

**THE INTERACTIONS AMONG ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP
BEHAVIOR, UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY AND LECTURER
EMPOWERMENT IN MALAYSIAN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES**

WONG SIEW CHIN

**Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya In
Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My research was certainly not a solitary endeavor and I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge many people who have provided their assistance and support in the completion of this dissertation.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof Dr Sufean bin Hussin, who is truly the epitome of a remarkable educator that goes above and beyond the call of duty. I am grateful for his immeasurable dedication, commitment and guidance over the years in helping me to develop and refine my thinking and research. There are simply no words to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude for his tolerance and support, without which this educational pursuit simply would not have been possible.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the five Malaysian research universities—UM, USM, UPM, UKM and UTM for the approval to conduct my research. In particular, I am indebted to the faculty members' kind participation and all the efforts undertaken during my data collection duration.

I am grateful to my beloved husband, Chee Weng and my lovely daughter, Eunice for their unwavering understanding, support, patience and encouragement during this educational endeavor.

Above all things, I thank God for sustaining me with the strength and perseverance to complete this study.

SYNOPSIS

Numerous previous research works have shown that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of employees in corporations is strongly related to job commitment, productivity, and sustainability. However, most of the research works were not based on a political-sociology conception of citizenship and thus not scientific enough methodologically to warrant their validity. The main purpose of this research was to construct a conceptually valid and reliable survey instrument on OCB, and then to use the instrument in the university setting. The other purpose was to construct and validate two other survey instruments, namely university autonomy (UA) and lecturer empowerment (LE), and then from the data obtained, the correlations and regressions among OCB, UA, and LE were analyzed.

Data on these three variables under study were gathered via surveys completed by 611 academics comprising deans, head of departments, professors and lecturers from five Malaysian research universities—University of Malaya (UM), University of Science Malaysia (USM), National University of Malaysia (UKM), University Putra Malaysia (UPM) and University Technology Malaysia (UTM), all of which fulfilled the required ‘research university’ criteria set by the government.

The statistical results based on factor analysis established the soundness OCB survey instrument—that offers a heuristic integrated model of OCB in juxtaposition of the Athenian and the Japanese Model of ‘citizenship’, and validated OCB as a unified construct that comprised nine dimensions or domains—community orientation by helping, innovation for improvement, competitive to excel, compliance, openness, individual resilience, agility, responsive leadership and entrepreneurial spirit. Factor analysis results also verified and validated seven distinctive facets of LE instrument namely participative decision-making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy in job, professional impact, execution of power as well as nine distinctive facets of UA instrument: academic programs, postgraduate academic programs, research and consultation, teaching and learning, management, human resource, finance, infrastructure facilities, students’ affairs in this study.

Overall, the findings in aggregate revealed that academics rated highly their sense of OCB, LE and UA in Malaysian research universities. In particular, seven domains in OCB (community orientation by helping, innovation for improvement, compliance, openness, competitive urgency to excel, individual resilience and agility), three domains in LE (professional growth, self-efficacy and status) and five domains in UA (university autonomy in academic programs, postgraduate academic programs, research and consultation, teaching and learning, students affairs) were found to be the more prominent aspects in their respective constructs. Correlation analysis demonstrated positive significant relationships among the three constructs and contended that the theoretical proposition of the triadic linkage among OCB, LE and UA was true. Additional multiple regression analysis lend support to the claim that lecturer empowerment and university autonomy were not only related to OCB, but both constituted as significant predictors of OCB.

The findings of this study have several theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, this study underscored the importance of the political dimensions of ‘citizenship’ in OCB construct and hence, established a novel conceptualization of OCB by providing a more consolidated model of OCB, previously overlooked by researchers. This study can be viewed as the first of its kind to integrate the political aspects of ‘citizenship’ based on the Japanese and Athenian conceptual models of citizenship, which was seen pivotal in understanding the notion of organizational citizenship behavior in universities—often regarded as a social and political institution. The findings implied that the OCB model with its political-psychology emphasis was theoretically valid and can be used by other researchers. Also, this study has illuminated social exchange theory as a tenable theory to be used in explaining bilateral mutual exchanges and relations between academics and the university—more autonomy and empowerment would harness more OCB among the academics in Malaysian research universities. From the practical perspective, further substantiation of the validated OCB, LE and UA instruments—with strong internal validity and item consistency—would make it a standard instrument applicable to many higher education institutions worldwide.

