their Higher Educational Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Items</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Western Countries</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q52. I have the opportunity to use my own judgement and to try out some of my own ideas.</td>
<td>4.1235</td>
<td>3.0645</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55. I had considerable decision-making power.</td>
<td>3.0706</td>
<td>2.4516</td>
<td>.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57. I felt I was getting ahead in my job.</td>
<td>3.9824</td>
<td>3.4839</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58. I enjoyed the feeling of responsibility my job gave me.</td>
<td>3.7882</td>
<td>3.3548</td>
<td>.0399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For item Q52, the manager has the opportunity to use his own judgement and to try out some of his own ideas, significant differences were found between the two groups (P = .0002). Managers who graduated from Western universities received the lowest score, while those managers who had graduated from Saudi universities had the highest. This suggests that the second group (managers who graduated from Western universities) are less satisfied in their current jobs than the first group (those who graduated from Saudi universities). However, an alternative explanation of the result of this item may be attributed to a high expectation towards participative approaches that may exist among some managers of the second group based on their Western educational background, while the managers of the first group may be more affected by their traditional and organisational backgrounds. Therefore, each group had different perspectives towards this item.

Item Q45 stated that managers had considerable decision-making power in handling their current job problems. For this item, managers who got their higher educational degrees from Western universities received the lowest score while managers who graduated from Saudi universities had the highest scores. The results of this item are
similar to those above. However, the literature suggests that there is a link between
the managers' degree of satisfaction and their decision-making power. One way of
increasing employees' decision-making power is by involving them in the decision
making process which leads to a more equitable redistribution of power between
superiors and subordinates. The argument used to justify this view of participation
is that the employees have to implement the decision and live with its consequences,
and so they should be given more influence and power by involving them in the
process of making it.

Item Q57 concentrated on the managers advancement and development they received
from their current jobs. As illustrated in Table 8.33, managers who graduated from
Western universities had the lowest mean score and managers who graduated from
Saudi universities had the highest. The low score of the second group suggests that
the members of this group may need to be motivated and more involved in
management decisions and other activities. The literature suggests management has
to recognise the importance of the PM approach in developing employees
knowledge, skills, abilities and satisfaction, which of course will possibly reflect
their satisfaction. Pateman (1970) stated that, "Participation develops and fosters the
very qualities necessary for it; the more individuals participate the better able they
are to do so." Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "Such an approach [PM] is useful not
only as a means of fostering subordinates' internal motivation and commitment to the
job but also as a strategy for employee development. By participating in this
process, the subordinates will be learning how to accept greater responsibility and
will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisations."

---

65 Diana, M., 1992, p. 69.
Item Q58 assumes that the managers enjoy the feeling of responsibility they get from their current jobs. For this item, significant differences were found between the two groups at 0.05 level. Respondents of the first group (Saudi universities) had the highest score and managers of the second group (Western universities) had the lowest mean score (see Table 8.33).

However, there are three possible explanations for the above results. Firstly, the possibility of the absence of a participative environment inside the Saudi security educational institutes. Secondly, the high expectation towards participation and its policies that may exist among some of the managers who graduated from Western universities. Finally, managers from the first group may not yet be aware of the importance of PM policies and practices due to cultural and organisational reasons. Elbing (1978) argued that employees in some cultures may have had no prior family, job, school, or social experience in participation and are not yet ready for it. Therefore, both management and employees need to be prepared before introducing this approach to the organisation if it is to work effectively. Participative approaches must fit in with the value systems of both management and organisation. If no effort has been made to generate such an environment, effective participation may not exist. However without such preparation the cultural and organisational barriers will constrain and limit the effective use of participation in managerial decision making.

8.8.2 Participative Decision Items and the Countries of Higher Education

Based on the countries of the respondents' higher educational degrees, the sample was divided into two main groups. Group 1 comprised managers who were granted their higher educational degrees from Saudi universities, and Group 2 included managers who were granted their higher educational degrees from Western

---

It was hypothesised that managers who graduated from Western universities would rate their responses towards participative items higher than those managers who graduated from Saudi universities. Based on these two groups, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test identified four participative items that received significant differences in responses (see Table 8.1B). These four items include Q42, Q44, Q65 and Q66. Table 8.34 shows these items and their level of significance. From this table it appears that managers who graduated from Saudi universities scored lower than managers who graduated from Western universities with regard to these four participative items.

**Table 8.34 Differences Between Respondents According to the Country of Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Items</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>W. Countries</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q42. Subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of their supervisors.</td>
<td>3.1287</td>
<td>3.8065</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Participative decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision.</td>
<td>3.0702</td>
<td>3.5161</td>
<td>.0297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65. Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.</td>
<td>2.5294</td>
<td>4.4194</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66. Managers prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position with a lower level of responsibility.</td>
<td>3.3529</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

Item Q42 proposes that subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of the manager. For this item significant differences were found between those managers who graduated from Saudi universities and those who graduated from Western universities (Table 8.34). Respondents who were granted

---

69 For some details about how these two groups were established, please see Section 8.8.
their higher educational degrees from Saudi universities received the lowest score, while those who graduated from Western universities received the highest. This result indicates that the managers who studied in and graduated from Western universities are more positive in their attitudes towards the above proposition than those who mainly studied in and graduated from Saudi universities. This seems to support the hypothesis that the managers who got their higher education in Western countries will be more positive in their attitudes towards participative decisions than those who graduated from Saudi universities. An alternative explanation for this result may be attributed to the fact that in Western countries there are more opportunities for students to learn about PM approaches from theoretical and practical perspectives.

According to Item Q44, the participative decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision. For this item, managers who graduated from Western universities received the highest score while managers who graduated from Saudi universities had the lowest. The result of this item is similar to the previous one and seems, once again, to support our hypothesis that managers who graduated from Western universities are much more in favour of participative decisions than those who graduated from Saudi universities.

Item Q65 proposed that a manager usually feels uncomfortable in a situation where he is told exactly what he is supposed to do and how to do it. For this item, managers who graduated from Saudi universities received the lowest score, while those who graduated from Western universities had the highest. The high mean score of the latter indicates that this group of managers supports the above proposition and tends to prefer a situation where they can use their own judgement and participate in the decision making process. The low score of the former indicates that this group of managers need to be prepared, encouraged and motivated to use their own ideas, skills and knowledge in doing their current jobs. However,
participation in making managerial decisions is one of the important strategies that can be used to achieve this goal. Stoner (1982) said, "There is strong evidence that commitment to a decision is usually increased when employees are involved in the decision making process." He also added that the "Subordinates' involvement increases their self-esteem; they take pride in their demonstrated value to the situation." In general, participation is seen by many writers and researchers as a means of giving employees the opportunity to develop their responsible attitudes and confidence both by discovering themselves through the participative process and by learning more skills and knowledge about their current jobs and organisation.

For the last item (Q66) where the managers were expected to prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position with a lower level of responsibility, the managers who graduated from Western universities had the highest score and managers who graduated from Saudi universities had the lowest. This is not surprising as the respondents answered the previous item (Q65) in a similar way.

There are four possible explanations for the above results. First, managers who graduated from Western universities may be influenced by their educational background as they had the opportunity to learn and maybe to practise some of the major principles of participative management. Secondly, managers who graduated from Saudi universities may not yet have become aware of the importance of PM based on their traditional and cultural value systems. Thirdly, they may also be affected by their organisational background as police officers. The traditional and organisational values of the employees may negatively affect their attitudes towards participative decision making approaches. If employees have been raised in a non-participative culture and learnt to function autocratically, there will be a great deal of
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resistance to the introduction of participation. Finally, it should be noted that not all employees are equally interested in participative management. Mondy et al (1990) write, "Managers must face the fact that some workers do not seek more responsibility and greater involvement in their job." This of course may be attributed to several reasons, such as personal, technical, organisational, cultural and/or task problems. However, employees must have the opportunity to discuss these problems and be prepared, before introducing a participative decision making approach to their organisations, if it is to work effectively.

8.9 ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF MANAGERIAL RESPONSES TO PM ITEMS

As stated earlier in Chapter 5, involving employees in the decision-making process is vital to the success of management. To some writers, employees' participation is the answer to most human problems in decision making. However, to implement such an approach effectively, management needs to be aware of the importance of participation before it takes place from both managerial and organisational perspectives. Furthermore, awareness in this area leads to a clearer understanding of both employees and management responsibilities, increases their job satisfaction and improves their attitudes towards participation. These aspects are central factors in establishing a participative decision-making approach and for preparing the work environment to accept such development. Elbing (1978) states that, "Participative systems tend to violate the traditional value system of some managers and some organisations. If management is not convinced of the system's real worth or feels threatened by its introduction, there may be participation in theory, but not in reality. This is quickly perceived by employees, who then resist real participation. In
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general, therefore, participative systems must fit with the value system of both management and organisation.\textsuperscript{76}

Therefore, this section continues the efforts to discover and diagnose the work environment of the Saudi security educational institutes by highlighting the items of job satisfaction and participative decision making that failed to achieve the 0.05 level of significance (see Table 8.1). Table 8.35 presents results that were not statistically significant regarding these items where each of them will be analysed separately as follows.

**Table 8.35 Additional Aspects of Participative Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Management Items</th>
<th>Likert Scale Equivalent (strongly agree &amp; agree)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q59. Managers should turn down a promotion (position) if they feel it would decrease their responsibility.</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>2.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60. Managers should spend most of the work time with subordinates rather than staying in their offices.</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>2.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49. My superior was willing to listen to my suggestions.</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>3.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56. I enjoyed the kind of work I did.</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>3.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43. The quality of a participative decision is expected to improve considerably.</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>3.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48. Generally, man on his own is a helpless person.</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>4.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
Although the items just failed the 0.05 significance test, the approval rate (agree and strongly agree) of the respondents is interesting and merits analysis. Table 8.35 reports that for item Q59, where a manager would turn down a promotion (position) if he felt it would decrease his responsibility, the sample responded with an approval rate of only 17.4 percent. This means that the sample rejected the above statement. As illustrated in Table 8.1, the six independent variables (Age, Qualification, Position, Span of Management, Experience and Country of Higher Education) had no significant impact on the responses regarding this item.

Item Q60 states that managers should spend most of the work hours with subordinates rather than staying in their offices. Table 8.35 shows that only 38.8 percent of the respondents agreed with this statement. The sample rejected the above statement, too. The general consensus with regard to this statement shows that the six independent variables were not statistically significant (see Table 8.1B).

However, the low approval rate of the above two items seems to indicate that the sample rejected both of them. An explanation for such a rejection may be attributed to the possibility that the respondents were influenced by their own culture, tradition, surrounding environment and their human needs. Another alternative explanation is that the respondents were not motivated enough to commit themselves to their current jobs and organisation. This result may also be attributed to the possibility that Saudi organisations do not generally equip their managers with the knowledge and information needed to increase their responsible attitudes and their awareness of PM practices. Malaika (1993) said, "Training and workforce development is poor in almost all Saudi organisations, and there is a lack of effective management training as well. This lack of training and workforce development at all organisational levels has a significant impact on organisational progress. Besides, it has a great impact on subordinates' motivation, job satisfaction, commitment, and performance."77

Furthermore, the literature indicates that awareness in this area of management practices may lead to a clearer understanding of employees' responsibilities and increase their commitment and job satisfaction. The participative process of making a decision, implementing it, and then seeing the positive results can help to increase employees' satisfaction, provide recognition and responsibility and reduce any conflict and ambiguity experienced by the workforce.\textsuperscript{78}

Item Q49 assumes that the managers in the Saudi security educational institutes were willing to listen to their subordinates' suggestions. For this item, 73.8 percent of the sample agreed with the above proposition. The lack of statistical significance of the six independent variables suggests a high consensus towards supporting the above proposition. These results indicate a high degree of job satisfaction and suggest that superiors should listen to subordinates and benefit from their knowledge and suggestions. Armstrong (1993) writes, "If they [employees] feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the outcome, then they are more likely to accept the decision or change because it is owned by them rather than being imposed by management."\textsuperscript{79} When cross-tabulating this item by each one of the six independent variables, it was found that the high age group (> 50 years), highly educated (Ph.D. degree) and managers in high positions (General Department) achieved the lowest approval rate (agree and strongly agree) regarding this item, i.e. 16.7 percent, 30 percent and 33.3 percent respectively (see Table 8.36). In contrast, all the other groups of the independent variables received a very high percentage rate regarding the approval of this item. The results in Table 8.36 concur with our previous results that were discussed in Section 8.3.1, Section 8.4.1 and Section 8.5.1.


\textsuperscript{79} Armstrong, M., 1993, p. 183.
Table 8.36 Item Q49 by High Age Group, Highly Education and Highly Positioned Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age &gt; 50 years</th>
<th>Education Ph.D.</th>
<th>Position General Dept</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree and Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>23 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree and Strongly agree</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Q56 suggests that managers enjoyed the kind of work they did. The sample responded to this item with an approval rate of 75.7 percent. The lack of statistical significance of the six independent variables suggests a high consensus among the sample towards the above proposition. This result may indicate that the majority of the subject managers are satisfied with their current jobs and enjoy their current positions. As the literature suggests, the PM approach means motivating employees to achieve their full potential, increase their self-esteem, and improve their satisfaction and commitment to the organisation's goals.
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regard to the enjoyment and satisfaction of their current jobs. In contrast, all the other groups of the independent variables achieved a very high approval rate regarding this item. Table 8.37 summarises the lowest approval rates and supports our previous results that were presented earlier in this chapter (see Section 8.3.1, Section 8.4.1, and Section 8.5.1).

### Table 8.37 Item Q56 by High Age Group, Highly Educated, and Highly Positioned Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age &gt; 50 years</th>
<th>Education Ph.D Degree</th>
<th>Position General Dept</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree and Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree and Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Q43 suggests that the quality of a participative decision is expected to improve considerably and 79.2 percent of the sample agreed with this item proposition. The lack of statistical significance of the independent variables suggests a high consensus among the sample towards approving the above proposition. Even though there were not significant differences between groups, respondents seemed to prefer the idea of implementing PM approaches in their organisations as their attitudes towards participative decision is highly positive (79.2%). However, the literature indicates that employers' participation in the decision making process often results in the most effective and qualified decisions. Mondy et al (1990) in their argument for and against group decision making said, "Research supports the fact that group decision
making often results in the most effective decision. Participation may also reduce any role conflict and role ambiguity experienced by the task force members.\textsuperscript{83}

Finally, item Q48 states that a man on his own (alone) is a helpless person. The sample responded to this item with an approval rate of 81.7 percent. The lack of statistical significance of the six independent variables suggests a high consensus among the sample towards the above statement. This can be used as an indication of the respondents' high positive attitudes towards PM practices, as most of the sample agreed with this statement (81.7%).

In this section, using the Likert Scale Equivalent, it was found that some of the respondents did not support the statements, which are a major concern if the subject organisations are planning to establish and practise PM approaches. On the other hand, the majority of the sample did have a positive attitude towards PM aspects and recognise that it plays a major role in the success or failure of management decisions. However, before establishing PM policies and procedures, management must believe in and have a full understanding of the subject from both a cultural and managerial perspective. This is important as management strategies designed for one culture may not be appropriate for another culture. The PM approach designed for Western culture, for instance, may not be appropriate for use in the Saudi Islamic culture. For example, the Saudi male and female managers may not have the opportunity to put forward their managerial views with the opposite gender in a face-to-face meeting. Therefore, the participative decision making approach must fit in with the traditional and cultural values of both management and organisation as much as possible if it is to work effectively.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, both employees and managers need to be prepared before introducing the PM approach to the organisation. Without such preparation the traditional and personal barriers will

\textsuperscript{83} Mondy, R.W. et al, 1990, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{84} Bowditch, J.L. and A.F. Buono, 1994, p. 404.
constrain and limit the effective use of participation in managerial decision making. The literature supported that failure to prepare management and organisation to accept and function in a participative environment is one of the major obstacles to success. Vroom and Deci said, "The problem all too often is that organisations adopt these newer participative approaches in a relatively superficial way, espousing them when things are going well, but falling back on more traditional, authoritarian approaches when things get tough. This inevitably creates problems of mistrust and resentment, thus undoing any advantages that were obtained. The general participative approach (to the extent that it is situationally appropriate) must be fully accepted by top management and used conscientiously in bad times as well as good if it is to work effectively. When it is, the approach can have remarkable effects on employee attitudes and work effectiveness."85

8.10 THE JUSTIFICATIONS FOR AND BARRIERS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARTICIPATIVE DECISION-MAKING APPROACHES

This section will summarise the justifications for and barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making approaches in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres as they were perceived by the respondents. The respondents were asked to write their opinions about the justification for and the barriers to the use of participative decisions in their current jobs and organisations based on two open-ended questions (Q.67 and Q.68). Their answers have been analysed qualitatively and the content of their answers has been categorised and ranked according to the frequencies of their mentioning and the percentage of respondents who answered these questions.

In Question 67, the respondents were asked to list the justifications and advantages, if any, of encouraging and enabling their subordinates to participate in the managerial decision-making process. Actually, there were 135 respondents to this question. Table 8.38 presents the main points that were mentioned by the respondents as justifications for the implementation of the participative decision-making approaches in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres.

