Participative Management Implementation in Study Program Development

Yuniarto Mujisusatyo[a]*, Zainuddin[b]

[a,b]*Postgraduate Program State University of Medan, Medan 20221, Indonesia*
[a]*Email: yuniartoms@yahoo.co.id*
[b]*Email: zain_djaros@yahoo.com*

Abstract

This research aimed to discover participative management implementation in study program development at State University of Medan, Indonesia. Participative management dimension reviewed were involvement, motivation to contribute, and responsibility acceptance. Management and organizational behavior theory concept were used to comprehend research phenomena. Quantitative data collected using questionnaire. Research population consisted of 788 lecturers and 231 of them were determined as sample. Research result showed that participative management implementation tendency in study program development were dominant in moderate level (51.948%). Correlation of each participative management dimension toward its total score were 0.788 for involvement, 0.621 for motivation to contribute, and 0.382 for responsibility acceptance responsibility.

Keywords: Participative; Management.

----

* Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

Paradigm shifting of governmental administration and good governance principle implementation have encouraged government role, function and activity change in fulfilling its society needs based by participation, accountability, transparency and predictability elements especially in state budget management.

Legal basis underlie such paradigm shift are (a) Act of Republic of Indonesia Number 17/2003 concerning State Budget; (b) Act of Republic of Indonesia Number 25/2004 concerning National Development Planning System; and (c) Government Regulation of Republic of Indonesia Number 8/2006 concerning Budget and Government Institution Performance Reporting. One of good governance implementation indication in higher education planning is the implementation of Performance-Based Budget as implementation of Act of Republic of Indonesia Number 25 Year 2004 concerning National Development Planning System. Performance-Based Budget have been implemented by Directorate General of Higher Education in order of 2003-2010 Higher Education Long Term Strategy goal attainment through higher education funding strategy using block grant system in form of Institution Competition Grant Program which has goal is encouraging the realization of quality higher education and autonomously managed in healthy organization environment. Institution Competition Grant Program also expected to empower higher education management to implement autonomy principle that simultaneously guarantee for accountability.

Problems experienced by higher education in certain field such as the lack of community service and research activity, joint research between lecturer and student, lecturer competency development through magister and doctoral advanced level study, internship program and calling for technical assistance for certain problem settlement, such as curriculum document compilation, could be completed using the said cost component above. Quality increase opportunity with support from the said cost component would certainly not only be experienced by study program not receiving fund from Institution Competition Grant Program and only rely on budget for developmental activity in order to quality and relevancy increase sourced only from State University of Medan.

Total study program in State University of Medan winning various Institution Competition Grant Program scheme through 2013 are 26 study programs. If one of study program quality indicator is accreditation status attainment from Higher Education National Accreditation Board of Indonesia then as empirical fact, Institution Competition Grant Program in State University of Medan have increased its study program accreditation quality. In 2009 there was only one department with "A" accreditation status, History Education Department, then its number increased into 7 departments in 2011.

Based on target on Key Performance Indicator No. 222 in State University of Medan Strategic Plan in 2011-2015 it was declared that target of "A" accredited study program in 2012 were 8, and 10 study programs in 2013. Such Key Performance Indicator then was not achieved. Value for money principle requiring money and output value balance and outcome value of certain activity as one form of investment return becomes contradictory as from 26 study programs which implemented of Institution Competition Grant Program only 7 study programs with "A" accreditation status. Institutionally, study program accreditation status collectively shall indicate certain higher education quality and is one of budgeting policy determinant factor by Directorate

General of Higher Education such as State Higher Education Operational Support regulated in Minister of National Education regulation number 58/2012. Problems identified related to the such not maximal "A" accreditation attainment is presumption that participative management in self-evaluation based Program Implementation Plan compilation and program implementation are less implemented.

Though factually self-evaluation compilation as basis in program planning and budgeting compilation have become routine activity while compiling planning at State University of Medan, but several problems are still encountered. Reviewer consolidated comment report document toward various program and Institution Competition Grant Program activities listed in Initial Proposal, Complete Proposal and Program Implementation Plan and Term of Reference of activity submitted and monitoring and evaluation result from Higher Education Council of Directorate General of Higher Education conducted annually toward Institution Competition Grant Program implementation found problems related yet utilized self evaluation data in program and activity compilation. Such matter indicated that coordination between unit either in study program, faculty and university were not running quite well. One of its cause factor might be the less involvement of responsible person in every structural unit in faculty and university by program study due to less comprehended coordination management in Institution Competition Grant Program administrator level in study program.

