

A Study of the Extent to Which Leaders Adopt the Principle of Decision-Making Participation -A Case Study of Selected Institutions in Setif

دراسة إستقصائية لمستوى تبني القادة لمبدأ المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات - حالة بعض المؤسسات بولاية سطيف -

Rima Khalouta

Management Department, University of Setif 1, Algeria

rimahalima@yahoo.fr

Received on:28/02/2024

Accepted on:24/07/2024

published on: 29/10/2024

Abstract: The significant challenges facing institutions in the present era have led to an increase in voices advocating for more participation in decision-making, in order to achieve better decisions. This process has become considered a fundamental factor in modern management, as it maximizes the contributions of employees and institutions to their fullest potential. This study aimed to diagnose the actual reality of institutional leaders' practice of the principle of participation in decision-making in the leadership process. Three active ceramic industry institutions were selected for a survey study to understand the reality of decision-making participation in these institutions. The study concluded that leaders in institutions, across various levels, are not aware of the importance of involving their subordinates in decision-making, and do not adopt this process as a principle in their leadership.

Keys words: Leaders, institutions, participation, decision

JEL classification codes: K10, D02, H43, D91

ملخص: إن التحديات الكبيرة التي تواجهها المؤسسات في العصر الحاضر، قد أدت إلى تزايد الأصوات الداعية إلى مزيد من المشاركة في إتخاذ القرارات، من أجل التوصل إلى قرارات أفضل، فهذه العملية أصبحت تعتبر عاملا أساسيا في الإدارة الحديثة، حيث تصل بإسهامات العاملين والمؤسسات إلى الحد الأقصى لها. هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تشخيص الواقع الفعلي لممارسة قادة المؤسسات لمبدأ المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار في عملية القيادة، حيث تم إختيار ثلاث مؤسسات ناشطة في صناعة الخزف وإجراء دراسة إستطلاعية لمعرفة واقع المشاركة في إتخاذ القرار في هذه المؤسسات، وخلصت الدراسة إلى عدم وعي القادة في المؤسسات على إختلاف مستوياتهم بأهمية مشاركة مرؤوسيههم في إتخاذ القرارات، وعدم تبني هذه العملية كمبدأ في قيادتهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القادة، المؤسسات، المشاركة، القرار

تصنيف JEL: D91, H43, D02, K10

Corresponding author: Rima Khalouta e-mail: rimahalima@yahoo.fr

1-Introduction

The significant challenges that institutions face in the present era have led to an increase in voices calling for more participation in decision-making, in order to reach better decisions. Therefore, a successful leader is one who involves subordinates in the decision-making process, a process that has become considered a fundamental factor in modern management. It maximizes the contributions of workers and institutions, reaching their utmost potential. Looking at Algerian institutions, like others striving to achieve a competitive

advantage that ensures their survival and continuity in a highly competitive market, it becomes imperative for them to undergo radical structural changes and shift from traditional hierarchical management to modern management adopting contemporary concepts like participation in decision-making. From this perspective, the main question posed is:

To what extent do the leaders of the institutions under study adopt the principle of participation in decision-making?

Based on this, the main hypothesis of this article is: **Leaders of the institutions under study adopt the principle of participation in decision-making.**

Study Methodology and Tools: In this research paper, the theoretical aspect of participation in decision-making will be presented. Afterward, the topic will be addressed from a field perspective. The field study was conducted on three ceramics manufacturing institutions in the state of Setif: Safsar, Batissaram, and Haddad institutions. The study sample consisted of 72 employees from each institution. Observation, interviews, and questionnaires were used as research methods. The questionnaires included a set of questions all centered around worker Participation in Decision-Making, including personal and job-related data. The Likert five-point scale was employed. Suitable statistical methods were used to match the nature of this study, such as the chi-square test to determine the differences between the institutions under study in each statement. Additionally, frequencies and percentages were utilized to describe the study variables and determine the respondents' answers, which were then used to analyze their opinions. Also, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to detect differences in the perspectives of the study participants across multiple institutions. Additionally, the Scheffe post hoc test was employed to identify the source of variance or the direction of differences among study groups and to determine their statistical significance. In the end, this led to a set of results, and a series of recommendations were formulated.

