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This study aimed to investigate not only the level of faculty members’ views on job satisfaction and their perceptions of organizational politics but also the relationship between their job satisfaction and perceptions of organizational politics. The study intended to examine how well faculty members’ job satisfaction can predict the perceptions of organizational politics as well. The descriptive relational survey model dominated the research. The study group consisted of 240 faculty members who work for 7 state and 7 private universities located in Ankara city. Data were collected using the Job Satisfaction Scale for Academicians (JSSA), and Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) Questionnaire along with a demographic information form developed by the researchers. Data were collected in September and October in 2019. Descriptive statistic (mean, standard deviation), reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient), correlation (Pearson coefficient) and Multiple Linear Regression were used to analyze the data. SPSS v. 23 was referred to in doing so. The main findings indicated that the faculty members’ job satisfaction total and nature of the job sub-dimension scores were at a very high level while organizational policy sub-dimension scores were high. Faculty members’ scores on “Go along to get ahead” were the highest and they appeared uncertain about “General political behavior” and “Honesty / Work ethics”. The JSSA subscales were moderately and positively correlated with the POPS subscales. The regression result demonstrated that the JSSA’s intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions significantly and positively predicted the POPS subscales.

Introduction

It goes without saying that the successful operation of any institution is subject to countless factors pertaining to inside and outside sources as well as to those linked to all the related/assumed shareholders. Some of these (f)actors cannot easily be detected in a proactive fashion or cannot even be recognized at ease. Yet it would be fair to state that one of these influencers which plays a highly active role in terms of the general motivation of employees—perhaps the group consisting the main stakeholders as has been mentioned by Swamy, Nanjundeswaraswamy and Rashmi (2015) - is their ‘job satisfaction’. In its simplest sense, the
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very term refers to the negative or positive feelings of workers towards their own job viz., what they do as part of their job. In certain resources, it is defined as admiration and contentment one feels to their job (Başar & Basım, 2015) and also as their overall attitude to it (Usop, Kadıng, & Usop, 2013). It is reported that job satisfaction and employee satisfaction are at times alternately used words (Küskü, 2001) and one of the more recent attempts to define job satisfaction is describing it as positive worker morale (Heathfield, 2016). Ravari Bazargan-Hejazi, Ebadi, Mirzaei and Oshvandi (2012) compiled the representations of the conception of job satisfaction checking the bulk of literature and shared that it as a multi-faceted jargon which is pertinent to affect, expectations, and belief systems of workers.

In fact, determining job satisfaction of employees is crucial since their willingness and hence their performance (Gül, Oktay, & Gökçe, 2008) is closely connected to the levels of job satisfaction they possess. To that end, it is not surprising at all to witness in various studies (e.g. Lin, 2012) that job satisfaction is emphasized as a major facilitator of productivity and efficiency. What is more, job satisfaction is usually associated with some other key notions of the field like loyalty (Witt & Beokermen, 1991), organizational citizenship (Swaminathan & Jawahar, 2013), employee engagement (Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016) in the workplace whereas with others of negative nature such as psychological distress (Moen, Kelly, & Lam, 2013), burnout, absenteeism (Tsopp, Grote, & Gerber, 2014) that leads to turnover (Al Rubaish, Rahim, Abumadini, & Wosornu, 2016) and thusly making the adverse effects of the phenomenon often times difficult to prevent (Altuntas, 2014). It is notable that employees’ job satisfaction is fundamental for their not leaving the job (Alqashan, 2013; Çekmecelioğlu, 2006; İnan & Çelik, 2018; Özel, 2014; Özyer, 2010; Randhawa, 2007). In brief, job satisfaction is the worker’s basic stance taken towards their job (Weiss, 2002).

Though job satisfaction is thought to be studied first by Hoppock (1935), the idea emerged with Taylorism via “Scientific Management” understanding of the 1900s. It is worth underlining on this timeline that Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (1959) is a milestone in that it sets forth a two-dimensional novel model of worker motivation:

![Figure 1. Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Lundberg, Gudmundson, & Andersson, 2009)](image)