Main source in program and activity compilation refer to Performance Based Budgeting and self-evaluation based are data – either financial or non financial data, as such data shall be processed into valuable information to explore solution alternative in order to complete problem's root, to determine program priority that refer to budgeting allocation and to determine performance indicator, and to evaluate and make decision concerning fund allocation to be more efficient and accountable. Review toward Term of Reference document submitted by Institution Competition Grant Program executive study program during 2008-2012 period by State University of Medan Institution Competition Grant Program administrator found fact that study program self evaluation data were frequently not sufficient to become information based in program and activity compilation as lack of depth analysis as one of good self evaluation compilation requirement.

Internal stakeholder participation factor that become spirit and criteria of self evaluation compilation especially in involvement of all relevant element aspect frequently encounter obstacle mainly related to inner and between unit coordination in data collection and data analysis process and conclusion making to become reference of certain activity compilation. Work involvement scope of academic staff and less involved administration staff or other education personnel make program that address non academic aspect such as human resource development, financial and asset management, or governance that should be proportionally considered as it is parameter of Good University Governance.

Even though self evaluation compilation conceptually demand active participation of internal stakeholders. Such facts reinforce notion that participative management still less optimally implemented as one of management style alternative in decision making of activity selection and self evaluation compilation and in implementing activity listed in Program Implementation Plan. Position, task and function of administrative staff and lecturer that complete one and another that should be participate must not be reduced and focus only on academic staff. Actually employee participation is generally defined as a process in which influence is shared among

individuals who are other hierarchically unequal [4].

2. Review of Literature

Management is defined as "coordinating and overseeing the work activities of others so that activities are completed efficiently and effectively" [8]. Two other definitions stated management as "the art of getting things done through people" [5] and " management is a distinct process consisting of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling, performed to determine and accomplish stated objectives by the use of human beings and other resources" [7]. Such part called human beings and other resources are formulated in 5 M (men, materials, machines, methods and money). From the said various theories, management essence could be considered either as process (function) as well as function (task).

Application from various philosophy that underlie management namely idealism, realism, pragmatism, and existentialism generate several management implementation stage that classify management practice stages as follow: (a) Participation management, (b) Management based on result (result management), (c) Management that enrich job (job enrichment), (d) Productivity priority management, (e) Management based on possibility (contingency management) and (f) conflict utilization management. Single management philosophy could be considered as certain management way of thinking. Such matter consist of attitude, belief and conceptions of an individual or group concerning management [3].

Participation as individual empowerment concept defined as follow "…participation must be a group process, involving groups of employees and their boss; others stress delegation, the process by which the individual employee is given greater freedom to make decisions on his or her own. Some restrict the term 'participation' to formal institutions, such as works councils; other definitions embrace 'informal participation', the day-to-day relations between supervisors and subordinates in which subordinates are allowed substantial input into work decisions. Finally, there are those who stress participation as a process and those who are concerned with participation as a result" [1].

Democracy cause and facilitate manager and employee participating in decision making. Concerning democratization in organization it is stated that organizational democracy is frequently associated with increased employee involvement and satisfaction, higher levels of innovation, increased stakeholder commitment, and, ultimately, enhanced organizational performance. However, democratic processes can also absorb significant time and other organizational resources and bog down decisions, which may lead to reduced efficiency. In the end, we conclude that although the economic arguments for organizational democracy may be mixed, increased stakeholder participation in value creation and organizational governance can benefit both society and corporations. In fact, the corporation itself may be envisioned as a system of self-governance and the voluntary cooperation of stakeholders [1].

As one consequence of management philosophy effect as mentioned above, participative management emerge due to organizational restructuration and company culture change that cause management style shift, especially shifting from authoritarian management in participative management with emphasize on teamwork and

empowerment. Participative management is also define as a process in which subordinate share a significant degree of decision making power with their immediate superiors [9].