This study suggests that university managers or Board of Directors should develop an internal organization structure and university culture that helps academics to function and perform their job responsibilities unfettered by internal bureaucratic rules and procedures—leading to greater sense of empowerment and demonstrating more of OCB. Besides that, the policy makers should be cognizant of the importance of academics’ participation in decision-making before implementation of any new policies that directly affects the academics’ scope of responsibilities. It is pivotal for academics and researchers, particularly in public universities to view themselves beyond merely as ‘employees of the government’ but as the ‘citizens’ of the university. The success of a university to face new challenges as they move into an era of globalization, internationalization and accountability fundamentally depends on the extent of OCB demonstrated for the attainment of their university’s objectives and goals.

INTERAKSI ANTARA TINGKAH LAKU WARGA ORGANISASI, AUTONOMI UNIVERSITI DAN PEMERKASAAN PENSYARAH DI UNIVERSITI PENYELIDIKAN DI MALAYSIA.

SINOPSIS

Sejumlah besar kerja penyelidikan sebelum ini telah menunjukkan bahawa tingkah laku warga organisasi (TWO) dalam dunia korporat adalah berkait rapat dengan komitmen dalam tugas, produktiviti dan daya kemampunan pekerja. Walau bagaimanapun, didapati kebanyakan kerja penyelidikan itu tidak menggunakan instrumen TWO yang mempunyai kesahihan dan kebolehpercayaan yang baik dari segi konsepsi kewargaan dan dari segi perspektif sosiologi-politik. Tujuan utama kajian ini ialah untuk membina instrument TWO yang relevan dan sesuai dari segi sosiologikal-politik, dan kemudian menggunakan instrumen tersebut dalam kajian yang melibatkan universiti institusi. Tujuan yang lain adalah untuk membina dan mengesahkan dua tinjauan instrumen yang lain, iaitu autonomi universiti (AU) dan pemerksaan pensyarah (PP). Seterusnya, korelasi dan regresi antara tingkah laku warga organisasi, autonomi universiti dan pemerksaan pensyarah dianalisis daripada data kajian yang diperolehi.

Data mengenai ketiga-tiga variabel dalam kajian ini dikumpulkan melalui soal kaji selidik ke atas 611 ahli akademik yang terdiri daripada para dekan, ketua jabatan, profesor dan pensyarah daripada lima universiti penyelidikan di Malaysia—Universiti Malaya (UM), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) dan Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), berdasarkan kriteria yang ditentukan oleh kerajaan.

Keputusan statistik berdasarkan analisis faktor membina satu instrumen tinjauan tingkah laku warga organisasi yang kukuh— dengan menawarkan satu model TWO yang bersepadu dan heuristik dari segi perbandingan aspek 'kewargaan', yang saling bertindih antara rakyat Athens dan Jepun Model, dan seterusnya mengesahkan TWO sebagai satu konstruk bersepadu yang terdiri daripada sembilan dimensi atau domain—berorientasikan komuniti dengan menghulurkan bantuan, inovasi untuk peningkatan, berdaya saing untuk kecemerlangan, pemantuhan, keterbukaan, daya ketahanan individu, ketangkasan, kepimpinan responsif dan semangat keusahawan. Keputusan analisis faktor juga mengesahkan bahawa instrumen PP terdiri daripada tujuh domain iaitu penyertaan dalam proses membuat keputusan, peningkatan profesional, status, keupayaan diri, autonomi dalam tugas, impak professional, dan kuasa pelaksanaan. Selain itu, instrumen AU juga disahkan terdiri daripada sembilan komponen iaitu autonomi universiti dalam program akademik, program pendidikan pascasiswazah, penyelidikan dan konsultasi, pengajaran dan pembelajaran, pengurusan, sumber manusia, kewangan, kemudahan infrastruktur dan hal ehwal pelajar.

Secara keseluruhan, dapatan kajian secara agregat menunjukkan tahap penilaian yang tinggi oleh ahli akademik terhadap persepsi tingkah laku warga organisasi, autonomi universiti dan pemerksaan pensyarah di universiti penyelidikan di Malaysia. Secara khususnya, didapati tujuh domain dalam TWO (komuniti berorientasikan bantuan, inovasi

untuk peningkatan, pemantuhan, keterbukaan, berdaya saing untuk kecemerlangan, daya ketahanan individu, ketangkasan), tiga domain dalam PP (peningkatan profesional, keupayaan diri, status) dan lima domain dalam AU (universiti autonomi dalam program akademik, program pendidikan pascasiswazah, penyelidikan dan konsultasi, pengajaran dan pembelajaran, hal ehwal pelajar) tergolong sebagai aspek yang lebih menonjol dalam konstruk masing-masing. Analisis korelasi menunjukkan hubungan yang positif dan signifikan di antara tiga konstruk dan menegaskan bahawa saranan teori yang menyatakan saling hubungkait antara TWO, PP dan AU dalam bentuk hubungan triadik adalah benar. Selain itu, analisis regresi pelbagai memberi sokongan kepada saranan bahawa pemerksaan pensyarah dan autonomi universiti tidak hanya berkaitan dengan tingkah laku warga organisasi, tetapi juga sebagai peramal yang signifikan kepada tingkah laku warga organisasi.