**Table 8.38 Justification for and Advantages of Involving Subordinates in Management Decisions as Mentioned by the Respondents Ranked According to the Number of Times Mentioned (Q. ) (N = 135)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Justification and Advantages</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increasing subordinates' satisfaction.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increasing subordinates' commitment and confidence.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improving quality and efficiency of the decision.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Applying the Islamic rules of Shura (consultation)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide management with a great deal of information.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It works as a means of training programme for preparing subordinates and new managers for higher level positions.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Better use of the available skills, knowledge and experience.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minimising personal interests in the decision.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Encouraging the openness of communication channels.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Decreasing dependence on the superior.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the most important points (justifications) in this table are the first three items because 50% or more of the respondents have mentioned them. The first justification mentioned is that subordinates' participation in the decision-making process increases their satisfaction. Sixty percent of the respondents who answered this question brought up this point. Fifty-three percent of the respondents mentioned that participation may increase subordinates' commitment and confidence. Also, fifty percent of the respondents think that participation improves the quality and efficiency of the final decision. However, the above points are in accordance with what was mentioned in the literature in Chapter 5 of this study. However, most studies and research in this field of management indicate positive correlation between subordinates' morale, commitment and satisfaction and the degree of participation in the decision-making process. Mondy et al (1990) said, "Research supports the fact that group decision-making often results in the most effective decision. Participation may also reduce any role, conflict and role ambiguity experienced by the task force members." They also added, "since individuals involved in making a decision generally become committed to it, group consensus expedites acceptance of the decision by the group. Therefore, both individual and group commitment to the decision is increased." Stoner (1982) pointed out that, "Subordinates' involvement increases their self-esteem; they take pride in their demonstrated value to the situation." Similarly, Hicks and Gullett (1975) argued that, "Participation in decision-making can lead to improved manager-worker relations, higher morale and job satisfaction."

However, Table 8.38 shows that some other justifications for involving subordinates in the decision-making process were raised by the respondents. For example, 35% of the respondents said that participation is considered to be an application of the

87 Ibid, p. 198.
Islamic rules and principles of the Shura concept. Some of the respondents, however, wrote some of the verses in the Holy Quran which emphasise such principles and assumption. This may show how important the religion and traditional values are in this area of management in general and for the Saudi managers in particular. However the principles of "Shura" as stated by the Holy Quran and the Hadith revealed that those who conduct their affairs by consultation are among the ones upon whom God's mercy and heavenly rewards will be bestowed. Table 8.38 also indicates that 21% of the respondents believe that participation provides management with a great deal of information. So they think that participation styles are a good way to get more ideas about the situation under discussion. The next point was that participation is a very useful way for training subordinates and new managers in decision-making and preparing them for higher level positions. Eighteen percent of the respondents have mentioned this justification. This, however, is in accordance with what was mentioned by Vroom and Deci (1992) that Participative Management is useful not only as a means of motivation and commitment to the job but also as a strategy for subordinates development. They added, "By participating in this process, the subordinates will be learning how to accept greater responsibility and will be more prepared to move to higher level positions within the organisation." The next mentioned justification is that participation styles may enable management to benefit from all the skills, knowledge and experience that are available in the organisation but may not be used to their maximum extent. Eight percent of the respondents have mentioned this point. Seven percent of the respondents also mentioned that involving subordinates in the decision-making process minimises managers' personal interest in the decision. Four percent mentioned that participation process encourages the openness of communication channels (upward and downward). Finally, one percent of the respondents said that participation may decrease subordinates' dependence on their

superiors which may enable managers to deal with the more important and serious matters.

Turning to Question 68, the respondents were asked to write the barriers and disadvantages of involving subordinates in the decision-making process in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. Actually, there were 133 respondents to this question and eight points were mentioned as barriers and disadvantages of subordinates' participation in the decision-making process (see Table 8.39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Barriers and Disadvantages</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Top managers and strong personality individuals might dominate the discussion</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interest groups may influence the final outcome.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confidentiality barriers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time-consuming process</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Absence of ability, skills and interest to participate.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employee whose opinion is not reflected in the final decision will be dissatisfied and may resist such decision.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixing the responsibility so it encourages participants to make riskier decisions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Decreasing the managers' prerogative and authority.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most notable barriers or disadvantages mentioned in Table 8.39 are: top managers with strong personality might dominate the discussion (58%), interest groups may influence the final outcome (decision) of the discussion (47%), and confidentiality problems (32%). In general, the confidentiality concept works as a barrier for participation, but it sometimes might be justified being seen as an unavoidable matter. In some organisations, the nature of certain types of information or decisions might require a great deal of confidentiality which not all subordinates should know about. When this is the case, then the subject of confidentiality is justified and therefore both manager and subordinates have to deal with it as a fact, accept its consequences, and try to minimise the side effects upon the participation process. However, the problem that may arise especially in developing countries is that some managers tend to misuse the application of confidentiality concept by classifying an extensive range of information and decisions as confidential matters. This is to avoid subordinates' participation in the decision-making process and to cover their autocratic decision-making style. When this is the case, confidentiality becomes a serious and destructive barrier to the participation process. However, Alshalan (1991) said, "the bureaucracy in Saudi Arabia suffers from over-emphasis on secrecy with no need for it most of the time."92 Table 8.39 also shows that 17% of the respondents think that participation is time-consuming process. 16% of the respondents mentioned the absence of subordinates' ability, skills or interest to participate in the decision-making process. However, the literature reviews highlight this point. Mondy et al (1990) said, "It should also be noted that not all employees are equally desirous of participation. Managers must face the fact that some workers do not seek more responsibility and greater involvement in their job."93 They added, "Whether or not greater involvement in decision making can be developed depends largely upon the ability and interest of the participants, both of the subordinates and the managers. This is not an easy concept to implement.

Obviously, if the subordinate has neither knowledge of, nor interest in a subject, there is little need to consult that person. Eight percent of the respondents think that the employee whose opinion is not reflected in the final decision will be dissatisfied and may resist such decision. Four percent of the respondents think that participation approach mixes responsibility and encourages participants to make riskier decisions as each one of them may feel that he personally is not responsible for the consequences of such decisions. But he feels that it is the whole group's responsibility and therefore will be encouraged to accept riskier decisions. Finally, three percent of the respondents think that participation might decrease the manager's prerogatives and authority.

However, these justifications and barriers of participation perceived by the respondents are some of the concepts that have been mentioned and discussed by many writers in this field of study. This means that our sample have shared some of the perceptions and ideas of the theorists and researchers about the importance of participation in management decisions. However, these points and some more others regarding the justification and barriers to the implementation of participative decision-making approaches have been discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 of this study.

8.11 SUMMARY

This chapter is a continuing part of the survey questionnaire analysis process. The data for this part was collected for the purpose of soliciting the respondents' actual attitudes regarding job satisfaction and participative decision items. The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to accomplish this process. The one-way ANOVA tests were used to identify statistical significance among different
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groups, whereas the Scheffé multiple comparison procedures were used for the purpose of identifying the differences in responses between each individual group. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was used to distinguish the differences in responses for the items of two sample groups only, e.g. high-level and low-level managers. It was found that the personal statistics regarding the respondents varied to a sufficient degree that it gave credibility to the target sample and also to the results of this research. The majority of the subject managers were educated, experienced and aged between 30 and 50 years (Tables 8.11, 8.28 and 8.2). This provided the study with respondents who had a significant amount of education and experience in the management field, which is valuable to research studies of this subject.

Although many of the respondents were highly educated and had several years experience, there was an indication that insufficient attention was being given to developing and involving managers to operate in a participative environment. The highly educated (Ph.D. group) and the more experienced managers (> 15 years) were found to be less satisfied with their current jobs and organisations when compared to the other groups in the sample. On the other hand, the lower educated and the less experienced managers scored lower with regard to participative decision items. These results help to support the need for special training programmes to prepare management and also employees in understanding the importance of participation and recognising the need for its implementation. The fact that mature managers scored lower than younger managers regarding most of the satisfaction items seems to indicate that they were less satisfied with their jobs and may need to be given the opportunity to participate in management decisions in order to improve their job commitment and satisfaction. However, mature managers scored higher than young managers regarding their attitudes towards participative items and did seem to agree that PM is equally necessary to the success of management and organisation. Similarly, managers who graduated from Western universities were more in favour
of participative decision making styles than managers who graduated from Saudi universities (Table 8.34). Furthermore, high-level managers and those with a large span of management indicated more positive attitudes towards participative items than the managers with low-level positions or a narrow span of management (Table 8.21 and Table 8.26). It was also beneficial to learn that the majority of the sample were well educated, as it reflected the fact that education was important for those occupying managerial positions. However, it was encouraging to find that the majority of the educated managers did have a positive attitude towards PM items, compared to those with a lower university degree (Table 8.15). This seems to indicate that they may have a strong influence on developing PM programmes and will play an effective role in preparing their organisations for a participative environment in the future.

However, it is agreed that PM policies and practices are vital to the success of management, but before establishing such approaches top management members must understand the subject and agree to work in a participative environment. It is important not to use this approach in a superficial way, or on a selective basis. It should be used in good times and in bad times as well if it is to work effectively. Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "The general participative approach (to the extent that it is situationally appropriate) must be fully accepted by top management and used conscientiously in bad times as well as good times if it is to work effectively. When it is, the approach can have remarkable effects on employee attitudes and work effectiveness." So if management does not believe in the real worth of participation or feel threatened by its implementation, there may be participation in theory, but not in reality. In addition, the participative decision making approach must fit in with the traditional and cultural values of both management and organisation if it is to work effectively. The PM approach designed for Western culture, for example, may not be appropriate for use in the Saudi Islamic culture. It

may need to be redesigned to fit in with the new culture. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the male and female managers will not be able to put forward their managerial views with the opposite genders in a face-to-face meeting due to traditional and religious reasons. Therefore, preparation for introducing and establishing this approach is necessary before it takes place in the organisation. Without such preparation the traditional, personal and technological barriers may limit the effective use of participation (see Chapter 5).

However, it is interesting to note that the managers who are less satisfied with their jobs and organisations are the ones who express more positive attitudes towards participative items. In contrast, the managers who scored higher regarding job satisfaction items scored lower when they described their actual attitudes towards participative items. This interesting point raises the question about the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and the degree of influence they have towards management decisions. Because this point is outside the aims of this study it will be put forward as one of the major suggestions and recommendations for future research. However, the literature suggests positive correlation between employees' morale and the degree of participation in the decision making process. To some writers, participation is the answer to most human problems in decision making. They argue that it improves job satisfaction, managers-workers relations, and increases commitment and responsible attitudes among the work force (see Chapter 5).

Finally, the chapter continues the efforts to discover and diagnose the work environment of the Saudi security educational institutes and centres by highlighting the items of job satisfaction and participative decision making that failed to achieve the .05 level of significance (Section 8.9). This is followed by an analysis of the open ended questions regarding the justification for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making styles in the Saudi security
educational institutes. In this regard, it was found that Saudi managers have shared some of the perceptions of the theorists and practitioners about the importance of subordinates’ participation in the decision-making process (Section 8.10).

The following chapter “Conclusion, Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Research”, briefly reviews the contents and findings of this study. It summarises the literature review, the analysis of the data collected and the interpretation of the hypotheses’ findings and results. Each chapter and hypothesis is outlined. Recommendations and suggestions are made for future research and studies.
CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

9.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the main concepts and outcomes that have been analysed and discussed in previous chapters, restates the findings connected with this study’s hypotheses and its central research questions, and links these findings to observations made during the field study in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres in Riyadh region, Saudi Arabia, in the Summer, 1996. A set of recommendations for the decision makers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres in particular and for Saudi public and private sectors in general about management decisions and their relevant styles, skills, and techniques will also be offered by this chapter. This set of recommendations will be a helpful tool for training centres and administrative reformers in their attempts to develop the capacity of human resources and to take care of administrative and managerial problems. It is a useful reference for other studies and researchers as well as for administrative training and reform centres in Saudi Arabia aimed at finding appropriate and effective ways to manage employees, increase the productivity, raising job-satisfaction, and improving the quality of management decisions. Finally, concluding remarks and suggestions for future research are also provided.

9.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

A general review of the literature reveals that little has been written about managerial decision making styles in general concerning Saudi Arabia and other developing
countries and in particular about subordinates' participation in the decision-making process in these countries. Whatever the reason for this scarcity, it is apparent that continuous research is needed in this field of study to understand and overcome the problems of management decisions in these countries.

However, to the knowledge of the researcher, no study has been conducted to analyse the managerial decision making styles of the subordinate-managers in the Saudi police sector, nor to find out the degree of their involvement in the stages of the decision-making process. Thus, the significance of this study lies in filling this important gap of knowledge which will provide the government with valuable information for making managerial and administrative reforms in both the public and private sectors. This makes the study of management decision styles both interesting and worthwhile. It also presents a significant contribution to the current research on management by reviewing and integrating relevant literature and adding to the body of knowledge in an area lacking empirical research. This study provides more in-depth data about this subject, and paves the road for future comparative research studies.

This study was limited to five major styles of making managerial decisions: autocratic (AI style), semi-autocratic (AII style), semi-consultative (CI style), consultative (CII style), and joint decision making (GII style). Figure 7.1 presented these styles on a power-sharing continuum scale starting with no participation (AI Style) and ending with joint decision (GII Style). However, participation in this study does not necessarily mean the full involvement of all subordinates in every types of decisions. The focus, here, is upon the degree of involvement by the concerned and relevant subordinates in certain types of managerial decisions. In this study owing to the specific nature of the Saudi security institutes as a police organisations, top secret and crisis decisions are excluded. Furthermore, the top directors of these organisations and their deputies were also excluded from the target sample due to the politically nature of their position and to the type of decisions they are dealing with.
Taking the above into account the objectives of this study were eightfold. First, to examine the evolution and importance of the concept of participation in managerial decisions through the human civilisations' history. Second, to identify the major decision-making methods, styles, skills and techniques that may be implemented by the decision makers when making their managerial decisions with special emphasis made on the implementation of these approaches in Saudi managerial practices. However, managers are required to know that complex decisions cannot be made by the use of a fixed formula or by ignoring the influence of human factors, technological inventions, resources available in the workplace, and environmental and cultural variables.\(^1\) Third, to investigate the degree of the respondents' involvement in the stages of the decision-making process for each type of decisions (programmed and non-programmed). Figure 4.1 illustrated the stages of the decision making process. However, Saudi security educational organisations have frequently been criticised for having a bureaucratised decision-making process. This study should prove whether this criticism is justified or not. Fourth, to examine the relationship between the types of managerial decisions and the styles of making these decisions. The study will then suggest decision-making styles and practices that may be appropriate for the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. However, Simon's classification for management decisions as programmed and non-programmed was used for the purpose of this study. Fifth, to examine the effect of the level of education, training, experience, age, position, managerial span, Western education and field of study on the managers' decision-making styles. The intention here is to find out how much of the variance in the managers decision styles can be explained, and to which variable(s) it can be attributed. This is to help management in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres to prepare for future development. Sixth, to compare managers' differences of Job-satisfaction and measure their actual attitudes towards participative decisions. It is very important to describe and

\(^1\) Hellriegel, D. and J.W. Slocum, 1989, p. 70.
understand the degree of satisfaction the employees have towards their current jobs and how they perceive Participative Management (PM) and respond to its fundamental statements or items. This is to explore the work environment of the sample organisations and diagnose any problems for implementing the participative decision making process. Seventh, to investigate the justifications for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making styles in general and in the Saudi context in particular. Lastly but not least, to provide information to Saudi managers desirous of implementing the participative decision making approach and to assist them in preparing their organisations and manpower for future development. This research aims to provide management with the necessary tools to be useful in changing the organisation’s business theory from one that is autocratically oriented to one that is participatory oriented.

In summary, this study is organised into nine chapters. Chapter One provides a brief introduction to the study, describes its rationale, states the problem to be examined, and outlines the objectives of the research. Then, discussion on the significance of the study and a set of managerial terminology and limitations that are important for a better understanding of the subject matters of this research are provided.

Chapter Two summarises the ancient and more recent managerial concepts and practices. It is difficult, however, to trace exactly the step-by-step development in the practices of management thought throughout the history of ancient civilisations. So, for the purpose of this study, this chapter presents only examples from some of the most famous ancient civilisations together with a brief description of their managerial thought. This is followed by a brief discussion of the Twentieth Century managerial development and its major theories of decision making. Therefore, from a human behavioural perspective, this chapter highlights the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making process together with how been the ancient and then the more recent civilisations viewed this concept and how it was developed.
may help today’s managers and subordinates to analyse managerial problems and make perfect decisions. However, this development is summarised in Figure 2.1.

Chapter Three reviews the major leadership theories, styles, and skills from the standpoint of managerial decision making. It also concentrates on how these theories view the concept of participation in the decision-making process. Managerial decisions are central factors in leadership applications and practices. Many of the leadership styles and applications reflect the decisions that managers take. Therefore, an examination of leadership studies and theories is important, not only to understand the theories but also to understand managerial decisions and the participation of subordinate-managers in the decision-making process. In general, the literature on leadership and managerial decisions tends to focus upon four basic styles which are termed as autocratic, participative, democratic, and laissez-faire. Table 3.3 is an attempt to summarise some of the major leadership theories and their corresponding decision styles. Using this table, it is clear that leadership theories exhibit various decision styles. These decision styles vary according to the degree of a manager’s authority, the amount of the subordinates’ participation in the decision-making process, and other situational variables. They may range from a complete autocracy on the one hand to a totally permissive or abdication style on the other; all have certain advantages and disadvantages.