2- First Part: Participation in Decision-Making

2-1- Definition of Participation in Decision-Making

Participation is defined as "involving every individual in the group with their thoughts and emotions in setting the group's goals and bearing part of its responsibilities". (Hassan, 1998, pp. 47-48). It means "the mental and emotional integration of the individual in the group's work after the group - to which they belong - provides them with opportunities to contribute to the goals and share in the responsibilities. (others H. Y., 1997, p. 146)", This definition includes three main ideas: integration or immersion, contribution, and responsibility. The first idea, immersion, means that the individual immerses themselves not only in the work but does so genuinely, not just superficially. The second idea is

contribution or participation, which motivates individuals to contribute, giving them the opportunity to unleash their creative energies and potentials. The third idea is responsibility, as participation encourages individuals to accept responsibility for the group's activities. In summary, participation means "the contribution of workers and employees in making some decisions and executing some tasks related to the work, its conditions, and its problems. (Moussa, 2009, p. 185)". From the above, we conclude that participation means that leaders and managers do not monopolize decision-making authority but instead involve employees in this process and listen to their opinions, ideas, and discuss their problems.

It is important to note that the process of delegating authority is different from the process of participation in decision-making. The former involves delegating authority, not responsibility, whereas the latter leads to the individual taking responsibility for the decisions they have helped to make. In other words, an individual's participation in decision-making leads to their sharing in the responsibility for that decision.

2-2- Levels of Participation in Decision-Making:

Participation has three levels, depending on the worker's ability and willingness to participate (Moussa, 2009, pp. 186-187):

A- Listening Level: At this level, the worker attends meetings and listens to discussions but does not participate in them;

B- Discussion Level: At this level, the worker attends meetings that directly discuss topics of interest to them, and they are allowed to participate in the discussion without having a vote in the decision-making process;

C- Voting Level: Here, the worker attends meetings, participates in discussions, and has a vote in making decisions and solving problems.

2-3- Conditions for Effective Participation:

There are several conditions that can make the participation process in decision-making more effective and successful (others H. Y., 1997, pp. 148-149):

A- Having sufficient time for participation before making a decision, as the participation process rarely occurs in emergency situations;

B- The topic under discussion should be related to the organization and of interest to the participants;

C- Participants should have the necessary intellectual and cognitive competencies;

D- The participant's ability to communicate and exchange views, so they can speak at the level of other participants;

Other conditions include (Hariz, 2008, p. 166):

E- Creating an appropriate climate of openness and understanding, and providing individuals with data and information so they can study, analyze, and identify alternatives based on it;

F- Involving workers in topics that fall within their scope of work and for which they have the capabilities and skills to contribute;

G- Giving the appropriate opportunity for participation, such as considering the opinions provided by individuals if they are appropriate and practically beneficial, and if their application results in positive outcomes that reflect on the effectiveness and wisdom of the decision made through participation.

Moreover, one of the most important conditions is that individuals are involved in decisions that target goals not in conflict with their interests and objectives, because if they are, it will not ensure their enthusiasm for and cooperation in their implementation (Achour, 1995, p. 184).

2-5- Effects of Participation in Decision-Making:

A- Positive Effects of Participation in Decision-Making: The most prominent advantages of participation in decision-making (Hamid, 2000, pp. 56- 57):

- Developing self-monitoring among subordinates;
- Increasing workers' commitment to implementing decisions and their sense of responsibility, and enhancing the effectiveness of these decisions;
- Achieving a high level of satisfaction among subordinates;
- Developing the capabilities and skills of subordinates, fostering a spirit of creation, initiative, and encouragement towards innovation;
- Enabling a deeper understanding and clarification of decisions among subordinates;
- Narrowing the gap in viewpoints between managers and subordinates.

The benefits of participating in decision-making include (Others, 1999, p. 41):

- A positive impact on the cohesion and bonding within groups in the organization, and easier implementation of decisions;
- Richer, more diverse, and detailed information;
- A strong potential for creativity.

Participation also derives its importance from the significance of the individual and their role in the success of change policies. Through participation in decision-making, resistance to required changes can be reduced.. (Maghribi, 2004, p. 135).