In addition to decision making, in participative management manager and employee also try to solve problems in organization [2]. Various definitions of participative management imply three crucial ideas: involvement, contribution, and responsibility with the following description: Involvement : firstly, and might be the most important, participation means meaningful involvement more than merely physical activity. Someone who participate means ego involvement not merely task involvement. Several managers misuse involvement task for real participation. They go through participation movement, but not more. They conduct meeting, ask for ideas and many others, but entire times that clearly visible to employee that their manager is autocratic superior that desire for no ideas. Empty managerial action is "pseudo participation", with result that employee fail to involve their ego; (b) Motivation to contribute: second concept in this participation is encouraging people to contribute. They are empowered to release their own resources : initiative and creative toward organizational goals, as predicted in Y Theory. Participation is more that attaining approval for anything stipulated already. Its high honor that it accommodate creativity of entire employees. Participation mainly increase motivation by assisting employee to comprehend and clarify their way to lead to the goals ; (c) Responsibility Acceptance: participation encourage people to accept responsibility in their group activity. This is a social process in which people become more involved in certain organization, committed for that, and work successively. As they talk about their organization, they start talk "us" not "them", participation help them become good organizational resident instead of not responsible one, and have tendency to behave like a machine [3].

3. Methods

Participative management in this research operationally defined as involvement, motivation to contribute, and responsibility acceptance of lecturer in higher education "tridharma" (education and teaching, research and community service), and supporting activity that consist of study program planning and development program and student activity in entire management function that consist of planning, organizing, leading and controlling. This research conducted on 18 study programs of State University of Medan-Indonesia in 2016.

Research population were 788 lecturers. Sample determined through *random sampling* method and its number determined using Krejcie and Morgan table, yielding 231 lecturers with the following characteristic :

Table 1: Sample Characteristic Based on Education

Sample Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor	2	0,9
Magister	172	74,5
Doctoral	57	24,7
Total	231	100,0

Table 2: Sample Characteristic Based on Service Period

Sample Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
< 5 years	5	2,2
5 – 10 years	40	17,3
10 – 15 years	41	17,7
15 – 20 years	35	15,2
20 – 25 years	29	12,6
25 – 30 years	81	35,1
Total	231	100,0

Data collection carried out using closed questionnaire of Likert scale. Data analysis conducted descriptively. Participative management dimension reviewed consist of (a) involvement, (b) motivation to contribute, and (c) responsibility acceptance.

Table 3: Dimension and Descriptor of Participative Management

Dimension	Descriptor
1. Involvement	(1.a) Participation in planning activity
	(1.b) Participation in activity implementation
	(1.c) Participation in activity evaluation
2. Motivation to contribute	(2.a) Participation in decision making
	(2.b) Individual idea effect on organization
3. Responsibility acceptance	(3.a) Understanding toward task and function
	(3.b) Compliance with program schedule
	(3.c) Compliance with target attainment and program goal

4. Result and Discussion

According to data analysis, it was revealed hat Participative Management ideal mean was 135, ideal lowest score was 128, ideal highest score of 201, median was 179.1, ideal standard deviation was 30. Whilst data mean for Participative Management is 177.234 with lowest core of 128, highest score of 201, median 179.149, range 173, standard deviation 13.758 and variance 189.283. Participative Management data frequency distribution presented in table 4.

According to Table 4 above it could be described that Participative Management measurement result score were generally dominated in 182-190 interval class amounted to 67 people (29.0%). Lowest score percentage lied in

to interval class, interval class 128-136 as of 3 people (1.299%) and class interval 200-208 with 3 people (1.299%). Average score 177.24 located in 173-181 interval. As of 57.576% (133 respondents) lied below average and 13.42% (31 respondents) lied beyond average.

Table 4: Participative Management Frequency Distribution

Class Interval			F. Absolute	F. Relative (%)
128	-	136	3	1,299
137	-	145	4	1,732
146	-	154	11	4,762
155	-	163	18	7,792
164	-	172	41	17,749
173	-	181	56	24,242
182	-	190	67	29,004
191	-	199	28	12,121
200	-	208	3	1,299

Table 5: Participative Management Trend Level

Range	Observation Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)	Category
≤ 90	0	0,000	Deficient
91 – 135	2	0,868	Low
136 – 180	120	51,948	Moderate
≥ 181	109	47,186	High

Participative management implementation trend in study program development according to table 5 were dominated by moderate category and followed by high category level. Participative management implementation according to cross tabulation of Formal Education with Involvement Dimension (table 6) also showed consistent result, that participative management implementation also dominant in moderate category (57.9%). Lecturer with Magister formal education background dominated involvement in study program development with 76.08% in percentage. In high category, lecturer involvement with Magister educational background were also dominant with 70.58% percentage.

Formal education and Involvement dimension cross tabulation were in moderate level in aggregate in participative management implementation (59.7%). Lecturer with 25-30 years service period (table 7) dominated involvement in study program development either in moderate category (36.23%) as well as high

category (32.94%).