Subordinates are an essential factor in choosing the most appropriate decision style in a particular situation. Their backgrounds, their maturity, their knowledge and their experience can determine the type of leadership decision style which they prefer to be managed through and which will achieve the desired goals. For instance, subordinates who are recently hired and are immature or inexperienced, with only the minimum of work skills, may prefer the autocratic leadership decision style. Subordinates who are technically proficient, skilled, experienced, and mature and confident, may prefer the
democratic and participative leadership decision style.\textsuperscript{2} Finally, subordinates who are experts, specialists, highly skilled, highly experienced, and highly mature with confidence may prefer the permissive leadership decision style.\textsuperscript{3} However, the most effective managers adapt their styles to the demands of a given situation, task, group, and their own needs and personal characteristics. Table 3.2 illustrates the relationship between subordinates' characteristics and their preferable leadership decision-making styles in a particular situation.

However, the success of a decision and the achievement of its desired goals is dependent not only upon the manager's style or subordinates characteristics but also upon his or her skills in using that style.\textsuperscript{4} Thus, organisations must enable managers as well as subordinates to possess and develop adequate skills in order to perform effectively all the tasks and the decisions for which they are responsible and to prepare them for higher management positions. Such skills can broadly be classified under four categories: technical, conceptual, interpersonal, and communicational. Figure 3.3 illustrates these four skills with their association to management level. In practice it is difficult to define precisely the amount of each of these four leadership decision skills which will be needed at each level of management. It is also hard to determine the transition points between the management levels. Technical skills are most important at the lowest level of management but decrease in importance as a person moves up in the managerial hierarchy. Conceptual skills, on the other hand, are least important at the lower level of management but increase in importance as a person moves up in the managerial hierarchy. Finally, the interpersonal and communication skills are almost of equal importance at all levels of management in the structural hierarchy.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{2} Donnelly, J.H. and Others, 1984, p.413.
\textsuperscript{3} Bennett, R., 1991, p.335; and Mony, R.W. and Others, 1990, p.554.
\textsuperscript{4} Vroom, V.H. and A.G. Jago, 1988, p.47.
Chapter Four covers some of the main concepts of management decision. It focuses on the decision's types, elements, methods, and process. It also highlights a number of factors that may negatively affect the decision-making process. The adapted model in Figure 4.1 illustrates the stages of the process, starting with the observation of the problem and runs through the process until the best possible decision is chosen, implemented, and monitored. In practice, however, these stages are rarely recognised as distinct stages by the decision-body. They are recognised as a series of interrelated and dynamic stages in a particular order of sequence. Moreover, a backtrack movement from one stage to earlier stages can be made at any time of the process in order to add or to change some information. It is also possible for a new cycle to commence if the implemented decision failed to achieve its objectives.

With regard to the types of decisions, Simon's classification for management decisions as programmed and non-programmed was used by this study. The programmed decisions are most likely to be made unilaterally because they are repetitive and have a good deal of certainty associated with the outcome. Such decisions, in their total effect, are important to the success of an organisation but individually they have little impact on the organisation. Therefore, programmed decisions are usually delegated to the lower level managers and are most likely to be made unilaterally with no real need for participation. On the other hand, non-programmed decisions generally require the decision maker to exercise judgement, intuition, and creativity. Non-programmed decisions are critical to the existence of the whole organisation. Because of their relative ambiguity and complexity, these decisions usually require more expertise than most individuals have. In respect of this, it is important to involve and allow subordinates to participate in the non-programmed decisions in order to increase their involvement, motivation, and satisfaction. Participation generates more ideas and more interests and helps to
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accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives. Table 4.2 shows a comparison between programmed and non-programmed decisions and summarises their major characteristics.

Chapter Five is devoted to clarify the concept of participation in managerial decision making and to justify why participation is important for employees, both the subordinates and the managers. It reviews the definitions, classifications, justifications, and barriers of participation that were most often given by other writers and analysts in this field of study. It also underlines some of the major techniques which may enable subordinates to participate in the process of creating alternatives and making decisions.

However, researchers in this field of study support the fact that the subordinates involvement in the decision making process often results in the most effective decisions. When subordinates feel that their ideas have been listened to and that they have contributed to the decision, then they are more likely to accept the decision and to execute it more effectively because it is developed by them rather than being imposed upon them by the manager. In this regard, participation is justified by a number of factors, including legitimacy effect, redistribution of power, provision of information, better use of skills and knowledge, openness of communication channels, training and learning aspects, improvement of morale and satisfaction, more confidence and more responsible attitudes, increasing the quality of the decisions, and accepting the reality of today's life. Despite the justification of a participative approach to managerial decision making, there are a number of barriers that may encounter the implementation of this approach, especially in the developing countries. Some of these barriers include management authority and prerogatives, data confidentiality, lack of responsible attitudes, lack of skills and interest, cost of time, complexity of the task, pressure from individuals and informal groups, traditional and cultural aspects, and misunderstanding or misuse of the participation concept.
Chapter Six describes the methodology and procedures used for this study. The methodology instrument consists of the use of a survey questionnaire to obtain empirical data from subordinate-managers currently employed in the main Saudi security educational institutes and centres. This is to identify their managerial decision-making styles, the degree of participation they may have in the decision making process and their understanding and attitudes towards the concept of participation and its techniques. The questionnaire was designed to answer the central research questions and test the hypotheses of this study. The chapter also identified the way in which the questionnaire forms were distributed and collected, the variables and factors affecting responses, the characteristics of the target sample, the sampling procedures, and the statistical tests and techniques used to carry out the analysis process of this study. Following collection of the questionnaires, the data was coded, verified and computerised to produce the highest attainable level of accuracy. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Extended Programme was used for the analysis of the responses.

Chapter Seven is devoted to the analysis and the findings of the data obtained from the questionnaire survey regarding the decision-making styles of the subject managers in the main Saudi security educational institutes and centres. It also examines the degree of their involvement in the stages of the process of making management decisions (programmed and non-programmed decisions). Finally, this chapter examines five of the major participative techniques that can be used to enable subordinate-managers to participate effectively in the decision-making process. The respondents were asked about their familiarity with, and practise, of these techniques and how useful they would be to them in their current jobs and organisations.
In brief, however, there are four general aims of this chapter. The first aim is to represent the characteristics of the low-level and high-level managers which may increase the reliability of both the responses and the study. The second aim is to examine the managerial decision-making styles of the sample managers according to the decision type (programmed an non-programmed), the third aim is to examine the degree of subordinates participation in the decision-making process for each type of decision and the final aim is to highlight five of the major techniques that may enable employees to participate effectively in the decision-making process. The Pearson correlation coefficient, the one-way ANOVA test, the Scheffé multiple comparison test, the parametric two samples T-test, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test, the Chi-Square and the Cramer's V tests, the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test and the cross-tabulation, frequency and percentage procedures were used to accomplish the analysis and the results shown in this chapter.

Chapter Eight is a continuing part of the survey questionnaire analysis and findings. The data of this chapter was collected for the purpose of soliciting the respondents' actual attitudes regarding the items of job-satisfaction and participative decision. It is an examination of the importance of participation in making managerial decisions. In short, this chapter has four general aims: firstly, to examine the differences between managers satisfaction in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres; secondly to identify the managers actual attitudes towards participative decisions and how they perceive Participative Management (PM); and thirdly to suggest decision-making styles and practices that may be appropriate for the Saudi public sector in general and the police sector in particular. The chapter then was finalised by an analysis of the open ended questions regarding the justification for and the barriers to the implementation of the participative decision-making approaches in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. The one-way ANOVA tests was used to identify statistical significance among different groups, whereas the Scheffé multiple comparison procedures used for the purpose of
identifying the differences in responses between each individual group. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was also used to distinguish the differences in responses for the items of two sample groups only, e.g. high-level and low-level managers.

Chapter Nine, the summary of findings and conclusions, outlines the major findings of the research project and offers policy recommendations together with suggestions for future research and studies.

9.2.1 The Evolution Of Participation In The Managerial Decision

The central research questions (Q. 1, 2 and 3) about the theoretical basis of management decisions and the development of the concept of participation in managerial decisions have been analysed through qualitative methods by describing, interpreting and analysing the related concepts and theories of the managerial decision making styles and practices (Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5). This is to determine how the understanding of such managerial development may help managers and subordinates to analyse decision problems, and how each approach has contributed to the development of the managerial decision-making process in general and the subordinates' participation in this process in particular. However, the survey and analysis of the literature in Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 showed the following conclusions:

1 Managerial decision making is an essential element of management. Several writers and theorists view decision making as synonymous with managing. Subordinates' participation in managerial decision making has frequently been recognised by many writers as an important motivating factor. To some, it is the answer to most human problems in decision making. They argue, that it motivates participants to accept more readily a decision and also implement it more effectively
as they feel that they are part of the process of making it (see Chapters 4 and 5 for more details).

2 Some of the managerial concepts and ideas which were considered to have been developed by twentieth century managerial theorists in fact existed and were practised by many ancient civilisations thousands of years ago. The ancient civilisations knew and practised similar concepts and ideas of modern management but not necessarily by name. Leadership, delegation, span of management, controlling, organising, and planning are managerial practices which can be found amongst the ancient civilisations. There were also hints that some ancient civilisations were aware of the importance of what is now known as managerial participation in the decision making process. This illustrate the idea of how ancient the concept of managerial participation in the decision-making is. In fact, we can think of this development as a simple and early attempts (hints) in the field of managerial participative decision. However, it is obvious that the military style dominates the practice of making decisions in this era (ancient civilisations) of management development.

3 The industrial revolution era and the twentieth-century's informational revolution created a new and complicated environment which produced a group of unpredictable and complex problems for management and also for the decision-making process. Before the twentieth-century, managerial problems were faced as they developed on the basis of trial and error because there were no previous examples or knowledge on which to base a decision. Prior to the end of the nineteenth century and into the beginning of the twentieth century, there was little systematic study and research into the evolution of management. These earlier attempts discussed some managerial concepts and principles such as organisational
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structure, the division of labour, and the importance of machinery to facilitate labour. This development began to create the necessary conditions for the systematic study of management. Therefore, the principles of management and decision-making began to be developed as a set of concepts and ideas and later on as written theories in the field of management thought. This development, also, introduced and developed the three major approaches of management (Classical, Neo-classical, and Modern approaches).

4 The Classical Management Approach emphasises the use of structures, regulations, principles, and physical and financial factors to management decision making. It focuses on the application of rational decisions so as to ensure predictable results, the selection of the one-best-way decision that would maximise the outcome, helps managers to perform and apply the universal formula of management's functions and principles. In general, this approach does not really encourage subordinates to participate fully in the decision-making process. But, by tracing the development of the theories of this approach, it is obvious that there is a general and slow movement in this direction. According to Weber's model, bureaucratic management is an orderly system that emphasises rules and regulations, hierarchical structure, legal authority and power, specialisation, impersonality, rationality, predictability, uniformity, and stability. Bureaucracy, as an ideal model, does not motivate subordinates to participate enthusiastically in the decision-making process. Its decisions are made through an orderly system of impersonal rules, regulations and procedures so as to ensure predictable results. Scientific Management Theory was work-oriented and saw the individuals as an extension of their machines. It concentrated on production, measurement, structure, and management effectiveness. It was concerned with the work itself, not upon the worker doing the work. In regard to the decision-making process, the Scientific Management Theory views individuals
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as rational and economic human beings who are capable of considering all decisions and options. Also of being able to select the one-best-decision and option that would maximise the output.\textsuperscript{13} It provides a logical method for analysing problems and for making decisions. The intention is to reduce the random factors, the use of the rule-of-thumb method, the use of the trial and error method, and of personality factors in the managerial decision-making process so as to achieve the best decisions leading to the greatest output. The Administrative Management Theory is a normative model which focuses on the formal structure of an organisation. It is also concerned with finding the one-best-way to achieve its objectives in order to solve managerial problems, and to make ideal decisions. In regard to the decision-making process, the Administrative Management Theory, as a normative model, focuses upon finding and practising the one best universal formula of management functions and principles in order to make ideal decisions, solve complex problems, and achieve objectives.\textsuperscript{14} In order to be a successful managerial decision-maker, Fayol believed that managers must understand the five basic functions of management and apply the Fourteenth managerial principles to them. These principles would guide the thinking of managers when resolving problems and making decisions. However, there are a few elements and principles of scientific management theory and administrative management theory that generally motivate managers and subordinates to interact with each other and as a result to participate in the decision-making process. For instance, co-operation, co-ordinating, initiative, and esprit de corps all, in one way or another, motivate and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to apply them successfully and to achieve their creative objectives.

5 The neo-classical management approach which is sometimes called the human relations movement emphasises the application of social need and human factors to management decision making. In general, this approach is worker-oriented. It focuses

\textsuperscript{13} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, pp. 52-53.
on the influence of subordinates' motivation, feeling, interaction, participation, and work groups in the decision-making process more than upon the influence of rules, regulations, and physical and financial factors in such a process. Moreover, neo-classical theorists challenged the economic person concept. So, rather than viewing workers as similar to each other and them only being motivated by economic incentives, they believed that workers are different from each other and are motivated by social, human, physical, financial, and many other factors and incentives.\textsuperscript{15} In regard to participation in the decision-making process, Hawthorne's researchers themselves were practising a sort of participative management by asking the workers for their feelings and opinions about their work group and responding positively to their answers. Vroom and Deci (1992) said, "the interpretation of the productivity increases at the Hawthorne plant as resulting from workers' participation in decision making would make the relay assembly room the birthplace of modern-day participative management."\textsuperscript{16} The work of the neo-classicists, however, encouraged managers to allow communication from the bottom-up, as well as from the top-down and to motivate subordinates to participate in the decision-making process to help them to eliminate conflict, minimise resistance to change, and achieve organisational goals.\textsuperscript{17}

6 The modern management approach emphasises the use of system analysis models, integrational and situational models, mathematical and quantitative models, and computer technology to management decision making. In general, the modern management approach is different from both the classical and neo-classical approaches in that it concentrates on the application of systematic analysis, the use of empirical research, and the integration of the other two management approaches with their internal and external environmental factors and forces. However, the focus of

\textsuperscript{15} Wren, D.A., 1994, p. 233.


attention in management has gradually shifted from the one-best-way approach and the fixed universal formula methods in making managerial decisions, to human, integrational, and situational methods in which subordinates have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{18} It, also, emphasises the improvement of the manager's decision-making abilities, the application of mathematical models, and the utilisation of sophisticated computer programs, all of which help to make the decision process easier and less expensive than ever before.\textsuperscript{19}

7 Successful decisions cannot be made by the use of a fixed formula or by ignoring the influence of human factors, technological inventions, resources available in the workplace, and environmental variables. The decision-makers should recognise, diagnose, and evaluate all the variables and factors involved in the decision making process, then choose the appropriate course of action. In general, this process makes it easier, faster and is less expensive for managers to analyse the huge amounts of data, enabling them to make timely, participative, and more accurate decisions. It gives them clear options and helps them to have a wider knowledge and a more complete understanding of situations and alternatives to apply to the decisions they have to deal with.

8 As it is impossible to control all the human errors resulting from the bias and emotive nature of the decision-body, the scientific method of decision making is probably one of the best methods available so as to limit the effects of such problems throughout the several stages that make up the decision-making process. The decision-making process is influenced by the size of the decision body. If the decision is taken by a single-decision-maker decision body, an autocratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will not participate effectively in the decision-making process. On the other hand, if the decision is taken by a multi-


\textsuperscript{19} Hodgetts, R.M., 1990, p. 75.
decision-maker decision body, a democratic decision making style is more likely to be implemented and subordinates will have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Therefore, it is obvious that the decision body plays an important part on the decision-making process (Chapter 4).

9 The decision-making process is presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core elements of the decision-making process. However, participation in the stages of the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. It is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction. Such participation will generate more ideas and more interests and help to accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives (see Figure 4.1 in Chapter 4). Generally, managerial decisions as a human activity are more likely to be effective if both managers and subordinates interact with each other, share the decision-making process, and understand the reasons for the final course of action. However, participation in the decision-making process is one of the ways that can help to enrich subordinates' understanding and acceptance of managerial decisions. In respect of this, it is important to allow and encourage subordinates to participate in the decision-making process in order to increase their commitment, motivation and satisfaction. Such participation generates more ideas and more interests and helps to accomplish the organisation's goals and objectives.

10 Participation in decision making has been frequently recognised, by many writers and analysts, as one of the important motivating factors in the field of management. Most of the writers and managers across managerial occupations define participation as a means of involving the relevant employees in the relevant decision making process. There is no universally accepted approach to the manager's choice
about how much and in what decisions or stages to involve subordinates in the
decision making process. It all depends upon the characteristics of the situation, the
individuals, and the decision itself. The attitudes, skills and enthusiasm of the
employees, both the subordinates and the managers, to participate are some of the
factors that may affect the degree of participation. The decision type, the level of
management, the techniques of participation, and the nature of the situation are also
some other factors that may affect the degree of participation in managerial decisions.
The aim is to give a greater commitment to organisational objectives and to increase
the effectiveness of decision making process. However, the degree and range of
subordinates' participation is a matter for debate but the concept and its importance
are agreed.

As a result of the growing importance of the participative decision making
approaches, several techniques and models have been developed which enable
subordinates to participate in the process of creating alternatives and making
decisions. However, they are not applicable for every situation nor every problems.
The type of decision, employees, objectives and surrounding environment are
important factors in choosing the appropriate techniques. However, Table 2.1 and
Figure 2.1 summarised the evolution of management participative decision
throughout the ancient and more recent civilisations’ history.