B- Negative Effects of Participation in Decision-Making: Generally, the disadvantages of participation in decision-making include (others H. Y., 1997, p. 150):

- Individuals whose suggestions are not accepted may feel alienated and psychologically distant from others;
- Participation may lead to stronger bonds among individuals, which could be against management;
- Participation may create expectations among workers for the continuity of this process, while management may be unable to sustain it;
- Implementing the principle of participation requires a relatively long time, which may cause anxiety and frustration for some, resulting in subpar decision-making.

Among the most significant criticisms of the participation process in decision-making are (-Baqi, 2001, p. 277):

- It appears as a concession by the leader of some of their leadership responsibilities imposed by their position;
- Some leaders may view it as an end in itself rather than a means to achieve democratic leadership.

3-Second Part: The Field Study

In this part, we will present and analyze the results related to the personal and job-related data of the study sample, in addition to presenting and analyzing the results related to the extent to which direct leaders - in the institutions under study - rely on their subordinates' participation in decision-making. However, before proceeding, it should be noted that the researcher used the "Cronbach's Alpha" method to measure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, with the result as shown in the following table:

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Reliability Coefficient	Participation in decision-making
	0.8

The source: outputs using SPSS software

The table shows that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is estimated at 0.80, indicating that the questionnaire enjoys a high degree of reliability.

3-1- Presentation and analysis of the results related to the personal and occupational data of the study sample

Through this section, the researcher aim to determine the characteristics and features of the study sample and assess their homogeneity.

* **Age:** The following table illustrates the distribution of individuals in the age groups

Table 2: Distribution of Sample Individuals by Age Variable

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages (%)	20- 30	31- 40	41- 50	51- 60	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages (%)	26	37	8	1	72
		36.1%	51.4%	11.1%	1.4%	100.0%
SAF	Repetitions and Percentages (%)	39	21	12	0	72
		54.2%	29.2%	16.7%	0%	100.0%
HAD	Repetitions and Percentages (%)	24	28	13	7	72
		33.3%	38.9%	18.1%	9.7%	100.0%
The total	Repetitions and Percentages (%)	89	86	33	8	216
		41.2%	39.8%	15.3%	3.7%	100.0%

The source:The form

Based on the data in the table above, which pertains to the distribution of sample individuals across different age groups, it can be observed that the majority of the researched community in the three institutions falls within the age range of 20 to 40 years. From this, it can be concluded that the majority of the workforce owned by the three institutions is composed of young individuals. This indicates a certain level of homogeneity and similarity in the ages of the workers in these institutions.

* **Educational level:** The following table illustrates the distribution of the sample according to the educational level variable.

Table 3: Distribution of Sample Individuals according to Educational Level

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	Elementary	Middle school	High school	University	The total
BATI	Repetitions and	2	37	29	4	72
		2.8 %	51.4%	40.3%	5.6%	100%

	Percentages					
SAF	Repetitions	2	33	35	2	72
	and Percentages	2.8%	45.8%	48.6%	2.8%	100%
HAD	Repetitions	12	11	37	12	72
	and Percentages	16.7%	15.3%	51.4%	16.7%	100%
The total	Repetitions	16	81	101	18	216
	and Percentages	7.4%	37.5%	46.8%	8.3%	100%

The source:The form

The previous table shows that workers with intermediate (middle school) and secondary (high school) education levels were the majority in the three institutions in the study. From the above, it can be concluded that there is a certain degree of homogeneity in the educational qualifications of individuals in the three institutions.

*** Experience variable:** The following table illustrates the distribution of sample individuals on the experience scale.

Table 4: Distribution of sample individuals by the variable of experience

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	From 1 to 5 years	6 –10 years	More than 10 years	The total
BATI	Repetitions	45	14	13	72
	and Percentages	62.5%	19.4%	18.1%	100.0%
SAF	Repetitions	53	7	12	72
	and Percentages	73.6%	9.7%	16.7%	100.0%
HAD	Repetitions	49	10	13	72
	and Percentages	68.1%	13.9%	18.1%	100.0%
The total	Repetitions and	147	31	38	216
	Percentages	68.1%	14.4%	17.6%	100.0%

The source:The form

The information presented in the above table shows that the majority of workers in the three institutions have experience ranging from 1 year to 5 years. Meanwhile, the three institutions have a small number of workers with long and medium-term experience.