Table 6: Formal Education with Involvement Dimension Cross tabulation

Formal Education	Involvement			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
Bachelor	0	1	1	2
Magister	7	105	60	172
Doctoral	1	32	24	57
Total	8	138	85	231

Table 7: Service Period with Involvement Dimension Cross tabulation

Service Period	Involvement			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
< 5 years	0	3	2	5
5 - 10 years	1	22	17	40
10 - 15 years	2	25	14	41
15 - 20 years	2	20	13	35
20 - 25 years	0	18	11	29
25 - 30 years	3	50	28	81
Total	8	138	85	231

Formal Education and Responsibility Acceptance Dimension Cross tabulation (table 8) as one of participative management also lied in moderate level. As of 95 lecturers (41.2%) occupied the moderate level. For high category, lecturer involvement with Magister educational background also dominating (73.6%).

Table 8: Formal Education with Responsibility Acceptance Dimension Cross tabulation

Formal Education	Responsibility Acceptance			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
Bachelor	0	1	1	2
Magister	3	71	98	172
Doctoral	0	23	34	57
Total	3	95	133	231

Lecturer with 25-30 years service period (table 9) had better responsibility acceptance in developing study program compared with those with less than 25 years service period. As 36 lecturers (37.89%) were in moderate category whilst 33.07% in high category concerning responsibility acceptance and service period analysis.

Table 9: Cross tabulation of Service Period with Responsibility Acceptance Dimension

Service Period	Responsibility acceptance			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
< 5 years	1	1	3	5
5 - 10 years	1	12	27	40
10 - 15 years	0	17	24	41
15 - 20 years	0	17	18	35
20 - 25 years	0	12	17	29
25 - 30 years	1	36	44	81
Total	3	95	133	231

As individual starts accept responsible for group activity, they inside see a way to do whatever they desire to do, which is, to complete work they feel responsible for. This is a key step in developing into successful working unit. As people desire to do something, they will find ways. In that condition lecturers see study program functionaries, faculty and university management functionaries as manager that could take role as contribute to support the team. Lecturers are ready to actively work with manager in management either in faculty as well as university level, instead of reactive to them.

Table 10: Formal Education with Motivation to Contribute Dimension Cross tabulation

Education	Motivation to contribute			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
Bachelor	0	2	0	2
Magister	12	106	54	172
Doctoral	8	33	16	57
Total	20	141	70	231

In aggregate, cross tabulation of Formal Education and Motivation to Contribute Dimension (table 10) indicated that in study program development as of 141 people (61%) had moderate contribution motivation, compared to 70 people (30.3%) with high contribution motivation. Likewise in other participative management dimension, lecturers with magister educational background also dominant for their contribution in moderate level (96.7%) and in high category (77.14%).

Table 11: Service Period with Motivation to Contribute Dimension Cross tabulation

Service Period		Motivation to contribute			
		Low	Moderate	High	Total
	< 5 years	0	3	2	5
	5 - 10 years	4	30	6	40
	10 - 15 years	3	24	14	41
	15 - 20 years	4	20	11	35
	20 - 25 years	4	13	12	29
	25 - 30 years	5	51	25	81
Total		20	141	70	231

Lecturer with 25-30 years service period (table 11) had better motivation to contribute in developing study program. As 51 lecturers (36.1%) were in moderate category whilst 35.7% in high category concerning motivation to contribute and service period analysis.

Table 12: Correlation of Three Participative Management Dimension with Total Score

No	Dimension	Correlation with Participative Management total score
1	Involvement	0,788
2	Motivation to contribute	0,621
3	Responsibility acceptance	0,382

Correlation analysis of each participative management dimension with total score are presented in table 12. Involvement dimension was participative management with highest coefficient of 0.788. Meanwhile responsibility acceptance only had 0.382 coefficient with its total score. Therefore to increase Participative Management variable could be conducted by maintaining involvement dimension performance, and increasing responsibility acceptance dimension. Such matter based on concept that Participative Management as a whole management view encourage entire workers to participate in decision making, mainly, therefore such matter affect goal setting and problem solving.

Participative management could be considered as a whole management view that encourage all workers or members of organization to participate in decision making, mainly, therefore such matter affect goal setting and problem solving through empowerment mechanism (empowering employee). Through empowerment and participative involvement lecturers in study program position themselves not just merely as a means to attain organizational goals in power or authority arena in management circle, but they participate in deciding vote in organizational management in which they work and responsible for what they do.