9.2.2 The Empirical Part Of The Study

A major difficulty facing the Saudi researcher is the scarcity of reliable data on the
participative decision-making approaches of the Saudi public sector in general and
the police sector in particular. There are just a few studies about decision-making
styles of Saudi managers and the degree to which they involve their subordinates in
the decision-making process. However, these studies were about government or
government and business organisations rather than police organisations and they
present contradictory findings about Saudi managerial decision making styles (see Section 7.3.3). Therefore, it is worthwhile to identify the managers' decision-making styles and techniques in the Saudi security educational organisations as well as to learn about their job-satisfaction and their attitudes towards participative decision making since they have frequently been criticised for having a bureaucratised decision-making process. As no comparative study on the issue of Participative Management (PM) in the Saudi police sector has come to the researcher's knowledge, the approach used in this study is mainly exploratory and descriptive in nature and takes, as a starting point, a number of questions and hypotheses on the current managerial situation of the Saudi security educational institutes and centres.

In order to answer these questions and hypotheses, a survey questionnaire has been conducted in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres in the Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia. This is to identify their managerial decision-making styles, the degree of participation they may have in the decision making process and their understanding and attitudes towards the concept of participation. Since participative techniques are associated with managerial decisions, this study investigated five of the major participative decision making techniques (conference, committee, brainstorming, nominal groups, and the Delphi technique) to identify how familiar the respondents are with them and what their opinions are towards their usefulness to their current positions and organisations.

However, this study utilises the survey questionnaire technique in accordance with the procedures and guidelines described by de Vaus (1993). The questionnaire was designed to include major areas of the subject under investigation and to cover a wide spectrum of issues essential in testing the study hypotheses and in answering the questions raised. All the important and relevant factors in designing a questionnaire were taken into account and careful consideration was given to the
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20 For more details see de Vaus, D.A., 1993, pp. 80-105.
wording of the items of this instrument to avoid ambiguity and ensure consistency. It was attractively presented to facilitate ease of response, especially as it was composed of a reasonable number of questions. Data were treated confidentially and participants were promised that their names or titles would not be mentioned. It was felt that such measures would eliminate any threat to the participants that might jeopardise anonymity and cause bias in their responses. The questionnaire was also divided into sections informing the participants of the nature of information requested. This was done in order to encourage and motivate the participants to continue and complete answering the questions. Moreover, as little specialist terminology as possible have been used and most of the questions were close-ended, in view of the advantages usually associated with this type of questions. The close-ended questions require little active input, such as a Yes/No or a tick of the appropriate box. They also ensure greater co-operation on the part of the participants. In this regard, responses were measured by either ticking the appropriate box on power-sharing continuum scale for some questions, and on Likert-type scale for the other type of questions. Some yes/no questions were also used. The rating scale questions were used to improve flexibility for the participants and to ensure that there was a possible variation in scores for every item or question asked. However, a few open-ended questions were necessary because they would enable participants to give some of their impressions, and to express their answers in more than a statement, an advantage that most rating scale questions do not provide (see Sections II and III in Appendix B).

Of the total of 340 questionnaires which were distributed 248 questionnaires were returned to the researcher. This gave us a response rate of 73 percent of the sample and 63 percent of the total population. The main reasons for the non-response were that the managers were too busy or the subject was too sensitive. However, forty six (46) copies of the responses were excluded because of their incompleteness, incorrectness, inadequateness, and/or unrepresentativeness. Therefore, the final sub-
total of the responses that are regarded as complete and to be included for the data analysis is two hundred and two (202) copies, which represent 59% response rate of the sample and 51% of the total population. Although a careful analysis of the unusable questionnaire forms was not conducted, it was observed that the questions which were avoided or partially answered were directly related to the questions or statements relating to the superior of the respondent. For example, Questions 22, 63 and 64 of the excluded questionnaire forms were only partially answered or not answered at all.

The data collected for this study were coded and then transcribed into a personal computer for compilation and statistical analysis. The questionnaire items were edited and coded, using a COBOL coding form for the purpose of computer processing and for producing the highest attainable level of accuracy. The statistical analysis was carried out on a personal computer, using the latest versions of SPSS for Windows (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The data was analysed through the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis of the data was performed by using frequency distribution of several items of the questionnaire in order to provide answers to the research central questions, clarify some points or arguments, and summarise patterns in the responses of the sample managers. Inferential analysis of the data was carried out by testing the research hypotheses through the use of several statistical tests. In this regard, means, standard deviations, correlation and frequency distributions were used. The open-ended questions were analysed and classified qualitatively according to the frequencies of their mentioning, and percentage of respondents.

In short, the data analysis shows that more than 77.0 percent hold at least a university degree, 85.6 percent have received training of more than one years duration as maximum to less than four months as minimum, and 74.7 percent are between the

---

ages 30 to 50 years. In addition, the survey data shows that almost 47.0 percent had 6 to more than 15 years experience in management positions, while more than 86.0 percent had 1 to 15 years of managerial experience. Furthermore, the data distribution shows a variety in the sources of education, training and field study backgrounds. The above data suggest that the respondents are more rational and familiar with the enquiries and to be more familiar with the subject of this study, which enables them to judge the subject matter and answer the questionnaire more fairly. Such data, therefore, increases confidence in their responses and as a result increases the validity and reliability of the present study.

Table 9.1 Summary of Hypotheses' Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Fully Confirmed</th>
<th>Partially Confirmed</th>
<th>Not Confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 3A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 3B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 3C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis # 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.1 summarises the findings of the hypotheses. The findings provide insight into what is required before an organisation implements the managerial participative decision making approach based on a review of published literature and an analysis of the empirical data. However, the findings regarding each hypothesis of this research will be discussed, interpreted and evaluated in more details in the following sections:

9.2.2.1 The Respondent' Predominant Decision Making Style
(Hypotheses 1 and 2)

It is clear from the data analysis that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were utilised by the respondents on all the presented decisions. Taking all the decisions (Q.12-21) as one group, the predominant decision-making style of the sample managers is the semi-autocratic decision-making style (30.1%) compared to the joint decision-making style (20.0%), consultative style (17.6%), semi-consultative style (16.2%), and autocratic style (16.2%). Taking the decisions' categories independently, the results indicated that the non-programmed decisions (Q.12 - Q.16) have been made by the joint decision-making style (26.8%) more than the other decision-making styles. However, the consultative style (23.0%) came in the next order. The semi-autocratic, the semi-consultative and the autocratic styles were shown to have less importance in terms of the non-programmed decisions, 21.8%, 18.6% and 9.8% respectively (see Figure 7.3). This seems to suggest that the joint decision-making style (GII) is the dominant style in the non-programmed decisions category. Such results indicate that the managers allow their subordinate(s) to participate in the non-programmed decisions and to have more influence on the outcome of these decisions. In terms of the programmed decisions category (Q.17 - Q.21), the dominant style is the semi-autocratic style (38.4%) compared to the other styles. However, the next most used style is the autocratic style (22.5%) followed by the semi-consultative style (13.7%), while the joint decision-making style (13.2%) and the consultative style (12.2%) are used less often (see Figure 7.3). Therefore, the
consultative style (CII) and the joint decision-making style (GII) were shown to have less importance in terms of programmed decisions, 12.2% and 13.2% respectively. The semi-autocratic style (AII) and the autocratic style (AI) were used on a large scale, 38.4% and 22.5% respectively. For the above results, Hypothesis 1, which stated that the dominant decision-making style of the respondents is the semi-consultative style (CI), is disproved. In general, such percentages tend to support the claim that the decision making styles in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres are not participative. However, this result seems to disagree with Alshalan (1991) that the consultative style is the actual and the ideal predominately decision making style of the Saudi public managers, but it also concurs with Malaika (1993) that Saudi managers are highly authoritarian in their decision making style. One possible explanation for such differences may be attributed to the fact that the respondents of our sample are managers with a military background. They are police officers and may be affected by an authoritarian environment and organisations (see Section 7.3.3 for more details).

Based on the continuum power-sharing scale which was discussed in more details in Chapter 7, the decisions' mean scores were conducted. Thus, a high score indicates that a manager allows his subordinate(s) to share his decision-making power, thereby increasing the influence of his subordinate(s) on the outcome of the decision. In comparison, a low score implies a lower degree of subordinate participation and, consequently, more manager control over the outcome of the decision. Taking these decisions independently the results indicate that the non-programmed decisions have the biggest participation mean scores, while the mean scores of the programmed decisions are the lowest (Table 7.15). The decisions about planning (Q.12) and re-organising (Q.15), for example, achieved the highest mean scores, 3.589 and 3.428 respectively, while the decisions about promoting (Q.19) or transferring an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Q.20), have the lowest mean scores, 2.164 and 2.358 respectively. It is obvious from the results that the total mean score
of the non-programmed decisions (3.351) is more than the total mean score of the programmed decisions (2.549). This suggests that the managers allow their subordinates to share their non-programmed decision-making power, thereby increasing the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the non-programmed decisions. On the other hand, the managers take more control over the programmed decisions, thereby decreasing the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the programmed decisions. Such results are consistent with the literature and support the proposition of Hypothesis 2 which assumed that non-programmed decisions are more participative than the programmed decisions (see Sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 for more details).

A possible explanation for such results may be attributed to the fact that the non-programmed decisions are more complex, unique, poorly structured and uncertain of outcome. Because of their relative ambiguity and complexity, these decisions usually require more information than one individual has. Furthermore, non-programmed decisions usually have critical results that may affect the whole workforce and organisation. On the other hand, programmed decisions are usually repetitive, well structured, clear and can be handled with a high degree of certainty. The information is more available and the rules are already established for the managers to follow. It is also possible to argue that managers in this type of decision, especially in developing countries, do not want to sacrifice their leadership power which usually gives them control over others and a more prestigious status in their organisation. Therefor, the managers allow their subordinates more influence in the non-programmed decisions and less influence in the programmed decisions.

However, the managerial decision-making styles of the non-programmed decisions and the programmed decisions can be summarised as follows:
1. Table 7.13 indicates that the five decision-making styles (AI, AII, CI, CII and GII) were utilised on all decisions. This emphases the argument that managers rarely employ only one decision-making style irrespective of the type and nature of the decisions. This result concur with the literature review presented in Chapters 2 and 3.

2. It is also clear from Table 7.13 and Figure 7.2 that the semi-autocratic style (30.1%) was predominantly employed by the respondents for this specific set of questions. Therefore, Hypothesis 1, which assumed that the dominant decision-making style of the sample managers is the semi-consultative style (CI), is disproved.

3. The non-programmed decisions were most often made by the joint decision-making style (26.8%) followed by the consultative style (23.0%) in the next order (see Figure 7.3). The programmed decisions were most often done by the semi-autocratic style (38.4%) followed by the autocratic style (22.5%). Furthermore, the total mean scores of these two types of decision (non-programmed and programmed) were 3.351 and 2.549 respectively (see Table 7.15). For these reasons, Hypothesis 2, which stated that non-programmed decisions are more participative than programmed decisions is supported.

4. The autocratic style (AI) has 9.8% in the total of all non-programmed decisions, whereas it has 22.5% in the total of all programmed decisions (Table 7.13). This indicates that the managers tend to use less autocratic styles in making non-programmed decisions.

5. The semi-autocratic style (AII) has 21.8% in the non-programmed decisions category whereas it has 38.4% in the programmed decisions category. This means that the sample tends to use the more autocratic style with the
programmed decisions than with the non-programmed decisions (see Figure 7.3). However, this style was predominantly employed by the managers for each one of the programmed decisions (see Table 7.13).

6. The semi-consultative style (CI) has 18.6% in the non-programmed decisions category whereas it has only 13.7% in the programmed decisions category (Table 7.13). This seems to suggest that the managers allow their subordinates more influence in the non-programmed decisions and less influence in the programmed decisions.

7. The consultative style (CII) has 23.0% in the non-programmed decisions category while it has 12.2% in the programmed decisions category (Table 7.13). This indicates that the sample managers are more consultative in their non-programmed decisions than in their programmed decisions.

8. The joint decision-making style (GII) has 26.8% in the non-programmed decisions category while it has 13.2% in the programmed decisions category. This seems to suggest that the managers tend to increase the participation and the influence of their subordinates on the outcome of the non-programmed decisions and to take control over the outcome of the programmed decisions. However, this style is the one most often used with the non-programmed decisions category (Table 7.13).

9.2.2.2 The Scientific Method and the Degree Of Subordinate-managers' Involvement In Its Process (Hypotheses 3A, 3B and 3C)

As stated earlier in Chapter 4, managers can use one, or a combination of methods to make their managerial decisions. However, the scientific method of decision making is probably one of the best methods available so as to limit the effects of the human
errors and bias. The scientific method involves an orderly process that comprises several stages. These stages were presented by different models and in various forms. Although there is a lack of agreement amongst researchers on the exact number of stages, it appears that they have agreed on the core stages of the decision-making process. The adapted model presented in Figure 4.1 was used in this study.

When cross-tabulating the decision-making methods (Question 24) by the managers' level of education (Question 4), it was found that the highest percentage (69.4%) who use scientific management are managers with a high level of education (Ph.D. and Master). The differences between the observed figures seem to indicate that a manager's level of education affects his decision-making methods (see Table 7.23). To assess the observed relationship, we computed the expected relationship between the level of education and decision-making methods (see Table 7.24). The results seem to indicate that there is an association between manager's level of education and the scientific decision-making approach. The managers who are highly educated implement the scientific decision-making approach more than those who are not. The results also indicate that none of the expected frequencies is less than 1, or more than 20% are less than 5. Therefore, the prescribed minimum requirements for the valid use of Chi-square have been fulfilled. In order to measure the significance level of this association the Chi-Square and the Cramer's V correlation co-efficient statistics procedures were conducted and it was found that $P = .0374$. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation coefficient between the two variables at .05 level and an observed relationship reflects a similar relationship in the population rather than arising from sampling error. Furthermore, the Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric test was also computed. This test indicates significant differences between the groups of educational level ($p < .05$). For all the above reasons, Hypothesis 3A, which stated that highly educated managers implement the scientific decision-making approach than those who are not, is supported.
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As stated previously in Chapter 4, and as it is mapped in Figure 4.1, the decision-making process deals with two types of managerial decisions which are programmed and non-programmed decisions. They share the first three and the last three stages of the decision-making process.

In terms of the stages of making programmed decisions, the T-test detected that high-level managers participated most in Stage 1 (observation), and more in stage 2 (recognising and diagnosing the problem) than in stage 3 (setting objectives and determining the type of decision to be taken). Participation in stages 4, 6 and 7 continued to decrease with a significant difference between the two position groups. However, stage 5 (choosing the final course of action) had significantly the lowest participation mean score. The total participation mean scores for the seven stages were also significantly different at .05 level (see Table 7.25). Furthermore, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test was also conducted to show the effects and interaction between these two factors. This measure confirms the patterns that were displayed in Table 7.25 and Figure 7.4: the stages and position levels both have significant main effects and the interaction between the them is also significant (see Table 7.26). Therefore, Hypothesis 3B, which stated that participation of upper-level managers in the process of making programmed decision decreases with each advance stage of the process, is statistically supported.

Turning to the stages of making non-programmed decisions, the T-test detected that high-level managers' participation in each stage of the non-programmed decision type process is significantly greater than low-level managers' participation (see Table 7.27 and Figure 7.5). The results further show that low-level managers participated most in stage 1 (observing the problem) and more in stage 2 (recognising and defining the problem) than in stage 3 (setting objectives and determining the decision type). However, participation in stages 4, 5, 7 and 8 continued to decrease with a
significant difference between groups totally and independently. Stage 6 (choosing the final course of action) had the lowest participation mean score among the eight stages with a significant difference between the two levels of management position (p = .000). Furthermore, the Repeated-Measure ANOVA test was also conducted to display the effects and interaction between these two factors. This test strongly confirms the above results and patterns that were discernible in Table 7.27 and Figure 7.5: the stages and position factors both have significant main effects and interaction between the factors is also significant (see Table 7.28). Therefore, Hypothesis 3C, which stated that the lower-level managers' participation in the process of making non-programmed decisions is decreased with each advance stage of the process, is supported.

However, what is interesting is that the choice stage (5 in the programmed decision and 6 in the non-programmed decision) achieved the lowest participation mean score for each level of management and in each type of decision. One alternative explanation is the possibility of superiors' intervention in this critical stage of the decision-making process which influence subordinate-managers to degrade their participation scores. Mondy et al (1990) and Van de Van and Delbecq (1971) argued that some managers with strong personalities who occupy high-level managerial positions might dominate the decision-making process, causing less insistent and lower-level managers to go along with them. Another possible explanation is the fact that some managers avoid responsibility and therefore do not want to be involved in this stage (choosing the final course of action) which is one of the important and critical stages. They might feel it is so much easier to let the final decision be made by others and criticise management for its failure than to participate in making the decision and taking the responsibility for it. Finally, it is also possible that some members of the decision-making body or the internal pressure groups influence the discussion and drive the final decision the way they
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want regardless of other participants opinions. Such situations, however, exist in most developing countries including Saudi Arabia. These types of problem will limit the effectiveness of participation, empty this concept of its real meaning, and discourage other subordinates to be involved in the process. Therefore, management should be aware of such problems and must encourage its employees (managers and subordinates) to overcome these problems and to participate effectively in the decision-making process.