3-2-Presentation and analysis of the results related to the availability of the principle of participation in decision-making among the leaders of the institutions under study:

*** Regarding the direct supervisor's search for employees' suggestions, we obtained the following results shown in the subsequent table:**

Table 5: Distribution of the sample individuals according to the extent of the direct supervisor seeking their suggestions

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages	12 16.7%	01 1.4%	20 27.8%	0 0%	39 54.2%	72 100%
SAF	Repetitions and Percentages	16 22.2%	2 2.8%	10 13.9%	0 0%	44 61.1%	72 100%
HAD	Repetitions and Percentages	11 15.3%	13 18.1%	18 25%	11 15.3%	19 26.4%	72 100%
The total	Repetitions and Percentages	39 18.1%	16 7.4%	48 22.2%	11 47.2%	102 51.4%	216 100%

the chi-square for the above data

calculated chi-square	degrees of freedom	level of significance
53.496	08	.000

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

What can be said about the data in this table is that the majority of workers in the Patisseram institution strongly and conclusively deny the direct supervisor's search for employees' suggestions, with their number reaching 39 workers.

Almost the same observations can be recorded at the level of the SAFSAR institution, where we find that more than 61% of the surveyed category completely rejects the content of this statement. The same applies to the Haddad conglomerate, where the majority of workers denied the direct supervisor's behavior in this manner, with their percentage exceeding 41%, corresponding to 30 workers. A significant percentage confirmed to us the supervisor's interest in the workers' suggestions and his constant search for them, with their number reaching 24 workers, which corresponds to 33.4%. Meanwhile, the rest of the percentage, estimated at 25% of the total workers, responded that their supervisor sometimes seeks their suggestions.

From the same table, we notice that the calculated chi-square (χ^2) value is 53.496, which is significant at degrees of freedom (08) and an error level (0.05) with a significance level of (0.000). This means that there are statistically significant differences between the three institutions.

*** Regarding the extent of the direct supervisor's implementation of the suggestions made by the employees, we obtained the results as shown in the following table:**

Table 6: Distribution of the sample individuals according to the extent of the direct supervisor's implementation of their suggestions.

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages	25 34.7%	2 2.8%	29 40.3%	0 0%	16 22.2%	72 100%
SAF	Repetitions and Percentages	19 26.4%	4 5.6%	31 43.1%	1 1.4%	17 23.6%	72 100%
HAD	Repetitions and Percentages	1 1.4%	4 5.6%	27 37.5%	25 34.7%	15 20.8%	72 100%
The total	Repetitions and Percentages	45 20.8%	10 4.6%	87 40.3%	26 12%	48 22.2%	216 100%

the chi-square for the above data

calculated chi-square

68.232

degrees of freedom

08

level of significance

.000

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software Considering the workers' opinions on the direct manager's implementation of the

suggestions proposed by the workers in the three establishments, we find that the majority in both Batisseram and Savsar responded with "sometimes." In the first establishment, 29 workers, equivalent to 40.3% of the total workforce, replied that sometimes the manager considers these suggestions and other times does not pay any attention to them. A significant percentage confirmed that although the manager does not seek their suggestions, once a worker independently makes a suggestion, the manager tries to implement this suggestion and considers it without hesitation, especially if it yields positive results after the testing process. This view was supported by 37.5% of the respondents, equivalent to 27 workers, while the remaining 22.2% (equivalent to 16 workers) denied the direct manager's implementation of their suggestions. In the case of Savsar, the situation is almost the same. Thirty-one workers from the surveyed group confirmed that the direct manager sometimes works on implementing the suggestions made by the workers. They informed us that the manager first examines the suggestion, and if it bears fruit, he implements it; if not, he disregards it. Twenty-three workers from the same group confirmed that the manager often, if not always, works on implementing their suggestions and tries to materialize them into reality, while only 18 out of 72 workers denied the manager's application of their suggestions.

Conversely, in the Haddad group, we recorded a very small category agreeing with this statement. Only 5 workers, confirmed that the direct manager implements their suggestions. Twenty-seven workers, equivalent to 37.5%, say that the manager sometimes implements the suggestions of his subordinates, while the majority hold an opposite belief, representing more than half of the surveyed group, about 55.5% or 40 workers. They informed us that the manager does not implement suggestions, as he primarily does not care about the workers, their opinions, or their suggestions, so how could he be concerned with implementing them. They added that his interest is focused first and foremost on pleasing those above him in rank.