Such view emerge due to for lecturers as professional, their devotion, knowledge, skill and time for organization not just merely live hood fulfillment, but already viewed from maintaining and raising their value and dignity angle as honorable man that only possess intellect, but also self-esteem and various need that only material in nature, but also related to mental, intellectual, sociological, status, self-development sides and even spiritual dimension form that indicated in job satisfaction. Satisfaction essentially is "…as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" [6]. Participative management implementation also proved balancing involvement of entire manager with their subordinate in information-processing-decision making or problem solving in organizational operational. Decision is selection between two or more alternatives and have three aspects namely (a) It is based on selecting. It is the determination of the most correct one among the alternative regarding the problem; (b) It is rational. While making decisions, a rational but not an emotional attitude should be adopted; (c) It is purposeful. Ways and methods that are serving for the purpose in solving the problem should be preferred [4]. Participative Management implementation mainly in employee involvement in decision making also impact on less employee absence, the increase of organizational commitment, increase performance and work satisfaction [2]. Participative management that have five elements, namely autonomy, participative decision making, objective by group, organizational shift and changing also proved to be significantly correlate with work productivity. Participative Management implementation's positive impact are not without barrier that lead into organizational goal attainment failure. Such failure tendency dominated by factor if manager do not change old pattern of behavior and position themselves personally in organizational decision making. Research fact also revealed that there were manager concern with participation approach. Several managers had difficulty in adjusting new regulation in a system that require high participation. They still remained in X theory, with possibility of fearing of their loosing position as decision maker, or they might concern for reduction in their previous power and control. These might be a remained position but still become real factor, in broader level. Even more influential units that disagree with the success of participative approach are organizational failure to provide necessarily new regulation toward manager as well as employee in better work environment [10]. Though this research had been conducted by applying research principle and procedure that was sought as much as possible but it is realized that there are still several shortcoming and weakness that potentially generate finding not in accordance with the desired one. The following are several research weakness (1) questionnaire usage in data collection and the absence of researcher in questionnaire filling process by respondent could cause researcher gather less information from respondent according to the actual situation and condition. Even though it had been requested for the respondent to look carefully at the available statement and answer option, but inaccuracy in determining answer was likely as there are quite much statement in each variable, potentially resulting boredom for the respondent, (2) this research need to be continued by analyzing development and improvement of study program through Organization Behavior approach and associate participative management with other variables such as organization culture, work satisfaction and performance so that it could generate comprehensive interpretation related with study program development.

5. Conclusions

Participative Management tendency level were dominant in moderate category (51.948%), followed by high category (47.186%) in second place and only 2 people (0.686%) in low category, whilst none in deficient category. Participative Management Variable Mean (177.234) was above its Ideal Mean (135). Correlation of

each participative management dimension toward its total score were respectively 0.788 for involvement; 0.621 for motivation to contribute and 0.382 fir responsibility acceptance. From three matters discussed above, namely moderate and high tendency level and mean above mean ideal are excellent and positive indication as asset for study program development.

Participative management increase could be enhanced through involvement, motivation to contribute and responsibility acceptance indicator/dimension enhancement of either lecturer receiving additional task or not receiving additional task in every activity of management function implementation (planning, organizing, leading and controlling) in higher education "tridharma" (education and teaching, research and community service), and supporting activity that consist of study program and student activity development activity.

Alternative effort could be carried out to maintain involvement dimension are by maintaining participation and sustainably, as Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) implementation, increasing lecturer participation either in planning, actuating and evaluation activity, either in academic, research and community service activity as well as study program development. Academic, research and community service planning as referred before including involvement in : (a) curriculum compilation, (b) Lecturing Contract compilation activity in Courses, (c) academic planning coordination meeting in research proposal compilation, (d) learning quality development discussion, (e) research proposal compilation, (f) community service proposal compilation. Study program development activity as referred above include activity in : (a) Study program Strategic Plan compilation, (b) Annual Work Plan compilation, (c) Term of Reference of activity to perform at study program, and (d) Accreditation and self-evaluation form compilation for study program accreditation.

Alternative effort of lecturer involvement in activity implementation that ideally performed include involvement in the following activity : (a) scholarly quality development, (b) research activity completion with fellow study program lecturers, (c) community service activity completion with fellow study program/department lecturers, (d) student coaching in interest, talent and reasoning affair at study program/department, (e) search for information of study program development, (f) resource person in seminar, (h) as study program visited by Higher Education National Accreditation Board assessor, (i) collaboration development between study program with external stakeholders. Whilst lecturer involvement in evaluation include the involvement in seminar, Focus Group Discussion, workshop meeting at study program related to curriculum evaluation and revision and learning activity evaluation.