9.2.2.3 The Impact Of The Personal Variables (Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9)

Data were collected on a variety of independent variables such as the job position, education, study in the West, span of management, managerial experience, and period of training. The intention here is to find out how much of the variance in the managers decision styles can be explained, and to which variable(s) it can be attributed. Each variable has been measured by using the weighted mean of participation based on the assumptions of the power-sharing continuum scale. The study showed that there are differences between the means of the total participation and the different levels of the non-programmed and programmed decisions categories. The Pearson correlation coefficient, the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the Scheffé multiple comparison tests were used in this regard. This process was accomplished by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program as follows:

1 In terms of the non-programmed decisions, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed no significant relation between the span of management and the total participation mean score. Also, the ANOVA showed there is no significant difference between the level of managerial span and the total participation for the non-programmed decisions, F(2,199) = 1.08, p > .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 4,
which stated that the managers with a wide span of management are more participative in their decision-making style than those with a small span of management, is not supported in terms of the non-programmed decisions. In terms of the programmed decisions, this hypothesis is not supported either because there is no significant difference between level of management span and the total participation score according to ANOVA, \( F(2,199) = .27, p > .05 \). Also, the Pearson correlation coefficient was shown to be insignificant at the .05 level. Furthermore, this hypothesis is not approved either when dealing with all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category because there is no significant difference between the span of management and the total participation for all decisions according to ANOVA, \( F(2,199) = .31, p > .05 \). The Pearson correlation coefficient was also not significant in this regard at the .05 level. However, what is interesting in this analysis is that the managers with a small span of management (< 15 subordinates) seem to be more participative in their decision-making style than those with a large span of management (> 50 subordinates). This result is contrary to the literature which argues that the span of management is one of the important factors that may affect the degree of subordinates' participation in management decisions. However, one can only speculate that such contradiction may be attributed to the influence of some other independent variables such as educational qualification, period of training, managerial experience, country of higher education, and personal values and tradition. Another probable explanation is also the fact that the police sector in Saudi Arabia is highly influenced by the military rules, procedures and regulations.

2 The high-level managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres are those who occupy department, general department or equivalent positions. They usually have a wider span of management and a large number of responsibilities. For this reason, their participation mean score was expected to be high compared to the lower-level positions. In the non-programmed decisions
category, the total participation mean scores show that the high-level managers are more participating in their decision-making style than the low-level managers (3.7 and 3.1 respectively). The Pearson correlation coefficient between management positions and the total participation score (3.3) is significant at .001 level. Also, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed significant differences between low-level and high-level managers in the total participation mean score, F (1,199) = 11.83, p < .001 level. Furthermore, F-value of each one of the non-programmed decisions are significant; Question 12 at level .05, Question 13 at level .01, Question 14 at level .05, Question 15 at level .05 and Question 16 at level .001. However, the decision to develop a new plan (Question 12) and the decision to re-organise the manager's department (Question 15) seem to achieve the highest degree of participation (3.6 and 3.4 respectively). A possible explanation is that such non-programmed decisions are more complex, uncertain of the outcome, unstructured, strategic and the managers need more ideas and information, thereby asking for their subordinates' involvement. Turning to the programmed decisions category, the study showed that high-level managers are also more participative than low-level managers in all the five programmed decisions, independently and jointly. The Pearson correlation coefficient between managerial position and the total participation is significant at .001 level and the ANOVA test also showed there was a significant difference between the low-level managers and the high-level managers in the total participation, F(1,199) = 20.40, p < .001 level. Furthermore, all the F-values of the programmed decisions are significant; Question 17 at level .05, Question 18 at level .05, Question 19 at level .001, Question 20 at level .001, and Question 21 at level .01. However, the decision to promote an employee who works in the department of a subordinate (Question 19) seems to be the least participatory decision (2.2). A possible explanation is that such decision, is repetitive, unambiguous and certain of outcome. The managers need file information and reports rather than opinions or judgement. They may also have to follow ready established rules and procedures to make such decisions. In terms of categorising all managerial decisions (programmed
and non-programmed) as one category, the result indicated that there are also
significant differences between the level of management and the total participation
of all the decisions according to ANOVA, $F(1,199) = 19.48, p < .001$ level.
However, the Pearson correlation coefficient was also shown to be significant in this
regard at the .001 level. For all the above results, **Hypothesis 5**, which stated that the
high-level manager is more participatory in his decision-making style than the low-
level manager, is supported.

3 In terms of the non-programmed decisions, there is no significant difference
between the levels of education and the total participation according to ANOVA, $F$
$(3,198) = 1.53, p > .05$, even though the correlation coefficient was shown to be
significant at .05 level. For this reason, Hypothesis 6, which stated that the more
educated the manager the more participative his decision making style, is not
significantly supported. However, even though this result is not statistically
significant, the highly educated groups (Master and Ph.D.) seem to be more
participatory in their decision-making styles compared with the other groups. The
total participation mean score of the Ph.D. and Master groups is 3.8 and 3.6
respectively, whereas the total score of the university and under university groups is
3.3 and 3.2 respectively. However, in the programmed decisions category, the study
showed that highly educated managers (Ph.D. and Master) are more participative in
their decision-making style compared to the other two groups (university and under
university). The Pearson correlation coefficient between the level of education and
the total participation is significant at .05 level and the ANOVA also showed there
was a significant difference between the groups and the total participation, $F(3,198)
= 3.42, p < .05$ level. Therefore, **Hypothesis 6** is supported in this type of decisions.
However, the Scheffé multiple comparison test also showed that the group with a
Ph.D. degree of education had a significantly higher mean (3.4) than the group with
below university education (2.5). Finally, in terms of dealing with all the managerial
decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category, the study found that
the highly educated groups are more participative in their decision-making styles than the other groups. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was again supported because there is a significant difference between level of education and the total participation score of all decisions according to ANOVA, (F 3,198) = 2.69, p < .05 level. The Pearson correlation coefficient was also shown to be significant at the .05 level. A possible explanation is the fact that highly educated managers may have had the opportunity to learn about and practise Participative Management (PM) and believe in its benefits for the whole organisation, so they involve, to a greater degree, their subordinates in management activities and decisions.

4 The data analysis indicated that managers who graduated from Western universities tend to share more of their power with subordinates when compared to the other group of managers in all the programmed and non-programmed decisions. Let us start with the non-programmed decisions category. The data showed that managers who studied in the West had higher participation mean scores than those who did not (3.9 and 3.2 respectively). However, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed a significant relationship between the independent variable (studying in the West) and total participation score of the dependent variables (non-programmed decisions) at .01 level. The ANOVA also showed a significant variation between the two groups in the total participation, F(1,200) = 8.73, p < .01. Turning to the programmed decisions category, the study found that the group of managers who have studied in the West have higher participation scores than those who have studied only in the Saudi universities (3.1 and 2.4 respectively). The Pearson correlation coefficient showed significant correlation between the independent variable (studying in the West) and total participation of the dependent variables (programmed decisions) at .001 level. The ANOVA also indicated a significant difference between the two groups in the total participation of this category, F(1,200) = 15.65, p < .001 level. Furthermore, in regard to all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category, the study also found that managers who studied
in the West tend to share more of their decision-making power with subordinates when compared to the other managers' group (3.5 and 2.8 respectively). The Pearson correlation coefficient showed significant correlation at .001 level and the ANOVA also showed there was a significant variation between the two groups in the total score of participation, $F(1,200) = 14.61, p < .001$. For all of these reasons, Hypothesis 7, which stated that the managers who received their higher educational studies at Western universities are more participative in their decision-making style than those who did not, is proved. An alternative explanation for these results may be attributed to the fact that in Western universities there are more opportunities for students to learn about Participative Management (PM) approaches from theoretical and practical perspectives. Therefore, they may be influenced by their educational background and by the concept and practice of participative management. On the other hand, it should be noted that not all employees are equally interested in participation. The traditional and organisational values of the managers may negatively affect their decision-making styles. If employees have been raised in a non-participative culture and learnt to function autocratically, there will be a great deal of resistance to the introduction of participation and to the involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process. However, it is possible also that our sample was influenced by their organisational background as police officers in police organisations.

5 The study found that the managers who had more than one year's period of training had the highest total participation mean score (3.8) among the training groups in the non-programmed decisions category. On the other hand, the lowest total participation mean score in the same category (2.7) went to those managers with no training. The Pearson correlation coefficient for all the non-programmed decisions was significant at .001 level and also the ANOVA showed significant differences between the period of training and the total degree of participation, $F(3,198 = 6.08, p < .001$. Furthermore, the Scheffé multiple comparison test
showed that Group 3 (4-12 months) and Group 4 (> 1 year), which have the highest total participation scores (3.4 and 3.8 respectively), are significantly different from Group 1 (no training) which has the lowest total participation score (2.7). For all these reasons, Hypothesis 8, which stated that managers who have managerial training qualifications are more participative in their decision-making style than those who are not, is supported in terms of the non-programmed decisions. In terms of the programmed decisions, the results seem to indicate that there are differences between the total participation mean scores and the training groups. As the period of training is increased, the responses become more participative. But, statistically there was no significant difference between the period of managerial training and the total participation according to ANOVA, $F(3,198) = 2.23$, $p > .05$, even though the correlation coefficient was shown to be significant at .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 is not significantly supported in terms of programmed decisions category. Nevertheless the ANOVA showed that there is a significant difference between the training groups and the degree of participation regarding the decision to increase the number of employees who work in the department of a subordinate (Question 18), $F(3,198) = 3.47$, $p < .05$ level. The Pearson correlation coefficient is also significant in this regard. Finally, when all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) were computed and re-tested as one category, the Pearson correlation coefficient was significant at .001 level and also the ANOVA showed significant differences between the training groups and the total participation of all the decisions as one category, $F(3,198) = 5.08$, $p < .01$ level. For this reason, Hypothesis 8 is supported accordingly. A possible explanation for the above results is that those managers with more years of managerial training had a greater understanding, skills and knowledge in developing their subordinates by giving them the opportunity to participate in management activities and complex decisions (non-programmed). It can also be said that those who did not attend any training programme will be less convinced of the key role of the participative management styles.
The study found that the total participation score for all the decisions (programmed and non-programmed) as one category indicated that the least experienced group (< 1 year) is the most participative one (3.1 mean) compared to the other groups. Furthermore, the ANOVA showed that the difference between the groups is not significant at .05 level. The ANOVA also showed no significant difference between the periods of managerial experience and the total participation related to each category of decisions (programmed or non-programmed) independently. Therefore, Hypothesis 9, which stated that the more experienced the manager is, the more participative his decision-making style would be, is not supported. However, even though there is no statistically significant difference between groups, the managers with the least experience (< 1 year of managerial experience) seem to be the more participative group in the non-programmed decisions, but not in the programmed decisions. One probable explanation is that the less experienced managers lack the knowledge and the skills to handle the non-programmed decisions as they are complex and uncertain of outcome, so they rely on their experienced subordinates to help them in making such non-programmed decisions. However, in regard to the programmed decisions, the less experienced managers may feel that these decisions are well structured, clear and certain of outcome, so they make these decisions with the minimum participation of their subordinates.

9.2.2.4 Respondents' Attitudes Towards The Items Of Job-Satisfaction And Participative Decisions (Hypothesis 10)

As indicated in the first chapter, managers are the key area to be studied. Therefore, it is worthwhile to describe and understand the degree of satisfaction the respondents have towards their current jobs and how they perceive PM and respond to its fundamental statements or items. This, however, to explore any barriers or justifications of PM, establish new basis for successful participation and prepare
Saudi managers to work in participative and effective environment in the foreseen future. However, it was hypothesised that the managers’ job-satisfaction and their perceptions of participation in making managerial decisions would tend to vary with age, qualification, position, span of management, experience, and country of higher education (Hypothesis 10). Such variations within and between the different items of PM and job-satisfaction were analysed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program. The one-way ANOVA test was used for measuring the statistical significance among the several group means, whereas the Scheffé multiple comparison test was conducted to give a conservative estimate of group means which are significantly different from one another. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was also used for measuring and comparing the central location of the sample divided into two groups. The findings of this process was summarised as follows:

1. It was assumed that the managers' job-satisfaction and their perceptions of participation in making managerial decisions would tend to vary with age. In particular, older managers were expected to be satisfied with their current jobs and to rate participative items higher than the other groups, because older managers would have more experience and be more aware of the benefits of participation on account of their long period of management practices. In terms of job-satisfaction items, the study found that older managers were less satisfied in their current jobs. Younger managers seem to enjoy their current jobs and to have the opportunity to use their own judgement and to try out some of their own ideas. Such results, however, disprove our assumption that older managers are more satisfied in their current jobs than younger managers. Turning to the participative decision items, the study found that older managers groups significantly rated most of the participative items higher than the young managers groups. The significant results indicated that there was a tendency for respondents in the mature managers group to score higher than respondents in the young managers group regarding participative items. This supports our assumption that mature managers are more willing to participate in their
decisions than young managers and tend to prefer that participative decision-making styles be employed in their current organisations. This seems to indicate that mature managers have a positive attitude towards PM in general and participative decision making in particular and are aware of their importance.

However, one possible explanation for the above results may be attributed to the fact that older managers usually occupy high-level managerial positions. The satisfaction of high-level managers is more often to be affected by their participation in the decision making process. The literature indicates that participation in decision making appears to have a direct and immediate effect on employee morale and can lead to higher job satisfaction. However, this explanation was supported by the results in Section 8.5 of Chapter 8. Another possible explanation for such differences may also be attributed to the possibility that some top management members, especially in the developing countries, tend to cover the skills and abilities of the motivated mature managers who work under their supervision. They may avoid involving them in management activities and encourage younger managers to participate since they pose no danger of taking over their positions in the foreseeable future. This highlights the need to encourage and support the implementation of the participative decision making approaches in the Saudi management organisations. Top management members need to understand that participation management approaches are increasingly being considered as a major factor of success or failure in today's organisations.

The level of education was assumed to have a strong impact on items regarding managers' job-satisfaction and their actual attitudes towards participative decisions. In particular, postgraduate managers were hypothesised to be satisfied with their current jobs and to rate participative items higher than the other groups, because highly educated managers would have more knowledge and be more aware of the importance of participation in making managerial decisions. Cressey et al
(1988) pointed out that, "The growth of education and diffusion of information in the society are other factors which will enhance the capacity and desire of larger sections of working population to be involved and will consequently increase the chances of participation." Therefore, it is worthwhile to analyse managers' responses to these items according to their level of education.

However, the results of the satisfaction items that were confirmed as statistically significant at 0.05 level or less seem to disprove the hypothesis that highly educated managers (PhD and Master) will rate their responses towards job-satisfaction items higher than those with below university qualifications. The responses in Table 8.13 showed that there is a tendency for scores in each of these items to be significantly higher in the graduate and undergraduate managers groups than in the postgraduate managers group. On the other hand, the results of the participative decision items that were confirmed as statistically significant at 0.05 level or less support the hypothesis that highly educated managers (PhD and Master) will rate their responses towards participative decision items higher than those with below university qualifications. Table 8.15 showed that managers with higher education (Master and PhD) had the highest mean score in all these items, while managers with below university degree had the lowest score. One explanation for postgraduate managers having the lowest satisfaction mean score is the possibility that they were not satisfied enough by the degree of participation they have in the decision making process in their current job. Another alternative explanation is that managers who hold either MA or a PhD may feel that their superiors are controlling them and preventing them from getting ahead and taking part in real management activities because of the fear that the educated managers may take their place in the future. However, in developing countries it is common to find such confrontation between managerial levels. Therefore, today's organisations need to understand that they must practise participative decision making policies and procedures if they are to

achieve their goals and objectives successfully. The literature indicated that participative decision making approaches are important to help managers (whatever their level of education) to handle their jobs effectively and cope with unexpected events in the future. In addition, managers would benefit from participation because individual ability alone does not determine success in a different situation. Participation enables individuals (managers and subordinates) to adapt more rapidly to new decisions, become more effective, and have satisfactory attitudes towards their jobs and organisation. However, it is worthwhile for managers with low mean scores to be encouraged and given the opportunity to participate effectively in management decisions and activities. This will increase their knowledge, develop their skills, and prepare them for future events and positions.

3 It was assumed that there will be statistically significant differences between high-level and low-level managers regarding the degree of job-satisfaction and the importance of participation in making managerial decisions. In other words, it was hypothesised that managers in high-level positions would rate job-satisfaction and participative decision items higher than managers in low-level management positions. The reasons for such an assumption is that most of the high-level managers in Saudi Arabia have been working in their organisations for a long period of time. This suggests that high level managers may be more experienced and have more knowledge than the other groups. This experience and knowledge may increase the probability of more satisfaction and participative decision-making styles. However, instead of low-level managers scoring lower than their high-level counterparts on the items of job-satisfaction, the results in Table 8.16 indicated that they actually scored significantly higher. This result disproved our hypothesis that high-level managers would respond more positively to the items of job-satisfaction than the low-level managers. In terms of the participative decision items, the results in Table 8.21 showed that the difference between the two groups confirmed that high-level managers are much more aware of the importance of and the need for
subordinates' involvement in management activities and decision making than low-level managers. This supports our hypothesis that high-level managers have more tendency and positive attitude towards participative decisions than low-level managers. Therefore, it is worthwhile for top management in the Saudi security educational institutes to motivate this trend and give high-level managers the opportunity to develop such participative approaches in their organisations. The involvement of employees in the decision making process retains and increases the opportunity of more employees' co-operation and satisfaction. In a growing number of organisations, the participation approach is seen as an important factor for success and development. It is to the benefit of all concerned (management and employees). However, there are three possible explanations for the above results: first, low-level managers are usually less sensitive in asking for more participation and involvement in the decision making process. In comparison, high-level managers are more critical in asking for more managerial privileges and this may affect their degree of satisfaction and attitudes towards participation. Finally, the satisfaction of high-level managers, especially General Department managers, may be affected by the existence of an unstable relationship with top management members. In this regard, three items of the survey questionnaire (Q49, Q63 and Q64) were designed to examine the relationship between respondents and their superiors. The results of these three items reflected the existence of an unstable relationship between general department managers and top management members (see Section 8.5.1 in Chapter 8 for more details).