*** Regarding the direct involvement of a supervisor in engaging their subordinates when proposing solutions to problems that arise during work, we obtained the following results, which are illustrated in the table below:**

Table 7: Distribution of the sample individuals according to their involvement by their direct supervisor when proposing solutions to problems.

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages	17 23.6%	2 2.8%	25 34.7%	1 1.4%	27 37.5%	72 100%
SAF	Repetitions and Percentages	33 45.8%	5 6.9%	17 23.6%	1 1.4%	16 22.2%	72 100%
HAD	Repetitions and Percentages	4 5.6%	13 18.1%	17 23.6%	20 27.8%	18 25%	72 100%
The total	Repetitions and Percentages	54 25%	20 9.3%	59 27.3%	22 10.2%	61 28.2%	216 100.0%

the chi-square for the above data

calculated chi-square	degrees of freedom	level of significance
71.509	08	.000

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

Regarding the issue of direct supervisor involvement in proposing solutions to problems that arise during work, the table above shows that the majority proportion in the Patisseram institution, estimated at 38.9% or about 28 workers, deny this behavior from their direct supervisor. This is followed by a rate of 34.7%, who see that their direct supervisor only sometimes engages in this behavior. Meanwhile, the majority of the workers interviewed from the Safsar institution confirmed to us that the supervisor often, if not always, involves them when proposing solutions to problems that arise during work. These workers added that the direct supervisor tries to study and test the proposed solution, and if it yields a positive result, it is applied directly without hesitation. What is important to him is that this does not harm the interest of the production process. They also added that the supervisor is very pleased with the proposed solutions and praises their proposer.

The remaining percentage is divided into two equal parts, with 23.6% of the workers feeling that the supervisor does not engage in this behavior and does not seek their advice when proposing solutions except occasionally. They attribute this to the nature of the problem; if it falls within the subordinate's area of expertise, he is involved in proposing solutions for it. If the problem is outside his area of expertise, the supervisor finds and proposes solutions on his own without seeking the worker's advice. The same percentage emphatically confirms that the direct supervisor does not value their opinion or the provision of solutions. In stark contrast, at the Haddad conglomerate, we find that the majority acknowledged that their direct supervisor strongly refrains from involving workers in proposing solutions to problems, with their number reaching 38 workers. This group informed us that he always prefers to be the sole knower of the problem's details and to propose possible solutions, in order to always appear as the one proficient at work, and to cast a shadow of ignorance on the workers. The remaining percentage is evenly divided between those who support the idea of the direct supervisor involving his subordinates when proposing solutions and those who support this idea sometimes and oppose it at other times, with the rate reaching 23.7%. Through the table above, we notice that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value is estimated at 71.509, significant at degrees of freedom (08), an error level (0.05), and a significance level of (0.000). This means that there are statistically significant differences between the Patisseram and Haddad conglomerate on one side, and the Safsar institution on the other.

*** Regarding the direct supervisor presenting his decisions to the workers for some modifications or approval, we obtained the following results as illustrated by the next table:**

Table 8: Distribution of the sample individuals according to the direct supervisor presenting his decisions to the workers.

Institution	Repetitions and Percentages	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages	9 12.5%	1 1.4%	6 8.3%	2 2.8%	54 75%	72 100%
SAF	Repetitions and	20	4	8	2	38	72

	Percentages	27.8%	5.6%	11.1%	2.8%	52.8%	100%
HAD	Repetitions	4	9	18	23	18	72
	and Percentages	5.6%	12.5 %	25%	31.9%	25.0%	100%
The total	Repetitions	33	14	32	27	110	216
	and Percentages	15.3%	6.5%	14.8%	12.5%	50.9%	100.0%

the chi-square for the above data

calculated chi-square	degrees of freedom	level of significance
77.344	08	.000

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software largest percentage of the surveyed population across the three institutions believes that their direct supervisor does not inform them about the decisions made for their approval or to make some modifications in them. The percentage reached 77.8% in Patisseram, 55.6% in Safsar, and 56.9% in Haddad. These workers informed us that the direct supervisor himself receives decisions from higher levels, and his role is merely to execute and communicate them to the workers. As for the group that answered 'always' and 'sometimes,' they attributed this to the simple decisions that fall within the direct supervisor's authority.