Concerning increase on responsibility dimension, alternative effort could be performed are encouraging lecturer to perform : (a) task and responsibility completion at academic affair according to stipulated goal and target, (b) task and responsibility completion at research and community service affair according to stipulated goal and target, (c) task and responsibility completion at student affair should assigned by study program/department according to stipulated goal and target, (d) task and responsibility completion should assigned in activity committee at study program according to stipulated goal and target. Such matters due to participative management are actually philosophy and method of managing human resource inside environment in which employee honored and their contribution are respected and utilized. From philosophical point of view, participative management center on belief that people at every organizational level could develop their original

interest in their success and could do much more than just merely perform task assigned to them. This approach involve worker in various information, completing problem, making decision, planning project and evaluating result.

Research conclusion had confirmed effectiveness of participative management in organization goal attainment. In study program level entire lecturer participation should be initiated from *planning* stage as the beginning for management function implementation, not only in academic, research and outreach program affair, but also in non academic affair including governance, resource (asset, facility-infrastructure and financial).

Participation in academic, research and outreach program affair due to they are lecturer's main duty and function which implementation could be ensured by study program due to regulation clarity. Its problem possibility might be on monitoring and evaluation against education, research and outreach program activity implementation. Likewise for research and outreach program activity in which quite strict monitoring and evaluation has been applied by Ministry of Research and Higher Education. Whilst for education affair, in monitoring and evaluation implementation study program could coordinate with Internal Quality Assurance Center. Study program Strategic Plan Compilation periodically conducted every five years should involve entire lecturers in study program so that vision, mission, goal and strategic target compilation as well as program and activity together with *Key Performance Indicator* are mutually established and made reference in study program management.

Lecturer involvement in Strategic Plan compilation could also optimizing adjustment between lecturer vision and mission personally with study program's vision and mission. Other impact would be that lecturer shall make such Strategic Plan as career development reference at least during five years period and is realized in Employee Working Target every year. Lecturer involved in planning with the said participative mechanism subsequently also be requested for their role to ensure whether study program accreditation concept in 7 standards established by Higher Education National Accreditation Board, specifically Vision, Mission, Goal and Target as well as Strategy Attainment (standard 1), Governance, Leadership, Management System, and Quality Assurance (standard 2), Student and Graduation (standard 3), Human Resources (standard 4), Curriculum, Learning and Academic Atmosphere (standard 5), Funding, Facility and Infrastructure and Information System (standard 6), Research, Service/Outreach program and collaboration (standard 7) have been made as reference in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and quality assurance system in their study program.

References

[1] A. Wilkinson, Adrian, P.J. Gollan, M. Marchingto, and D. Lewin. The Oxford Handbook of Participation in Organizations. New York : Oxford University Press, 2010,pp. 10.

[2] F.K. Muindi."The Relatinship between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business, University of Nairoby." Journal of Human Resources Management Research Vol 2011, Article ID 246460, 34 pages DOI : 105171/2011.246460, 2011

[3] G. Terry translate by Winardi..Asas-asas Manajemen, Bandung : Alumni, 2012, pp.67.

[4] Gülcan, Murat Gurkan-Gazi. "Views Of Administrators And Teachers On Participation In Decision Making At School (The City Of Ankara Sample)". Journal of Education Vol. 131 No. 3.pp.637-652,2013.

[5] H. Usman. Manajemen : Teori Praktik dan Riset Pendidikan. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara, 2010, pp. 5-10.

[6] J. Colquitt et al. Organizational Behavior. New York : Mc. Graw Hill, 2009,pp. 105.

[7] R.E. Indrajit and R. Djokopranoto. Wealth Management untuk Penyelenggaraan Perguruan Tinggi. Yogjakarta : Andi Offset, 2011, pp. 315.

[8] S.P. Robbins and M. Coulter. Management. New Jersey : Prentice Hall, 2007, pp. 37.

[9] S.P. Robbins and T. A. Judge. Organizational Behavior. New York : Prentice Hall, 2009, pp. 259.

[10] Samad Ranjbar Ardekani and Shapour Amin Shayan Jahromi."Relationship Between Participative Management and Personnel Productivity: A Survey in Gachsaran Gas and Oil Company." World Applied Sciences Journal 15 (9): pp.1319-1324, 2011 ISSN 1818-4952 © IDOSI Publications, 2011