In this model Herzberg (1966) argued that factors of job satisfaction are not the same as the ones resulting in job dissatisfaction. The motivation-hygiene theory comes into play here to further clarify the situation. “Hygiene factors” are considered maintenance factors that are vital to refrain from dissatisfaction, but they do not warranty satisfaction on their own. There indeed are other Content and Process Theories apart from this model of Herzberg, some of which are Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory and Vroom’s Expectancy Theory (Haque, Haque, & Islam,
The concept then began to be dealt with through the following two aspects in particular in the second half of 1970s (Farrell, 1978; Seashore & Teber, 1975) as: personal aspects (demographic features of the workers, their personal qualities, skills, contextual, perceptual, cognitive, and expectation) together with the rather environmental and/or job-bound ones (political/economic context, professional nature, organizational climate, and ethos) alongside the fact that it was handled through the ‘relation between’ these two aforementioned groups of variables (McClelland, 1976). During these years Hackman and Oldman (1975) formed a model of occupation contentment and Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) stated that job satisfaction is actually relational and relative in that workers have an idea of their job satisfaction levels comparing those with others’. It is pinpointed that Locke’s Range of Affect Theory (1976) of those years stands out amongst others being a well-known model of this sort. Job satisfaction as an area of study has always attracted more and more attention of researchers since then i.e. from the beginning of 1980s (Gautam, Mandal, & Dalal, 2006). Recently two paradigms seemed to have come into view: taking job satisfaction as affective employee satisfaction and the other one is seeing it as cognitive employee satisfaction where the former is a more general emotional response to a job and the latter is the evaluation of circumstances, chances or gains (Thompson & Phua, 2012) applying to the job.

Studies of job satisfaction have been conducted for decades using a fair number of instruments, for instance, there have been global/cross-national scales, multidimensional instruments, single-item and multiple-item tools intending to assess levels of job satisfaction of workforce in general or specified places (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003). With a view to identifying job satisfaction levels of workers, several tools have been developed by scholars so far some of which can be listed as: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967); Bell and Weaver’s (1983); Lester’s (1987); Hellriegel and Woodman’s (1995) Job Descriptive Index (JDI); Jiménez’s (2008). Besides these, Ali and Akhter (2009) came up with a questionnaire so as to interpret the job satisfaction levels of academics working for a private university in Bangladesh. Lepold, Tanzer, Bregenzer and Jiménez (2018) also investigated Facet-Items vs. Facet Scales of job satisfaction. It is significant to underscore here that demographic factors affect job satisfaction levels to a great extent (Reddy, Reddy, & Rao, 2016) making them an integral part of any form of measurement carrying alternative orientations and structures of different kind.

It is acknowledged that relatively fewer studies in the literature are encountered particularly belonging to the job satisfaction levels of faculty or academics (Ahsh, Abdullah, Fie, & Syed Shah Alam, 2009; Aslan, Shaukat, Ahmed, Shah, & Mahfar, 2014) as opposed to a great deal of research concentrating on job satisfaction within the framework of diverse disciplines e.g. Business, Health Sciences, Psychology in different work places (Strydom, 2011) including schools (Hawley, 2008; Mehta, 2012; Nîr, 2012; Kumari, & Jafri, 2011; Seniwoliba, 2013). A lack of theoretical negotiation upon the potential constructs of job satisfaction was voiced and it was uttered that there are ‘dozens’ of dimensions of loads of instruments/tools in the research field (Pepe, Addimando, & Veronese, 2017). Notwithstanding, it is underlined that the issue is still worth analyzing (Sıdık, Ab Hamid, Ibrahim, & Ali, 2017) for researchers especially on the part of university employees whose job satisfaction is compatible both with academic success of learners (Banerjee & Lamb, 2016) and with the overall improvement of the university that they work at. Job satisfaction of academics is again akin to carrying the services and quality of
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The organization, which is the university or the higher education institution in that case, to desired levels (Machado-Taylor, Meira Soares, Ferreira, & Gouveia, 2011). This quality improvement in return, at macro levels, is essential for the improvement of the country bearing in mind the roles and functions of higher education institutions regarding employment, innovation and scientific research. Having said that, it is of crucial importance to touch upon and reiterate the inherent components of job satisfaction namely salary, relationship between colleagues, job security and many others when it comes to studying the topic within the sphere of academic organizations (Khalid, 2012). In spite of being limited, the studies on universities and university workers conducted in varying socio-cultural backgrounds (Bernard, 2012; Dave & Ravel, 2014; Ghaffar, Ameer, Arshad, & Urooj, 2013; Toker, 2009) still offer shifting views at the same time adding onto the existing literature. In light of all these, it could be said with confidence that there is a gap in the available literature in regard to studies researching job satisfaction levels of academicians.