4 The span of management was hypothesised to have a strong impact on items regarding managers' job-satisfaction and their actual attitudes towards participative decisions. In particular, managers with a large span of management will rate job-satisfaction and participative decision items higher than those managers with a small span. The results in Table 8.25 and Table 8.27 showed that managers who supervise

---

a large number of employees scored significantly higher than the other two groups for these items. Therefore, the results supported our hypothesis that managers with a large span of management are more satisfied in their current jobs and in favour of participative decisions than those managers with a small span of management.

One alternative explanation to these high positive attitudes towards participative decision items is that the managers may be driven by their thirst and eagerness for participation in management activities. Another explanation may be attributed to the fact that the decision making capacity of managers with a wide span is more likely to be overloaded. The literature suggests that the manager's decision making capacity is more likely to be overloaded as the ambiguity and heterogeneity of tasks done by the employees increases, as their dispersion from the manager increases communication difficulties, as the amount of any extraneous duties undertaken by the manager increases, and as the interdependence between the work of the employees increases.\footnote{Moorhead and Griffin (1992) write, "A manager who has a small span of control can maintain close control over the workers and stay in contact with daily operations. If the span of control is large, close control is not possible."} Managerial experience is very important to the success of management and plays an essential role in the overall PM programs and their implementation. The awareness of the importance of the PM approach and its functions and practices in the organisation are likely to correlate to the years spent in the job by experienced managers. It was hypothesised that the highly experienced managers rate their responses towards job-satisfaction and participative decision items higher than those with less years of management experience. In terms of job-satisfaction items, this assumption was significantly disproved as those managers who had more than 15 years experience had the lowest mean score. However, it was interesting to note that

\footnote{Butler, R., 1991, p. 69.}
\footnote{Moorhead, G. and R.W. Griffin, 1992, p. 535.}
managers with more than 15 years of management experience scored lower than those with less than 6 years experience and that those with 6 to 15 years managerial experience scored higher than these two groups with regard to job-satisfaction items (see Table 8.30). An alternative explanation for such results may be attributed to the fact that some of the top management members, especially in developed countries, in a movement to protect their managerial positions, may ignore managers of the closest circle (level) and simultaneously encourage managers from the middle and far circles to be involved in management activities as they raise no danger of taking over their position (see Figure 8.2). Such results seem to suggest that highly experienced managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres need to be enabled by management to have authority and responsibility in their jobs. They also need to be given the adequate freedom to practice their own ideas, methods and decision styles in their jobs. In other words, they need to be involved in the decision-making process.

On the other hand, differences between the more experienced and less experienced managers regarding the importance of the participative decision's items were found the same as expected. Responses in Table 8.32 indicate that there is a clear tendency for scores in each of the participative decision items to be significantly higher in the more experienced group than in the less experienced group. This result supported our hypothesis that managers who had more than 15 years managerial experience will rate their attitudes towards participative items higher than those who had less than 6 years experience. An alternative explanation for this result may be that the years spent in the job by managers are likely to attribute to their awareness of the importance of the participative decision, develop their responsible attitudes and increase their self confidence.

6 It was hypothesised that managers who graduated from Western universities would be more satisfied in their current jobs and rate their attitudes towards
participative decision items higher than those managers who graduated from Saudi universities. The main point is that the group of managers who graduated from Western universities would have a chance to learn and even more to deal with actual PM policies and practices inside and outside their universities, while the other group may not have had the same opportunity. For the job-satisfaction items, significant differences were found between the two groups at 0.05 level or less. Respondents of the first group (Saudi universities) had the highest score and managers of the second group (Western universities) had the lowest mean score (see Table 8.33). The result suggests that the managers who graduated from Western universities (Group 2) are less satisfied in their current jobs than those who graduated from Saudi universities (Group 1). This result seems to disprove our hypothesis that managers who graduated from Western universities are much more satisfied in their current jobs than those who graduated from Saudi universities. For the participative decision items, significant differences were also found between those managers who graduated from Saudi universities and those who graduated from Western universities (Table 8.34). Respondents who were granted their higher educational degrees from Saudi universities received the lowest score, while those who graduated from Western universities received the highest. This result indicates that the managers who studied in and graduated from Western universities are more positive in their attitudes towards the participative decision items than those who mainly studied in and graduated from Saudi universities. This seems to support the hypothesis that the managers who got their higher education in Western countries will be more positive in their attitudes towards participative decisions than those who graduated from Saudi universities.

However, there are four possible explanations for the above results. Firstly, the possibility of the absence of a participative environment inside the Saudi security educational institutes and centres. Secondly, the difference between the educational system and background of each group. Thirdly, the high expectation towards
participation and its policies that may exist among some of the managers who graduated from Western universities. Finally, managers from the first group may not yet be aware of the importance of PM policies and practices due to cultural and organisational reasons. It should be noted that not all employees are equally interested in participative management. Elbing (1978) argued that employees in some cultures may have had no prior family, job, school, or social experience in participation and are not yet ready for it. Therefore, both management and employees need to be prepared before introducing this approach to the organisation if it is to work effectively. Participative approaches must fit in with the value systems of both management and organisation. If no effort has been made to generate such an environment, effective participation may not exist.28

9.2.2.5 The Respondents' Predominant Participative Techniques

(Hypothesis 11)

This research highlighted five of the major participative techniques that can be used to enable subordinate-managers to participate effectively in the decision-making process. The respondents were asked about their familiarity with, and practise, of these techniques and how useful they would be to them in their current jobs and organisations. The data analysis in Chapter Seven shows that 83.1% of the respondents have heard of the conference technique and of those who had, 81.4% have experienced it as a superior or a subordinate. However, there are two possible explanations for the high percentage of the actual use of this technique. One explanation is that familiarity with this technique (83.1%) led to high practise of it. Another possible explanation may be attributed to the fact that this technique does not enforce managers to use its outcome. Therefore, they may use this technique to cover their authoritative managerial styles and to appear as modern and participative managers. The results further show that 90% of the respondents have previously

heard of the committee technique and of those who had, 80.7% have experienced this technique in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. However, the high familiarity with, and experience of, this technique were to be expected as the committee technique is one of the more common techniques that are found in all types of organisations, i.e. government, educational institutions, religious, business firms, etc. In terms of the brainstorming technique, 72.6% of the respondents have previously heard of it and of those who had, 67.1% have experienced it in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. Some of the respondents make written comments indicating their admiration of this technique. For example, one of the respondents said, "Maybe I don't know this technique by name, but I used to practise it a long time ago and it really works". Another one said, "That's what we need in our department". He also added, "I believe this technique will stop most of the hidden agendas and unhealthy arguments that we used to have in most of our committees' meetings". Finally, the data analysis also indicates that only 36.3% of the respondents had previously heard of both the Nominal Group and the Delphi techniques and of those who had, only 31.5% and 28.8% respectively have experienced them in their jobs as a superior or a subordinate. This degree of familiarity and experience is considered to be low.

In an attempt to compare the respondents' personal attitudes towards the usefulness of practising these five techniques in their current departments and organisations, the mean scores were calculated. The results indicate that participants feel that the committee technique (mean 4.12) is the most useful one in their organisations compared to the other four techniques. This was followed by the brainstorming technique (mean 4.10), then the conference technique (mean 3.98), then the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) (mean 3.31) and finally the Delphi method technique (mean 3.16) with the lowest usefulness attitude.
For all the above results, Hypothesis 11, which stated that the subordinate-managers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres are more familiar with the committee and conference techniques than with the other mentioned techniques, is supported. However, it is obvious from the results that the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) and the Delphi method technique achieved the lowest percentages and mean scores among the five presented techniques, which may indicate the need for introducing these techniques to the Saudi management process through a short and well prepared training programmes. These techniques will help Saudi managers to minimise the shortcomings of the traditional face-to-face meeting techniques. They also allow each participant to express his ideas freely without fear or hesitancy. However, the top man syndrome and self-orientation are still strong characteristics of Saudi management. Therefore, the Nominal Group Technique will be a very useful means to minimise the negative effects of power and status differences among participants in a face-to-face meeting. It prevents the respondents from being influenced by the personalities and ranks of other participants and allows for the sharing of information simultaneously. As it is religiously and traditionally difficult, if not impossible, for Saudi managers to share their views with the different gender in a face-to-face meeting, the Delphi technique becomes one of the important techniques that can be used to overcome such problems. Moorhead and Griffin (1992) stated that "The Delphi technique is useful when experts are physically dispersed, anonymity is desired, or the participants are known to have difficulty communicating with one another."30 This technique also avoids the psychological drawbacks (e.g. shyness, show-up or personal conflict) associated with traditional face-to-face decision-making techniques. Therefore it could be worthwhile to develop and adopt such techniques in the Saudi managerial practices. A full discussion of these techniques was presented in Chapter 5 of this research.

9.3 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The study generates a set of recommendations for the decision makers in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres in particular and for Saudi public and private sectors in general about management decisions and their relevant styles, skills, and techniques. The Saudi managers could utilise the findings of this study to correct, maintain, and/or eliminate any shortcomings in the decision making process of their current organisations. This study will be a useful reference for other studies and researchers as well as for administrative training and reform centres in Saudi Arabia aimed at finding appropriate and effective ways to manage employees, increase the productivity, raising job-satisfaction, and improving the quality of management decisions. Saudi universities, government organisations, private organisations, training institutes and centres, or other information seekers about management decision in general and Saudi managers in particular could also benefit from this study. It is a helpful tool for training centres and administrative reformers in their attempts to develop the capacity of human resources and to take care of administrative and managerial problems. It would enrich their knowledge and understanding of the subject matters of this research.

Irrespective of the level at which participation takes place, the degree to which decision making is shared, or the techniques that are used in making the decision, there are some important recommendations for successful participation in the managerial decision-making process. According to what was proposed in the previous chapters of this study, some of the basic recommendations for successful participation and policy reforms were offered:

1. Participation should be introduced and developed in a relatively gradual and planned way rather than be imposed by management orders, government
legislation, or because of the pressures of environment and society. Participation by imposition never achieves its objectives successfully.

2. The participative decision-making approach needs to be fully understood and accepted by all the concerned employees both subordinates and managers. To implement such an approach effectively, management needs to be aware of the importance of participation before it takes place from both managerial and organisational perspectives. Awareness in this area leads to a clearer understanding of both employees and management responsibilities and improves their attitudes towards participation. These aspects are central factors in establishing a participative decision-making approach and for preparing the work environment to accept such development. When this occurs, the approach can have remarkable effects on employee attitudes and work effectiveness.

3. Subordinates and managers should be prepared before introducing the participation approach to their organisation. They must be taught, trained and encouraged to work in a participative environment. Without such preparation, several barriers may constrain and limit the effective use of participation in managerial decisions.

4. Managers must believe in and must be seen to believe in participation. They must show by their actions that they will implement and support the joint and participative decisions reached by the group members during the decision making process.

5. Subordinates must believe in participation as a positive means of developing their knowledge, skills, experience, interests and responsibilities, and not simply as a way of getting more power.
6. The members of a participative decision making group should never meet unless there is something specific to discuss and should always conclude their discussions with agreed decisions which are put into effect as soon as possible.

7. Participants should have all the possible information and facilities they require.

8. Openness of communication should take place at all levels of management and organisation.

9. The climate surrounding decision making should be supportive to participation practices.

10. The participative decision approach must fit in with the situational, traditional and cultural values of both employees and organisation as much as possible if it is to work effectively. The participative decision making style for programmed decision may not be the appropriate style for non-programmed decision. The management strategies designed for one culture may not be appropriate for another culture. The PM approach designed for Western culture, for instance, may not be appropriate for use in the Saudi Islamic culture. It may need to be redesigned to fit in with the new culture. For example, the Saudi male and female managers may not have the opportunity to put forward their managerial views with the opposite gender in a face-to-face meeting due to traditional and religious reasons. However, the literature supported that failure to fit in with the traditional and cultural values of both management and organisation is one of the major obstacles to success.
11. Subordinates’ participation (to the extent that it is situationally appropriate) should take place before decisions are made.

12. Top managerial positions should be informed and kept in the picture when the final decisions are reached.

13. As it is religiously and traditionally difficult, if not impossible, for Saudi managers to share their views with the different gender in a face-to-face meeting, the Delphi technique becomes one of the important techniques that can be used to overcome such problems. This technique also avoids the psychological drawbacks (e.g. shyness, show-up or personal conflict) associated with traditional face-to-face decision-making techniques. Therefore it could be worthwhile to develop and adopt such techniques in the Saudi managerial practices and training programmes.

14. Participation should not be used in a superficial way or just as a possible means to rescue a sinking ship or to be modern. It must be used with confidence in bad times as well as good if it is to work successfully.

15. It is also important to stress that participation in decision making is not of itself a magical remedy to managerial problems and conflicts, but if it is used effectively it may provide an opportunity to avoid unnecessary problems and to co-ordinate the conflicts of interest and opinion of both the employees and the management.

16. Finally, participation is a continuous process that must be accepted, supported, and maintained by management. It cannot simply be introduced
and then be left to look after itself. Where this occurs, more resistance and failure will result than if it had not been introduced in the first place.

9.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

It is hoped by the researcher that this present attempt to investigate managerial decision making styles and techniques in the Saudi security educational institutes and centres will stimulate further research in this field of management studies. However, the researcher has a number of suggestions that can be applied to future research and studies in the following areas:

1. It is interesting to note that the managers who are less satisfied with their jobs and organisations are the ones who express more positive attitudes towards participative items. In contrast, the managers who scored higher regarding job satisfaction items scored lower when they described their actual attitudes towards participative decision items. This interesting point raises the question about the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and the degree of influence they have towards management decisions. Because this point is outside the aims of this study it is strongly put forward as one of the major suggestions for future research and studies.

2. It would be useful to replicate this study in the Saudi private sector's organisations in order to determine their views towards the concept of participation and to develop more findings and further understanding of the Saudi managerial decision making styles.

3. Future research study could also focus on the kind of participation programmes and techniques available at the universities, the IPA (Institute of Public
Administration), and other Saudi managerial training centres for public or private employees.

4 Another area in need of further research is the relationship between the traditional and cultural values of the Saudi employees and their managerial decision making styles both with their actual attitudes towards the importance of subordinates' participation in the stages of the decision making-process.