Through the table, we note that the calculated Chi-square (χ^2) value is estimated at 77.344, significant at degrees of freedom (08) and an error level (0.05) with a significance level of (0.000). This indicates that there are statistically significant differences between the three institutions.

*** Regarding the direct supervisor giving subordinates the opportunity to freely express their opinions, we obtained the following results as shown in the table below:**

Table9: Distribution of sample individuals based on the extent to which the direct supervisor gives them the opportunity to freely express their opinions.

Institutio n	Repetitions and Percentages	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	The total
BATI	Repetitions and Percentages	44 61.1%	2 2.8%	8 11.1%	0 0%	18 25%	72 100%
SAF	Repetitions and Percentages	52 72.2%	3 4.2%	4 5.6%	1 1.4%	12 16.7%	72 100%
HAD	Repetitions and Percentages	4 5.6%	8 11.1%	15 20.8%	21 29.2%	24 33.3%	72 100%
The total	Repetitions and Percentages	100 46.3%	13 6%	27 12.5%	22 10.2%	54 25%	216 100%

the chi-square for the above data

calculated chi-square	degrees of freedom	level of significance
93.611	08	.000

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

The data from the table above indicates that the majority of workers surveyed at both Patisseram and Savsar have complete and absolute freedom to express their opinions, with numbers reaching 46 and 55 workers at the first and second institutions respectively, These workers reported that their relationship with their direct supervisor goes beyond a mere work relationship, extending into friendship, given the long time they have spent together in the institution.

Conversely, the situation at Hadad Group presents a stark contrast to the aforementioned results. Only 12 workers believe that their direct supervisor often or always gives them the opportunity to freely express their opinions. Meanwhile, 45 workers confirmed that their direct supervisor refrains from giving them opportunities to express their opinions, attributing this to a significant fear of the supervisor, which inhibits their freedom of expression. The remaining group, consisting of 15 workers, acknowledges that the

supervisor only allows them to express their opinions in specific situations, depending on the supervisor's mood.

From the table above, we note that the calculated value of Chi-square (χ^2) is 93.611, which is significant at degrees of freedom (df) = 8 and an error level (α) of 0.05, with a significance level of 0.000. This means there are statistically significant differences between Hadad Group on one hand, and Savsar and Patisseram on the other.

3- 3- Variance Analysis Regarding the Significance of Statistical Differences Among the Institutions Under Study: To clarify the significance of the differences, we relied on the ANOVA measure, and the results are presented as shown in the following table:

Table (10): One-Way ANOVA Regarding the Significance of Statistical Differences in Participation in Decision Making According to the Type of Institution

axis	source of variation	Degrees of freedom	sum of squares	mean of squares	F value	level of significance
Decision-Making Participation	Between groups	2	375.111	187.556	7.480	0.000
	Inside groups	213	5340.514	25.073		
	The total	215	5715.625			

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

The table shows that the value of F for participation in decision-making was estimated at 7.480, significant at degrees of freedom within groups (213) and between groups (02) with a significance level of (0.000). This indicates the presence of statistically significant differences.

3-4- Identifying the Source of Differences Among the Institutions Under Study: To determine the source of these significant differences and uncover their statistical significance, we relied on the Scheffe post-hoc test to identify the direction of these differences among the institutions of Patisseram, Safsar, and Haddad Complex. The results are presented as shown in the following table :

Table (11):Results of the Scheffe test for determining the direction of differences between the institutions under study

dependent variable	Instiution (A)	Institution (B)	differenc e of means	standar d error	level of signifi cance	confidence level95 %	
						minimum limit	Maxim um limit
Delegation of authority	BAT	SAF	1.77778-	83455.	106.	-3.8350	2794.
		HAD	1.44444	83455.	226.	-.6128	3.5017
	SAF	BAT	1.77778	83455.	106.	-.2794	3.8350
		HAD	3.22222*	83455.	.0001.	1.1650	5.2794
	HAD	BAT	-1.44444	83455.	226.	-3.5017	6128.
		SAF	-3.22222	83455.	.001.	-5.2794	-1.1650

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

The table reveals that there are statistically significant differences in participation in decision-making, and the subsequent table clarifies these differences and their directions.