Dapatan kajian ini mempunyai beberapa implikasi teori dan praktikal. Secara teori, kajian ini menekankan kepentingan dimensi-dimensi 'kewargaan' yang berunsurkan aspek politik dalam TWO konstruk dan mendirikan sebuah konsep TWO yang novel dengan membina satu model bersepadu TWO yang lebih kukuh dan kuat. Kajian ini merupakan kajian yang pertama mengintegrasikan aspek politik 'kewargaan' berdasarkan konsep kewargaan model Jepun dan Athens ke dalam model TWO, serta menekankan kepentingannya dalam memahami idea tingkah laku warga organisasi di universiti yang sering dianggap sebagai sebuah institusi sosial dan politik. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa model TWO dengan penekanan politik-psikologi teori adalah sah dan boleh digunakan oleh para penyelidik lain. Selain itu, kajian ini menggunakan teori saling tukar sosial (*social exchange theory*) sebagai satu teori untuk menerangkan hubungan pertukaran dua hala antara ahli akademik dan universiti—iaitu penilaian autonomi universiti dan pemerksaan pensyarah yang tinggi akan mempamerkan tingkah laku warga organisasi yang lebih di kalangan ahli akademik universiti penyelidikan Malaysia. Dari perspektif praktikal, pembuktian lanjut instrumen tingkah laku warga organisasi, autonomi universiti dan pemerksaan pensyarah yang disahkan akan menjadikannya sebagai instrumen yang standard dan sesuai digunakan dalam kajian yang melibatkan institusi pendidikan tinggi di serantau dunia.

Kajian ini mencadangkan bahawa pengurus universiti atau Lembaga Pengarah harus membangunkan struktur organisasi dalaman dan budaya universiti yang membantu ahli akademik untuk berfungsi dan melaksanakan tanggungjawab kerja mereka dengan baik supaya tidak dibelenggu oleh peraturan dan prosedur birokrasi dalaman—yang seterusnya mendorong penilaian pemerksaan pensyarah yang lebih tinggi dan mempamerkan tingkah laku warga organisasi yang lebih di kalangan ahli akademik. Selain itu, pembuat dasar harus menyedari kepentingan penyertaan ahli akademik dalam membuat keputusan sebelum pelaksanaan sebarang polisi baru, yang secara langsung akan memberi kesan kepada ahli akademi. Tanggapan ahli akademik dan penyelidik, terutamanya di universiti awam, sebagai 'warga' universiti dan bukan semata-mata sebagai 'kakitangan kerajaan' adalah penting kerana kejayaan sebuah universiti untuk mengharungi cabaran baru, melangkah ke era globalisasi, pengantarabangsaan dan akauntabiliti bergantung kepada tahap tingkahlaku warga organisasi yang dipamerkan untuk mencapai objektif dan matlamat universiti mereka.

LIST OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	ii
Synopsis	iii
List of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xiv
List of Abbreviations	xxi
List of Appendices	xxiii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of the Study	1
1.2	Theoretical Framework of the Study	8
1.3	Statement of the Research Problem	18
1.4	Purpose and Objectives of the Study	28
1.5	Research Questions	29
1.6	Significance of the Study	30
1.7	Limitations	32
1.8	Operational Definition of Terms	33
1.9	Summary	36

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	38
2.2	University Organization and Management	38
2.3	The Models of University Management and Governance Structure	43

2.4	General Development Phases of Universities in Malaysia	47
2.5	The Concept of University Autonomy	52
2.6	The Aspect of University Autonomy	57
2.7	Academic Autonomy	59
2.8	Autonomy and Self-Determination	62
2.9	Empowerment	63
	2.9.1 Lecturer Empowerment	70
2.10	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	71
	2.10.1 Previous Conceptualization of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	72
	2.10.2 The Circumplex Model Of OCB	75
	2.10.3 OCB Research In Educational Institutions	77
	2.10.4 University Organization as an Open System and Learning Organization	78
2.11	Summary	81