5 Finally, due to the fact that Saudi managers are affected largely by Islam, the researcher very strongly suggests that the concept of Shura as one of the basic principles in the Islamic society should be studied and investigated in more details from managerial decision making perspectives. This might be a good way to motivate employees (managers and subordinates) to participate more in management activities and decisions.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS
Q.12 - Q.21

(Tables A-1 to A-10)
Table A-1: The Decision to Develop a New Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Level</td>
<td>3.4375</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>-2.403</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Level</td>
<td>3.8630</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5920</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ.</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>1.3908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>1.1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.8462</td>
<td>1.1130</td>
<td>1.8403</td>
<td>.1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>1.1353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.2119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-3: Effect of Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>3.1778</td>
<td>1.1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>3.4505</td>
<td>1.2043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>4.0167</td>
<td>1.1122</td>
<td>6.1051</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.2247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.1755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-4: Effect of Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>3.1379</td>
<td>1.0255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.4516</td>
<td>1.3142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.6486</td>
<td>1.1755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>4.0541</td>
<td>1.1534</td>
<td>3.5696</td>
<td>.0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3.4912</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>-2.722</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>4.1290</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-6: Effect of Management Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.8947</td>
<td>1.0485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
<td>1.2946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3.6047</td>
<td>1.1810</td>
<td>.7085</td>
<td>.5480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>1.2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.2221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-7: Effect of the Study Field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.5748</td>
<td>1.1514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.8889</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>3.8571</td>
<td>1.2364</td>
<td>.7585</td>
<td>.4701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.6306</td>
<td>1.1691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1-8: Effect of Management Span**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.6984</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.4079</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>1.647</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.5891</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-2: The decision to partly amend a plan

Table 2-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.9688</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.5890</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1940</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Effect of Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ.</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>1.5315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.2130</td>
<td>1.2459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.4103</td>
<td>1.3518</td>
<td>2.5245</td>
<td>.0588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>1.5951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.3515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.3778</td>
<td>1.0931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>3.1099</td>
<td>1.3454</td>
<td>12.7586</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>1.2097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>1.6021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.2606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.4483</td>
<td>1.2126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.0484</td>
<td>1.3722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.2703</td>
<td>1.3064</td>
<td>6.6831</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.3122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.3122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3.0877</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.7742</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.9474</td>
<td>1.1773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.2045</td>
<td>1.3743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3.2442</td>
<td>1.4053</td>
<td>.2548</td>
<td>.8579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>1.4530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.3744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.1969</td>
<td>1.2789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>1.5635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.1402</td>
<td>3.5773</td>
<td>.0303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3057</td>
<td>1.2783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.2619</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.0789</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.1931</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

441
### Table A-3: The decision to cancel a plan

#### Table 3-1: Effect of Managerial Level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>3.1406</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.6301</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3184</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ.</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>1.6081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>1.3763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.5641</td>
<td>1.3726</td>
<td>1.1484</td>
<td>.3307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>1.5951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.4406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-3: Effect of Age
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>1.3409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>3.2747</td>
<td>1.3481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>1.2310</td>
<td>8.8517</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.6733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.3645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-4: Effect of Training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.4483</td>
<td>1.3519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.2742</td>
<td>1.4391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.5676</td>
<td>1.3042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.5946</td>
<td>1.5538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.4009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3.2339</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>3.8065</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-6: Effect of Management Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.6842</td>
<td>1.2933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.2955</td>
<td>1.4476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3.2558</td>
<td>1.4567</td>
<td>.4876</td>
<td>.6921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.4478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-7: Effect of the Study Field
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.2283</td>
<td>1.4040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>1.2360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.2649</td>
<td>2.9296</td>
<td>.0564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3-8: Effect of Management Span
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.3254</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.3158</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.3218</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-4 The decision to reorganise your area of responsibility

Table 4-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>3.2891</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.6806</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4300</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>3.4545</td>
<td>1.3886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.3704</td>
<td>1.2043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.4872</td>
<td>1.2747</td>
<td>.3583</td>
<td>.8554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>1.5670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.2784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>1.2358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>3.3667</td>
<td>1.1751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.8833</td>
<td>1.2226</td>
<td>8.5984</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.2044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.2044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>21.7931</td>
<td>1.0481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.4677</td>
<td>1.3516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.4932</td>
<td>1.2033</td>
<td>3.3002</td>
<td>.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.7297</td>
<td>1.3049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.2498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3.3353</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.9355</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.5789</td>
<td>1.1213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.3409</td>
<td>1.2855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3.4941</td>
<td>1.2689</td>
<td>.3170</td>
<td>.8131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>1.5811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.2778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.3150</td>
<td>1.1866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>1.4240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>4.0476</td>
<td>1.3593</td>
<td>3.2321</td>
<td>.0422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.5238</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.4279</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-5: The decision to implement new rules and procedures

Table 5-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.9219</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.7260</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2139</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>1.5015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>1.3122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.5641</td>
<td>1.2095</td>
<td>1.3649</td>
<td>.2547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>1.5092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.3475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.2222</td>
<td>1.0420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>3.1758</td>
<td>1.3131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>1.1092</td>
<td>19.5698</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.2247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.5172</td>
<td>1.2989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>3.2742</td>
<td>1.3078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.2568</td>
<td>1.2612</td>
<td>3.9193</td>
<td>.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.6216</td>
<td>1.4786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.3227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3.1228</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.7742</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.4737</td>
<td>1.0203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.1136</td>
<td>1.4014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>3.2209</td>
<td>1.3840</td>
<td>.9148</td>
<td>.4348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>1.0929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.3521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-7: Effect of Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.1496</td>
<td>1.2976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>3.7619</td>
<td>1.3381</td>
<td>2.0336</td>
<td>.1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2293</td>
<td>1.3015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.1508</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>- .97</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>3.3421</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.2228</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-6: The decision to change some rules or procedures that are followed by subordinates

Table 6-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.4531</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5700</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>1.0954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.5463</td>
<td>1.0624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2.5789</td>
<td>1.1060</td>
<td>2.7936</td>
<td>.0415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>1.3540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.0930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>1.0313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>2.4667</td>
<td>1.1338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>2.6167</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
<td>1.2621</td>
<td>.2886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>1.5055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.1054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.7241</td>
<td>.9963</td>
<td>.3073</td>
<td>.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>2.5645</td>
<td>1.1541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>2.4932</td>
<td>1.1441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.5946</td>
<td>1.0661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.1134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2.5294</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>2.7742</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.8421</td>
<td>1.2140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2.7045</td>
<td>1.1261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.3294</td>
<td>.9927</td>
<td>2.4526</td>
<td>.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>1.4530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.0957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.6349</td>
<td>1.1071</td>
<td>.1029</td>
<td>.9023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>.8891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>1.2498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.6154</td>
<td>1.1163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.5680</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.5658</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5672</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-7: The decision to increase the employees who work in the department of a subordinate

Table 7-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.7891</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.2778</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9650</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>2.9318</td>
<td>1.5310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.8796</td>
<td>1.2658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.0769</td>
<td>1.5111</td>
<td>1.1581</td>
<td>.3269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>1.5670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.3909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.4444</td>
<td>1.2890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
<td>1.2987</td>
<td>5.2433</td>
<td>.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.3667</td>
<td>1.4376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.6733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.3502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.4483</td>
<td>1.2126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>2.8226</td>
<td>1.3970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>3.0411</td>
<td>1.3788</td>
<td>3.4729</td>
<td>.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.4865</td>
<td>1.4068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.3674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2.8765</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.4839</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.8421</td>
<td>1.3850</td>
<td>.1754</td>
<td>.9130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.4304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.9412</td>
<td>1.3685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>3.2222</td>
<td>1.4814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.4012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.9291</td>
<td>1.3104</td>
<td>.8204</td>
<td>.4422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>1.4530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>1.5916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9809</td>
<td>1.3578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.9762</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.9600</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9701</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-8: The decision to promote an employee who works in the department of a subordinate

Table 8-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>- 4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>3.2347</td>
<td>.0234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>11.4151</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>1.6933</td>
<td>.1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>- 4.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2.204</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>.2596</td>
<td>.8544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>3.099</td>
<td>.0391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>- 1.52</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-9: The Decision to transfer an employee who works in the department of a subordinate

### Table 9-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.0547</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>-4.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3550</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>2.0547</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.1852</td>
<td>1.1693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2.5128</td>
<td>1.5368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>1.6865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.3109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>1.9333</td>
<td>.9391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>2.1222</td>
<td>1.1201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>1.5565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.5492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.3186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>1.9655</td>
<td>.9056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>2.3387</td>
<td>1.3422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>2.3836</td>
<td>1.4007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.6486</td>
<td>1.3787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.3186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2.2412</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.4211</td>
<td>1.2612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2.3977</td>
<td>1.4186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.2824</td>
<td>1.2966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>.7265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.3313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.2126</td>
<td>1.2320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>1.5645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3312</td>
<td>1.3054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.3095</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.4400</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3582</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-10: The decision to nominate a person to work in the department managed by your subordinate

### Table 10-1: Effect of Managerial Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level</td>
<td>2.4609</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>3.0972</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.6900</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-2: Effect of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qual/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Univ</td>
<td>2.7045</td>
<td>1.4876</td>
<td>.8363</td>
<td>.4754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.6111</td>
<td>1.2518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2.7949</td>
<td>1.5590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.5670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.3839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-3: Effect of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>2.1333</td>
<td>1.0787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>2.5222</td>
<td>1.2828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>1.4686</td>
<td>9.5135</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>1.3292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.3016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-4: Effect of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>2.2759</td>
<td>1.2506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4 months</td>
<td>2.5968</td>
<td>1.3845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12 months</td>
<td>2.8082</td>
<td>1.4010</td>
<td>1.7761</td>
<td>.1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.3944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.3742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-5: Effect of Country of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of H.E.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2.5706</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Countries</td>
<td>3.4194</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-6: Effect of Management Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2.7895</td>
<td>1.3976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2.7159</td>
<td>1.4852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.6588</td>
<td>1.3234</td>
<td>.0641</td>
<td>.9788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>.9718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.3920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-7: Effect of the Study Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Field/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>F. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2.5906</td>
<td>1.2808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.4444</td>
<td>1.5899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Business</td>
<td>3.4762</td>
<td>1.5040</td>
<td>4.1761</td>
<td>.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7006</td>
<td>1.3294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10-8: Effect of Management Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span/Var</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T. Value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.6508</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 employees</td>
<td>2.7867</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.7015</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE
(ENGLISH VERSION)
Dear Administrator

The attached questionnaire is one of the core requirements of my PhD thesis at the University of Leicester in the United Kingdom of Britain. The main purpose of this study is to assess the degree of subordinates' participation in managerial decision-making process within the Security Educational Institutions in Saudi Arabia. Therefore, this questionnaire has been designed to evaluate your participation in the process of making programmed or non-programmed decisions and to find out which decision-making styles, methods, or techniques you implement when making your decisions.

I should be very grateful for your assistance in filling out this questionnaire. It would be very valuable, helpful and deeply appreciated. The questionnaire should be completed without writing your name or that of your institution.

I assure you that:

1. It will not take more than 20-25 minutes of your valuable time to answer this questionnaire.
2. Most of the questions simply require you to tick in an appropriate box to indicate your answer.
3. A few of the questions, however, require that you write a few words in the spaces provided.
4. None of the information will be used for any purpose other than this study, and all information will be treated as strictly confidential.

If you have any questions about completing the questionnaire, please do not hesitate to telephone me on 4250641, Riyadh. In case I am not available, please leave your telephone number and I will contact you as soon as possible.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION WITH THIS SURVEY

Mohammed Al-Arifi
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
King Fahad Security College

Telephone 2464444
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Respondent Code

SECTION I - DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION

A Please tick the box corresponding to your position/situation (only one box for each question or statement).

1 Age:
   a) Less than 30 years
   b) From 30-40 years
   c) From 41-50 years
   d) More than 50 years

2 Marital Status:
   a) Single
   b) Married

3 Employment Status:
   a) Civilian Rank
   b) Military Rank

4 Educational Qualifications:
   a) Below University Degree
   b) University Degree (Bachelor)
   c) Master Degree
   d) Doctorate Degree

5 Your Educational Background:
   a) Humanities (Religion, Philosophy, History, Arts, Psychology, Socio-psychology, Police Science, etc.)
   b) Science (Engineering, Computing, Economics, Physics, etc.)
   c) Public Administration, Management, Business Administration
   d) Other (please specify) ..............................................
6 Periods of managerial training:
   a) No training
   b) Less than 4 months
   c) From 4-12 months
   d) More than one year

7 Your current position or equivalent:
   a) General Department
   b) Department
   c) Unit
   d) Other (please specify) ...........................................

8 How many employees are you currently supervising?
   a) None
   b) Less than 15
   c) From 15-50
   d) More than 50

9 Managerial experience:
   a) Less than 1 year
   b) From 1-5 years
   c) From 6-15 years
   d) More than 15 years

B Please put the country number corresponding to your position on the box in front of each of the following questions or statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Arab and Islamic Countries</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>European Countries</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Eastern Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Name of the country where you obtained your highest educational degree

11 Name of the country in which you received most of your managerial training
SECTION II - STYLES, PROCESS AND TECHNIQUES OF MAKING DECISIONS

Instructions:

There are many ways or styles in which managerial decisions are made. And there is no one perfect style or process that can be applied to all decisions in all situations. Please read the definition or description of each one of the following concepts before answering the questions in this section:

AI style: I decide without involving subordinates.
This means that you alone make the decision using your own information without involving subordinates or making detailed explanation.

AII style: I get only information from subordinates and then I decide.
This means that you alone make the decision, but you ask subordinates to supply you with the necessary information rather than to generate or to evaluate alternative decisions. You may or may not explain the problem to your subordinates.

CI style: I make prior consultation with relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide.
This means that, before the decision is taken, you meet with, explain the problem to the relevant subordinate(s) individually and ask each one for his or her advice and to generate or evaluate alternative decisions. You then make the decision by yourself. However, your decision may or may not reflect the subordinate(s)' influence.

CII style: I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates together as a group, and then I decide.
This style is the same as the above, but you meet and consult with the relevant subordinates as a group.

GII style: I join the decision-making with subordinates.
This means that you and your subordinate(s) together discuss, generate and evaluate alternatives until you both reach an agreeable decision. However, the final decision should reflect the group's influence on a majority basis.

Scientific Decision Making approach is one of the important methods that can be used effectively in making managerial decisions throughout the implementation of orderly stages that make up the decision-making process.

Programmed decisions are the type of decisions that are usually well structured, routine, recurring, and can be handled with a high degree of certainty; that is, the decision-making rules are already established, the outcome and goals are clear, so that they do not have to be treated de novo each time they occur - e.g. the decision to promote one of your subordinate's employees.

Non-programmed decisions are the type of decisions that are usually unstructured, complex, novel and uncertain of the outcomes; that is the decision rules and procedures are not yet established, the outcome is ambiguous and unclear so that they have to be treated as new each time they occur - e.g. the decision to develop a plan for your department.
A Below is a group of decisions. Each decision is followed by a list of different managerial decision-making styles. After reading the descriptions of each style, as stated in the instructions, please tick only one box for each decision, to indicate which style you most often use.

12 The decision to develop a plan for your area of responsibility:
   a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
   b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (All style) □
   c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (Cl style) □
   d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
   e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □

13 The decision to partly amend the plan:
   a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
   b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (All style) □
   c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (Cl style) □
   d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
   e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □

14 The decision to completely cancel the plan:
   a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
   b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (All style) □
   c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (Cl style) □
   d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
   e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □
The decision to reorganise your area of responsibility:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AII style) □
c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style) □
d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □

The decision to implement new rules or procedures in your area of responsibility:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AII style) □
c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style) □
d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □

The decision to change some of the rules or procedures followed by your subordinates:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AII style) □
c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style) □
d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □
The decision to increase the number of employees working for your subordinate:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style)  
   □

b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AI style)  
   □

c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style)  
   □

d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style)  
   □

e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style)  
   □

The decision to promote one of the employees working for your subordinate:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style)  
   □

b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AI style)  
   □

c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style)  
   □

d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style)  
   □

e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style)  
   □

The decision to transfer one of your subordinate's employees:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style)  
   □

b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (AI style)  
   □

c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style)  
   □

d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style)  
   □

e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style)  
   □
The decision to nominate an employee from another department to work in the department managed by your subordinate:

a) I decide without involving subordinates or making any detailed explanation (AI style) □
b) I get only information from the relevant subordinates and then I decide (All style) □
c) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then I decide (CI style) □
d) I make prior consultation with the relevant subordinates as a group, and then I decide (CII style) □
e) I join the decision-making with subordinates together as a group (GII style) □

Generally, in making managerial decisions your superior tends to:

a) Decide without involving his subordinates (AI style) □
b) Get only information from the relevant subordinates and then he decides (All style) □
c) Consult with the relevant subordinate(s) individually and then he decides (CI style) □
d) Consult with the relevant subordinates together as a group and then he decides (CII style) □
e) Joint decision-making together with his subordinates as a team (GII style) □

B This section contains a group of questions and statements that may reflect the degree of participation you have in the process of making a programmed or a non-programmed decision. Before going over this section, please read carefully the previous definitions or descriptions as stated in the instructions and then tick the box which most accurately expresses your point of view (only one box for each question):

23 Which type of managerial decisions do you actually make?

a) Programmed decisions □
b) Non-programmed decisions □
c) Both programmed and non-programmed □
d) None □
24 When handling managerial decisions you used to:

a) Rely on your abilities, skills and past experience
b) Observe and imitate others
c) Attempt and amend until you reach a satisfactory decision
d) Implement the scientific decision-making approach

25 In the development of a programmed decision-making process, the degree of your participation in achieving the stages of this process is: (Please tick only one box for each statement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the development of a non-programmed decision-making process, the degree of your participation in achieving the stages of this process is: (please tick only one box for each statement).

26-1 Using your intuition, feeling, and awareness to observe the existence of a decision opportunity

26-2 Helping in recognising, diagnosing and defining the problem or the situation

26-3 Helping in setting objectives and determining the type of decision

26-4 Helping in generating and formalising the alternatives and solutions

26-5 Helping in testing and evaluating the generated alternatives

26-6 Helping in choosing the final course of action from the available alternatives

26-7 Helping in implementing and supporting the chosen decision

26-8 Helping in evaluating and monitoring the implemented decision
This section contains some of the major methods or techniques that can be used when implementing a participative decision-making style. Please read carefully the definition and description of each method or technique as they are stated below. Then answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate box (only one box for each question).

"Conference" is a form of participation in managerial decision-making which requires a face-to-face meeting. It is formed to exchange view or pass on information, which may or may not lead to a conclusion. However, the conference may conclude that a particular decision would be a good thing to do, but it does not decide or have the authority to make decisions by itself.

27 Have you ever heard of this method? Yes No □ □
28 If yes, have you ever experienced it as a superior or a subordinate? □ □

29 How useful do you think it to be applied to your department or organisation? Very Useful Useful Don’t Know Not Useful Not at all Useful □ □ □ □ □ □

"Committee" is another form of participation in managerial decision-making which requires a face-to-face meeting. It is formed to exchange information and advice, which may lead to a conclusion. Most often committees have specified duties and authority and they make decisions on actions of some kind or another.

30 Have you ever heard of this method? Yes No □ □
31 If yes, have you ever experienced it as a superior or a subordinate? □ □

32 How useful do you think it to be applied in your department or organisation? Very Useful Useful Don’t Know Not Useful Not at all Useful □ □ □ □ □ □

"Brainstorming" is a group decision-making technique which requires that every member of the group will present his or her ideas and suggestions, no matter how strong or weak they are. There is no criticism allowed by anyone, and the evaluation of all the ideas will be delayed until the last member has presented his or her ideas.