Table (12):Scheffe Test Results Regarding the Significance of Statistical Differences in Participation in Decision Making

Institution	HAD	BAT	SAF
HAD			*+
BAT			
SAF	*+		

The source: Based on the analysis outputs using the SPSS software

The table indicates that there are statistically significant differences in the degree of employee participation in decision-making in favor of the Safsar

institution. The degree of worker participation in this institution is better than in both the Patisseram and Haddad institutions. The researcher attributes this result to the fact that direct supervisors in the Safsar institution try and are keen to gain the trust of their subordinates and link it to the goals of the institution. In contrast, Patisseram and Haddad do not focus on this issue.

Referring back to the previous analysis, we find that the direct supervisor in the Safsar institution somewhat enjoys an element of participation in decision-making. The responses of the subjects indicated that the direct supervisor implements their suggestions and involves them when proposing solutions to problems that arise during work. They are given the opportunity to freely express their opinions and are presented with his decisions for approval or to make some adjustments. This positively affects these subordinates. Working under a policy of participation in decision-making makes these subordinates feel valued, humane, and important within the institution, which increases their job satisfaction, sense of responsibility, and self-confidence. This encourages them to strive more in proposing new ideas and to exert more of their latent energies to achieve the goal. As for the Patisseram and Haddad institutions, there is somewhat a lack, if not an absence, of the principle of participation in decision-making. The responses of the subjects in most cases (in the Patisseram institution) and all cases (in the Haddad institution) denied the basis of participation in decision-making. This makes these workers feel unimportant and undervalued within the institution, which reduces their level of job satisfaction and their sense of responsibility and self-confidence, hindering the emergence of creative ideas among them. This confirms **the inaccuracy of the main hypothesis, as not all leaders of the institutions under study adopt the principle of participation in decision-making in leadership.**

4- Conclusion: This article is concluded by presenting a set of results and offering a sentence of recommendations:

***Results:**

- Participation in decision-making is crucial in organizations and has become a fundamental factor in modern management, maximizing the contributions of employees, leaders, and institutions.
- A successful leader is one who adopts the inclusion of subordinates in decisions, achieving their satisfaction, encouraging them to work freely and

diligently, unleashing their creative ideas, and making them responsible for their assigned tasks.

- Participation in decision-making is not a random process but a structured one that leaders must fully understand in all its aspects.

- Most leaders refrain from adopting a participatory decision-making policy.

- Leaders in institutions, regardless of their levels, lack awareness of the importance of involving their subordinates in decision-making and do not adopt this process as a principle in their leadership.

*** Recommendations:**Based on the findings, the researcher recommends:

- Emphasizing the policy of participation in decision-making at all levels within the organization, expanding the scope of this participation, and seriously activating this principle.

- Completely moving away from and abandoning the autocratic approach in dealings.

- Organizing training courses and involving leaders at various levels to educate them about the principle of participation in decision-making, the levels of this process, its essential conditions and requirements, and its positive effects on leaders, individuals, and institutions.

Bibliography List:

1- Achour, A. S. (1995). *Organizational Behavior in Organizations*. Alexandria: University Knowledge House.

2- Baqi, S. E.-D. (2001). *Organizational Behavior* . Alexandria: University House for Printing and Distribution.

3- Hamid, R. A. (2000). *The role of leadership in Decision-Making During Crises*. Egypt: Al-Aman Press.

4- Hariz, S. M. (2008). *Fundamentals of Business Management, Theoretical and Practical Skills*. Amman: Qandil Publishing and Distribution .

5- Hassan, A. (1998). *Personnal Management and human Relations*. Alexandria: University Youth Foundation.

- 6- Maghribi, K. M. (2004). *Organizational Behavior, Concepts and Foundations of Individual and Group Behavior in the organization*. Amman: Dar Al- Fikr for Publishing and Distribution.
- 7- Moussa, F. M. (2009). *Human relations in Industrial Organizations*. Amman: Zahran Publishing and Distribution.
- 8- others, H. y. (1997). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Between Theory and Application* . Dar Al Kitab Al- Hadith.
- 9- Others, M. P. (1999). *Team Management, concepts and Practices*. Dunod, Paris.