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	84
3.2	Research Design	85
3.3	Population and Sample for the Study	89
3.4	Research Instruments	90
	3.4.1 Development and Adaptation of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Scale	91
	3.4.2 Development and Adaptation of Lecturer Empowerment Scale	93
	3.4.3 Development and Adaptation of University Autonomy Scale	96

3.5	Research Procedure	98
	3.5.1 Pilot study	98
	3.5.2 The Validity and Reliability of the Instrument	99
	3.5.3 Data Collection Procedure	102
3.6	Statistical Data Analysis Techniques	102
3.7	Summary and Comments	105

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1	Introduction	106
4.2	Part I: Preliminary Analysis	107
	4.2.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for the Three Survey Instruments	110
4.3	Part II: Extents and Prominent Aspects of OCB, UA, and LE	123
	4.3.1 Extents and prominent aspects in OCB	123
	4.3.1.1 Extents and prominent aspects of Community Orientation by Helping	123
	4.3.1.2 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Innovation for Improvement	126
	4.3.1.3 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Compliance	129
	4.3.1.4 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Openness	132
	4.3.1.5 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Responsive Leadership	134
	4.3.1.6 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Competitive Urgency to Excel	137
	4.3.1.7 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Entrepreneurial Spirit	140
	4.3.1.8 Extents and Prominent Aspects of Individual Resilience	143

4.3.1.9	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Agility	146
4.3.2	Extents and Prominent Aspects in Lecturer Empowerment	148
4.3.2.1	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Participative Decision-Making	148
4.3.2.2	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Professional Growth	152
4.3.2.3	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Status	154
4.3.2.4	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Self-Efficacy	156
4.3.2.5	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Autonomy in Job	159
4.3.2.6	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Professional Impact	161
4.3.2.7	Extents and Prominent Aspects of Execution of Power	163
4.3.3	Extents and Prominent Aspects in University Autonomy	166
4.3.3.1	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Academic Programs	166
4.3.3.2	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Postgraduate Academic Programs	169
4.3.3.3	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Research and Consultation	171
4.3.3.4	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Teaching and Learning	173
4.3.3.5	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Management	176
4.3.3.6	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Human Resource	179
4.3.3.7	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Finance	181
4.3.3.8	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Infrastructure and Facilities	184

4.3.3.9	Extents and Prominent Aspects of University Autonomy in Students' Affairs	186
4.3.4	Extents and Prominent Aspects of the Overall OCB, LE and University Autonomy Domains	188
4.4	Part II: Extents of Correlations among the Major Concepts Domains	190
4.4.1	Extents of Correlations between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Lecturer Empowerment Domains	192
4.4.2	Extents of Correlations between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and University Autonomy Domains	194
4.4.3	Extents of Correlations between Lecturer Empowerment and University Autonomy Domains	198
4.5	Triadic Linkage among the Major Concepts Domains	201
4.6	Extent of Lecturer Empowerment and University Autonomy Predicting OCB	202
4.7	Extent of Lecturer Empowerment and University Autonomy Domains Predicting OCB	206
4.8	Summary	211
 CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION		
5.1	Introduction	213
5.2	Summary of Major Findings	215
5.3	Implications of the Findings	233
5.4	Discussion	237
5.5	Recommendations for Future Research	244
5.6	Conclusion	245

REFERENCES	247
APPENDIX A	267
APPENDIX B	341
APPENDIX C	361

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1	The triadic link among OCB, Autonomy and Empowerment	9
2	The Workplace Social Exchange Network (WSEN)	13
3	Circumplex Model of OCB: Axes and representative behaviors	17
4	General organizational structure of Malaysian public universities	40
5	Models of university management	44
6	Classification of the relative types and meaning of autonomy	53
7	Integrated Japanese and Athenian model of OCB	76
8	The triadic linkage among OCB, Lecturer Empowerment and University Autonomy	87
9	Correlational design with possible ways of relationships among the levels of the three main variables	88
10	Circumplex Model of OCB with nine domains	116
11	Scatter plot diagram between LE and OCB	203
12	Scatter plot diagram between UA and OCB	203
13	Residual plot	205