33 Have you ever heard of this technique? Yes No □ □
34 If yes, have you ever used it? □ □
“Nominal Group Technique” (NGT) is another group decision-making technique which requires the following steps:

a) Every member writes his main ideas silently.
b) Sequentially, the chair will ask for one idea from one member at a time. He will write the ideas on a chart visible to the entire group.
c) Serial discussion of the ideas for clarification.
d) Preliminary vote on the importance of each idea by using small cards for secret voting.
e) Discussion of the preliminary vote for more clarification.
f) Final vote.

"Delphi Method Technique" is another group decision-making technique which does not require a face-to-face meeting. But, rather, every member of the group expresses his or her ideas in writing and sends them to the co-ordinator who summarises them and returns the summary to the members. This process continues until an agreeable decision is reached.
### SECTION III- ATTITUDE TOWARDS JOB SATISFACTION & PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

This section contains a group of questions and statements that may reflect your personal attitude about your job, and the degree of participation you have in the process of making a decision. Please read the following statements carefully, then tick the box which most accurately expresses your actual attitude (only one box for each statement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Subordinates' participation in the decision-making process does not decrease the role of their superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The quality of a participative decision is expected to improve considerably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Participative decision-making process is expected to increase the speed of making a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Participative decision style is expected to improve considerably the satisfaction and morale of the subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Participative decision style decreases considerably the cost of making a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Participative decision-making style increases subordinates' acceptance of the decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Generally, man on his own is a helpless person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>My superior was willing to listen to my suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I had a great deal of responsibility in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>There is a great deal of opportunity to develop my knowledge, skills and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I have the opportunity to use my own judgement and to try out some of my own ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I have the opportunity to develop new and better ways to do my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I have the opportunity to try my own methods or styles of doing the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I had considerable decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I enjoyed the kind of work I did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I felt I was getting ahead on my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I enjoyed the feeling of responsibility my job gave me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Managers should turn down a promotion (position) if they felt it would decrease their responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Managers should spend most of the work time with subordinates rather than staying in their office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I like the people to whom I report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I got considerable co-operation from the subordinates I worked with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I felt my superior and I understood each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>My boss backed me up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65 Managers usually feel uncomfortable in a situation where they are told exactly what they are supposed to do and how to do it.

66 Managers prefer a position with a higher level of responsibility than a position with a lower level of responsibility.

67 Please list below the justifications and advantages, if any, of encouraging and enabling subordinates to participate in the managerial decision-making process.

68 Please list below the barriers and disadvantages, if any, of subordinates' participation in the managerial decision-making process.

THANK YOU

If there are any other matters which you think have not been covered, and which you feel are important to your job or to the practice of management generally, please use the space given below to write about them:

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.............
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE
(ARABIC VERSION)
عزيلي الإداري:

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

الأستبيان المرفق صمم للحصول على أفكار وأراء وجمع معلومات واقعية
 حول أهمية المشاركة في العملية الإدارية بشكل عام وأخذ القرارات بشكل خاص
 من خلال نظرة الأداريين (مديرين ومروعيين) العاملين بالكليات والمعاهد
 والمراكز الأمنية في المملكة العربية السعودية وذلك بآمل أن يخدم هذا البحث
 تطوير العملية الإدارية في مثل هذه المؤسسات التعليمية بشكل خاص والأجهزة
 الحكومية والمؤسسات التعليمية الأخرى بشكل عام.

أخي العزيز ستكون مشاركتك وتعاونك في إجابة هذا الاستبيان مساهمة فعالة
 في رسالتي للدكتوراه في مجال الإدارة العامة، لذا أمل التكرم بإعطاء جزء من
 وقتكم الثمين (15 - 20 دقيقة) لإجابة جميع الأسئلة وذلك بالتأخير في المرسوم
 المناسب أمام كل فقره أو سؤال، وإذا لم تتأكد من إجابة سؤال «ما» فأرجو
 اختيار الجواب الذي يغلب على ذلك أن الجواب المناسب، كما أرجو أن تكون
 إجابتك في غاية الصدق والأمانة والوضوح.

وأخيراً أود أن أؤكد لك أن إجابتك ستكون سرية وسوف تستخدم في البحث
 والبحث العلمي فقط على أساس تعميمي وليس عن فرد بينه أو مؤسسة تعليمية
 محددة، ولهذا ليس المطلوب منك كتابة الأسم أو التوقيع أو ماбоالعلى
 شخصيتك أو المؤسسة التعليمية أو الإدارة التي تعمل بها.

والله الموفق، إلخ.

شكرًا حسن تعاونك وجميل تكرمك بالإجابة على هذا الاستبيان.

أخوك
طالب / محمد العربي
الرياضة
ت. 2464444
القسم الأول: معلومات عامة

أ) هذا القسم يشتمل على عدد من الأسئلة الشخصية. الرجاء وضع علامة (+) في المربع المناسب لكل سؤال:

- العمر:
  - ا) أقل من 30 سنة
  - ب) أكثر من 30 سنة
  - ج) من 30 - 40 سنة

- العلاقة الاجتماعية:
  - ا) متزوج

- الوظيفة:
  - ا) موظف عمري
  - ب) موظف نسائي

- المؤهل التعليمي:
  - ا) أقل من الجامعة
  - ب) بكالوريوس
  - ج) ماجستير

- إذا كنت حائزاً على المؤهل الجامعي أو مافوق المؤهل الجامعي، فما هو التخصص الذي تحمله:
  - ا) دراسات آسيوية (علوم عربية، علوم اجتماعية، علوم أقتصادية، فلسفة، آداب)
  - ب) دراسات عربية (هندي، حساب، آلي، اقتصاد، فيزياء)
  - ج) إدارة عامة أو إدارة أعمال
  - د) أخر (حدد ...

- مدة دورات التدريب الأداري الحاصل عليها:
  - ا) دون
  - ب) أقل من 4 أشهر
  - ج) من 4 - 12 شهرا
  - د) أكثر من سنة

- تصنيف الوظيفة أو العمل الذي تقوم به حالياً:
  - ا) إدارة عامة
  - ب) إدارة إدارية
  - ج) قسم
  - د) أخرى (حدد ...

- ماهو عدد الموظفين (العاملين) الذين تشرف عليهم حالياً:
  - ا) بدون
  - ب) أقل من 15 موظفا
  - ج) من 15 - 50 موظفا
  - د) أكثر من 50 موظفا

- عدد سنوات الخبرة الإدارية:
  - ا) أقل من 1 سنة
  - ب) من 1 - 5 سنوات
  - ج) من 6 - 15 سنة
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لا يوجد نص قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.

7 - الاعترافات المبهرة (Programmed Decisions)

هي ذلك النوع من القرارات التي عادة ما تكون روتينية، واضحة، متكيرة ويمكن معالجتها ببساطة ودقة من نتائجها بصورة مشابهة إلى حد كبير حيث يتم تطبيق مجموعة من القواعد والأدوات الواضحة والمقدمة سلفا عند إتخاذ تلك القرارات. ومن الأمثلة على ذلك: قرار بتقديم أحد مروحيات، منح إجازة، تعيين موظف جديد.... الخ.

8 - الاعترافات الغير مبهرة (Non-Programmed Decisions)

هي تلك القرارات المعقدة والتي لا تنتقش بصورة الروتيني أو الحدوث المتكرر. وإنما يتم التعامل معها كقرار جديد عند حدوثها كما أنها غير واضحة الأمور والإجراءات المحددة سلفا وإنما الأمر يعتمد على طبيعة المشكلة والظروف المؤثرة في القرار. ومثال على ذلك القرار بوضع خطة جديدة لتطوير العمل في الإدارة، إنشاء مصنع جديد، إنتاج أو توريد بضاعة جديدة على السوق، مواجهة الكوارث والأزمات.... الخ.

أ) كل سؤال من الأسئلة التالية متبوّع بخمسة أساليب من أساليب إتخاذ القرار التي تم شرحها أعلاه. أرجو اختيار الأساليب التي تستخدمه في الغالب وذلك بوضع علامة (X) في المربع المقابل له (هنا إجابة واحدة فقط لكل سؤال):

12 - عندما تريد أن أخضع حلولاً للتحليل الفعلي في إدارتي:

[ ] أ) اتخاذ القرار بدون مشاركة المسؤولين (AI)

[ ] ب) أحصل على معلومات فقط من المسؤولين ثم أقرر (AII)

[ ] ج) أطلب المشورة من المسؤولين كل على حدة ثم أقرر (CI)

[ ] د) أطلب المشورة من المسؤولين بصورة جماعية ثم أقرر (CII)

[ ] ه) أنا والمسؤولين نشترك في إتخاذ القرار بصورة جماعية (GII)

13 - عندما تريد أن أعيش داخلياً في الحلقة المبتكرة أو المبتكرة:

[ ] أ) اتخاذ القرار بدون مشاركة المسؤولين (AI)

[ ] ب) أحصل على معلومات فقط من المسؤولين ثم أقرر (AII)

[ ] ج) أطلب المشورة من المسؤولين كل على حدة ثم أقرر (CI)

[ ] د) أطلب المشورة من المسؤولين بصورة جماعية ثم أقرر (CII)

[ ] ه) أنا والمسؤولين نشترك في إتخاذ القرار بصورة جماعية (GII)
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ج) هذا القسم يشمل على عدد من التكتيكات والاستراتيجيات التي قد تساعد المدير في تطبيق أساليب المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات بشكل جيد ومناسب. أرجو قراءة التعريف أو الشرح الخاص بكل طريقة ثم إجابة الأسئلة التي تليها بوضع علامة

(×) في المربع المناسب:

{ Conference }

أسلوب اللقاءات العامة

هذا الأسلوب يأخذ الطريقة المساعدة في ممارسة أساليب المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات يطلب
من الرئيس لقاء مسؤولية وجهة لوجه وبصورة جماعية لأبلغهم ببعضهم تفوق أو تفوق إلى نتيجة أو توصية معنوي. كذلك قد يتفق المشاركون في اللقاء على أهمية إتخاذ قرار معين ولكنهم كمجموعة غير مخولين ولا
يمكن السماح الكافية لإتخاذ مثل ذلك القرار وإنما الأمر منزول للرئيس.

لا

نعم

27- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟

30- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟

28- إذا كانت الإجابة (نعم) فهل سبق أن

أستخدمته أو أشتركت فيه؟

29- إلى أي درجة تعتقد بفائدة تطبيقه

في مجال عملك؟

{ Committee }

أسلوب اللجان

هذه الطريق تحتوي على عدد من الطرق المفيدة في تطبيق أساليب المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات حيث يقوم أعضاء اللجنة بتبادل الأراء والأفكار وجها لوجه في موضوع محدد سلفا بغرض
الوصول إلى التوصية أو القرار المناسب. في ظل الأخف تكون اللجنة مكلفة بمهام محددة
وقد تخلو سلطة إتخاذ القرار في حدود معينة أو الرفع بتصويتها إلى الجهه المختصة.

لا

نعم

30- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟

32- إلى أي درجة تعتقد بفائدة تطبيقه

في مجال عملك؟

31- إذا كانت الإجابة (نعم) فهل سبق أن أستخدمته

أو أشتركت في عضوية أحد اللجان؟

مهيمناً مفيد غير مفيد جداً
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أسلوب تنشيط وتعزز الأفكار

هذا الأسلوب يستخدم في تطبيق وممارسة أسلوب إتخاذ القرار بشكل جماعي عن طريق إجتماع الرئيس بمسؤوليه وجهته لوجه ثم يطلب من كل عضو (رئيس أو مسؤول) أن يدلل بجميع أراءه وأفكاره فيما كانت درجة اهتمامه حيث لا يسمح لأي عضو بنقد أي من الأفكار المطروحة. بعد إلقاء جميع الأعضاء بأعاناتهم وأفكارهم تبدأ مرحلة التقييم والمناقشة من أجل الوصول إلى القرار المناسب.

نعم لا

33- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟
34- إذا كانت الإجابة (نعم) فهل سبق أن استخدمته أو أشتركت فيه؟
35- إلى أي درجة تعتبر بفائدته تطبيقه في مجال عملك؟

أسلوب المجموعة الأبدائية

هذا الأسلوب كذلك يستخدم في تطبيق وممارسة أسلوب إتخاذ القرار بشكل جماعي عن طريق إجتماع الرئيس بمسؤوليه وجهته لوجه ويتطلب الخطوات التالية:

أ) يقوم كل عضو (رئيس أو مسؤول) بكتابة أفكاره الرئيسية بشكل صامت.
ب) يقوم الرئيس باجتماع ويتوسلل بأخذ فكرة واحدة فقط من كل عضو ويكتبها على لوحة واضحة للجميع ثم يستمر بهذه الطرق حتى يحصل على الأفكار المشار إليها في الخطوة السابقة.

ج) مناقشة توضيحية للأفكار المكتوبة على اللوحة حسب تسليسها.
د) التصويت الأبدائي على أهمية كل فكرة باستخدام كروت صغيرة حفاظاً على سرية التصويت.
ه) مناقشة التصويت الأبدائي لمزيد من الأيضاح.
و) التصويت النهائي ومن ثم الوصول إلى القرار المناسب.

نعم لا

36- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟
37- إذا كانت الإجابة (نعم) فهل سبق أن استخدمته أو أشتركت فيه؟
38- إلى أي درجة تعتبر بفائدته تطبيقه في مجال عملك؟

أسلوب الدلالي

هذا الأسلوب لايتطلب إجتماع الأعضاء (رئيس ومسؤولين) وجهته لوجه وإنما يقوم كل عضو بكتابة رأيه في الموضوع مجال النقاش ويبيته إلى المنمق والذي يقوم بدوره بتلخيص جميع الأراء المطروحة ثم يبث بذلك المخلص إلى الأعضاء مرة ثانية، وهنا تستمر العملية بشكل متكرر حتى يتم التوصل إلى القرار المناسب.

نعم لا

39- هل سبق أن سمعت بهذا الأسلوب من قبل؟
40- في حالة الإجابة (نعم) فهل سبق أن استخدمته أو أشتركت فيه؟
القسم الثالث: الرسوم الوظيفي والمشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات

من خلال تجاربك الشخصية، إلى أي درجة توافق أو تعارض (بشكل عام) مع المبادئ التالية وذلك بوضع علامة (✓) في مربع واحد فقط من المربعات التالية لكل عبارة:

- مشاركة المسؤولين في إتخاذ القرار لا تحدث من مهام وصلاحيات مدير الإدارة.
- توقع أن تزداد قيمة وأهمية القرار من خلال مشاركة المسؤولين في إتخاذه.
- أسلوب المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار يؤدي إلى سرعة عملية إتخاذه في الوقت المناسب.
- المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار يؤدي إلى تحسين الرضى لوظيفي لدى المسؤولين بشكل كبير.
- أسلوب المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات يؤدي إلى تحفيز تكاليف عملية إتخاذ القرار.
- المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار يزيد من قبول وموافقة المسؤولين على تنفيذها بسرعة وفعالية.
- بشكل عام، الإنسان لوحده شخص محدود القدرات والمهارات.
- الرئيسية المباشر لدى الأساليب للأقسام إلى أي متطلبات.
- لدي مسؤوليات كبيرة في عملي.
- هناك فرص كثيرة لتطوير مهاراتي ومعارفي وقدراتي في مجال العمل.
- أستطيع أن أطلق أفكاري وقدراتي الذكية في مجال العمل الذي أقوم به.
- لدي الفرصة في ممارسة وتطوير أساليب وطرق جديدة في مجال العمل.
- لدي الفرصة في تطبيق وممارسة أساليبي وطرقي الخاص في مجال العمل.
- لدي مسؤوليات كبيرة في إتخاذ القرار.
- أحب نوعية العمل الذي أقوم به.
- أشعر بأنني أتقدم وأسمر نحو الأفضل في عملي.
- أشعر بالأمتياز للمسؤولية التي وفرتها لي وظيفتي.
59- سأرفض الترقية لمركز إداري أعلى إذا شعرت
بأنه سيجب من مسؤولياتي وصلاحياتي الحالية.
60- على المدير أن يقضي أغلب وقت العمل مع
الموردين بدلاً من البقاء داخل المكتب.
61- أحب الأشخاص الذين عمل لديهم.
62- هناك تعاون بيني وبين الموردين في العمل.
63- هناك تفاهم بيني وبين رئيسي في العمل.
64- رئيسي في العمل يساندني دائماً.
65- أشعر بعدم الراحة عندما يتم توجيهي بشكل
دقيق ومحدود بماذا وكيف يجب أن أعمل.
66- أفضل العمل ذي المسؤوليات الأكثر من
العمل ذي المسؤوليات القليلة.

67- في الأسطر التالية، أرجو نشر الملاحظات والعزاء إن وجدت لعملية مشاركة
الموردين في إتخاذ القرارات الأدارية:

68- في الأسطر التالية، أرجو رد النيويه والمعلومات - إن وجدت - لعملية مشاركة
الموردين في إتخاذ القرارات الأدارية:

شكرًا مرة أخرى على تعاونكم وتعاونكم، كما أذكركم بأن الأسطر التالية مخصصة للتعليقات
أو أي آراء أخرى لم تشمل في هذه الأسئلة وسأقوم بدراسة نموذجها في مجال عملكم بشكل خاص أو
في مجال العمل الأداري بشكل عام:

والله الموفق...
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