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	Description of Athenian Citizenship Model	20
2	Comparison between management features of Japanese Model with the traditional US Model	22
3	Typology of phases in Malaysian higher education	48
4	Malaysian Research University assessment criteria	50
5	Total number of academic staffs in research universities	89
6	Internal consistency of the instruments (Cronbach's alpha) after pilot study	100
7	Data analysis methods	103
8	Demographic profile of respondents	108
9	Factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation of OCB construct	113
10	Internal consistency for OCB Scale	115
11	Factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation on Lecturer Empowerment	117
12	Internal consistency for Lecturer Empowerment Scale	119
13	Factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation of University Autonomy	120
14	Internal consistency for University Autonomy Scale	122
15	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in 'community orientation' by helping domain	124
16	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in 'innovation for improvement' domain	126
17	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in 'compliance' domain	129

18	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘openness’ domain	132
19	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘responsive leadership’ domain	135
20	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘competitive urgency to excel’ domain	138
21	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ domain	140
22	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘individual resilience’ domain	144
23	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘agility’ domain	147
24	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘participative decision making’ domain	149
25	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘professional growth’ domain	152
26	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘status’ domain	154
27	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘self-efficacy’ domain	157
28	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘autonomy in job’ domain	159
29	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘professional impact’ domain	162
30	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in execution of power domain	163
31	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘academic programs’ domain	167
32	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘postgraduate academic programs’ domain	169
33	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘research and consultation’ domain	171
34	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘teaching and learning’ domain	174

35	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘management’ domain	177
36	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘human resource’ domain	179
37	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘finance’ domain	182
38	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘infrastructure and facilities’ domain	184
39	Frequency, mean and standard deviation for items in ‘students’ affairs’ domain	186
40	Mean and standard deviation for domains in Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Lecturer Empowerment and University Autonomy variables	188
41	Correlation coefficients between OCB and LE domains	191
42	Correlation coefficients between OCB and UA domains	195
43	Correlation coefficients between LE and UA domains	198
44	Correlation coefficients for OCB, LE and UA variables	201
45	The ANOVA table	204
46	Regression coefficient for Organizational Citizenship Behavior	204
47	Test of normality on the residuals	206
48	Model summary table	207
49	Coefficient table	208
50	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘community orientation by helping’ domain	268
51	Factor loadings for item BA1 to BA9 in ‘community orientation by helping’ domain	269
52	Factor loadings for item BA1, BA4, BA5, BA6 and BA7 in ‘community orientation by helping’ domain	270
53	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘innovation for improvement’ domain	271

54	Factor loadings for Item BB1 to BB6 in ‘innovation for improvement’ domain	272
55	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘collegial harmony’ domain	273
56	Factor loadings for item BC1 to BC6 in ‘collegial harmony’ domain	274
57	Factor loadings for item BC1, BC2, BC5 and BC6 in ‘collegial harmony’ domain	275
58	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘compliance’ domain	276
59	Factor loadings for item BD1 to BD7 in ‘compliance’ domain	277
60	Factor loadings for item BD1, BD3, BD4, BD5 and BD7 in ‘compliance’ domain	278
61	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘openness’ domain	279
62	Factor loadings for item BE1 to BE6 in ‘openness’ domain	280
63	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘responsive leadership’ domain	281
64	Factor loadings for item BF1 to BF7 in ‘responsive leadership’ domain	282
65	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘competitive urgency to excel’ domain	283
66	Factor loadings for item BG1 to BG7 in ‘competitive urgency to excel’ domain	284
67	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ domain	285
68	Factor loadings for item BH1 to BH7 in ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ domain	286
69	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘individual resilience’ domain	287
70	Factor loadings for item BI1 to BI7 in ‘individual resilience’ domain	288
71	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘agility’ domain	289

72	Factor loadings for item BJ1 to BJ7 in ‘agility’ domain	290
73	Factor loadings for item BJ1, BJ2, BJ3, BJ4, BJ5 in ‘agility’ domain	291
74	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘participative decision making’ domain	292
75	Factor loadings for item LA1 to LA7 in ‘participative decision making’ domain	293
76	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘professional growth’ domain	294
77	Factor loadings for item LB1 to LB6 in ‘professional growth’ domain	295
78	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘status’ domain	296
79	Factor loadings for item LC1 to LC8 in ‘status’ domain	297
80	Factor loadings for item LC1, LC2, LC3, LC4, LC5 and LC7 in ‘status’ domain	298
81	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘self-efficacy’ domain	299
82	Factor loadings for item LD1 to LD7 in ‘self-efficacy’ domain	300
83	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘autonomy in job’ domain	301
84	Factor loadings for item LE1 to LE7 in ‘autonomy in job’ domain	302
85	Factor loadings for item LE1 to LE6 in ‘autonomy in job’ domain	303
86	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘professional impact’ domain	304
87	Factor loadings for item LF1 to LF8 in ‘professional impact’ domain	305
88	Factor loadings for item LF1 to LF7 in ‘professional impact’ domain	306
89	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘execution of power’ domain	307
90	Factor loadings for item LG1 to LG9 in ‘execution of power’ domain	308

91	Factor loadings for item LG1, LG2, LG4, LG5, LG6, LG7, LG8 and LG9 in ‘execution of power’ domain	309
92	Factor loadings for Item LG1, LG2, LG4, LG5, LG6 and LG7 in ‘execution of power’ domain	310
93	Factor loadings for item LG2, LG4, LG5, LG6, LG7 in ‘execution of power’ domain	311
94	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in academic programs domain	312
95	Factor loadings for item AA1 to AA10 in ‘academic programs’ domain	313
96	Factor loadings for item AA1, AA2, AA3, AA4, AA5, AA6, AA8, AA9 and AA10 in ‘academic programs’ domain	314
97	Factor loadings for item AA2, AA3, AA4, AA6 and AA9 in ‘academic programs’ domain	315
98	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘postgraduate programs’ domain	316
99	Factor loadings for item AB1 to AB12 in ‘postgraduate programs’ domain	317
100	Factor loadings for item AB1, AB2, AB3, AB4, AB5, AB6, AB8, AB9, AB10, AB11 and AB12 in ‘postgraduate programs’ domain	318
101	Factor loadings for AB2, AB3, AB4, AB6, AB8, AB9, AB10, AB11 in ‘postgraduate programs’ domain	319
102	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘research and consultation’ domain	320
103	Factor loadings for item AC1, AC2, AC3, AC4, AC5, AC6, AC8 and AC9 in ‘research and consultation’ domain	321
104	Factor loadings for item AC2, AC3, AC4, AC6 and AC9 in ‘research and consultation’ domain	322
105	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘teaching and learning’ domain	323
106	Factor loadings for item AD1 to AD8 in ‘teaching and learning’ domain	324

107	Factor loadings for item AD2, AD3, AD4, AD5, AD6 and AD8 in ‘teaching and learning’ domain	325
108	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘management’ domain	326
109	Factor loadings for item AE1 to Item AE9 in ‘management’ domain	327
110	Factor loadings for item AE1, AE2, AE3, AE4, AE5, AE7, AE8 and AE9 in ‘management’ domain	328
111	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘human resource’ domain	329
112	Factor loadings for item AF1 to AF8 in ‘human resource’ domain	330
113	Factor loadings for item AF2, AF3, AF4, AF5, AF6, AF7 and AF8 in ‘human resource’ domain	331
114	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘finance’ domain	332
115	Factor loadings for item AG2 to AG7 in ‘finance’ domain	333
116	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘infrastructure and facilities’ domain	334
117	Factor loadings for item AH2 to AH8 in ‘infrastructure and facilities’ domain	335
118	Factor loadings for item AH2 to AH8 in ‘infrastructure and facilities’ domain	336
119	Factor loadings for item AH2, AH3, AH4, AH5, AH6, AH8 in ‘infrastructure and facilities’ domain	337
120	Summary of inter-correlations, means, and standard deviations for all items in ‘students’ affairs’ domain	338
121	Factor loadings for item AI1 to AI8 in ‘students’ affairs’ domain	339
122	Factor loadings for item AI2, AI3, AI4, AI5, AI6 and AI8 in ‘students’ affairs’ domain	340

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

OCB	Organizational Citizenship Behavior
LE	Lecturer Empowerment
UA	University Autonomy
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
AVE	Average Variance Extracted
BA	Community orientation by helping
BB	Innovation for improvement
BC	Collegial harmony
BD	Compliance
BE	Openness
BF	Responsive leadership
BG	Competitive urgency to excel
BH	Entrepreneurial spirit
BI	Individual resilience
BJ	Agility
LA	Participative decision making
LB	Professional growth
LC	Status
LD	Self efficacy
LE	Autonomy in job
LF	Professional impact

LG	Execution of power
AA	Academic programs
AB	Postgraduate academic programs
AC	Research and consultation
AD	Teaching and learning
AE	Management
AF	Human resource
AG	Finance
AH	Infrastructure and facilities
AI	Students' affairs

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Preliminary analysis for instruments development
Appendix B	Survey Questionnaire
Appendix C	Approval letters