Political games in an institution are exposed to outside forces of culture, politics and economy where one set of games are known as ‘insurgency games’, and the others are entitled ‘counter-insurgency games’ (Mintzberg, 1985). One can easily think that any organization / institution / workplace is political in an ingrained way-discounting if it is an ethical or objective concept and this realm has reflections in the literature (e.g. Ferris & Hochwarter, 2010). Yet, in an ironic manner, it is interlineated in the literature itself that organizational politics as an issue still remains almost ‘untouched’ (Heath & Sitkin, 2001) even by the onset of the new millennium taking into account the huge area of study constituting a great potential for researchers of the field. Evidence displays that the area is empirically tested in a single cultural context (North America), failing to take into consideration the probable social differences (Poon, 2003; Zibenberg, 2017) which are highly critical for scholars to check what the subject would be telling about various workplaces containing different workers, belief systems and rituals as a whole. This is essential thinking that perceptions of organizational politics may shift from one individual to another (Bodla & Danish, 2009). Also it is shared that possible positive results of organizational politics like advancing in career, gaining prestige/status, increased power/position, reaching both personal and organizational aims, accomplishing a task/feelings of achievement, ego (Vigoda-Gadot & Kapun, 2005) and so on are inclined to be neglected with some exceptions (e.g. Cacciattolo 2015; Drory & Vigoda-Gadot, 2010; Gotsis & Kortezi, 2010; Othman, 2008; Vredenburgh & Shea-VanFossen, 2010) since the rest of the studies mostly figured out the negative aspects (Basar & Varoğlu, 2016; Eldor, 2017; Rosen & Hochwarter, 2014), which again leads to a restricted comprehension of an arguably exhaustive political phenomena (Ferris & Hochwarter, 2012).

Organizational politics is primarily defined as exercising power/influence that tends to arise out of the processes or procedures of the institution (Kurchner-Hawkins & Miller, 2006; Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008) resulting from and in a shadowy system of illegitimate behaviors (Stacey, 1996) thus and so is made up of informal or unofficial attitude and behavior (Aryee, Chen, & Budhwar, 2004; Ulkeryildiz, 2009) such as employees’ not contacting the immediate head(s) during times of conflict as expected but approaching other seniors (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2010). In institutions or workplaces the following political acts are usually faced: individual ones, coalition ones and lastly network levels (Kinicki, 2008). Byrne, Manning, Weston and Hochwarter (2017) and Searle and Auton (2015) indicated that challenge and organizational politics are closely interrelated. Doldor (2007) announced that terminology like political climate, political behaviors, political tactics, political skills, influence tactics and political influence behavior in an organization can be used interchangeably. Similar to the previously inspected concept of this paper: job satisfaction; organizational politics is another
term linked to certain organizational jargon like stress, staff turnover, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as well as productivity (Miller et al., 2008). It is seen in many of these discussions that there are references to the term job satisfaction too, which shows that these two terms are both worth studying, preferably together to explore whether there exists any co-relation between them in differing socio-cultural contexts i.e. in various countries like Turkey and in different organizations such as universities.

Organizational politics carries importance both for the employees and the managers since the first group seems to be constantly checking if the workplace is a political arena which calls for responding to relevant dynamics successfully (Buchanan, 2008) and the second group frequently tries to maintain the balance of ‘doing things as necessary’. Hoy and Miskel’s (2008) political tactics: ingratiating, networking, information management, impression management and coalition building ones (2008) elaborate on the topic with yet-another perspective. Withal Zanzi and O’Neil (2001) remarked sanctioned political tactics and non-sanctioned political tactics within the context of organizational politics and there are Sussman, Winkler, Huotilainen, Ritter and Näätänen’s (2002) tactics which are attacking/blaming other workers, making use of information as a political tool, developing and sustaining a favorable image, coming up with a base of support, ingratiating, ensuring allies and forming power coalitions, creating obligations and reciprocity. Kylén (1999) discovered that political tactics of reactive type of workers are linked to laissez-faire leadership style and groups whose leaders are more decisive and caring often demonstrate less reactive political/tactical behaviors. Such outcomes originate some questions as to whether organizational politics would cause inequality among the workers making the concept more complicated-if not totally ‘knotty’.

Kacmar and Ferris (1991) introduced such indicators of organizational politics: variables that are organizational factors (centralization, hierarchy, formalization, span of control), variables related to job factors (autonomy, job control, feedback channels and procedure, chances of promotion, variety in skills), variables which are individual-bound factors (age, sex, Machiavellianism, self-monitor). Later, Kacmar and Carlson’s (1997) Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale set the tone in the relevant literature as it was designated with the intention to measure the concept delving originally into numerous other conceptions through scales: faith in people, alienation, cynicism, altruism, trust, social attitude and self-activity inventory owning the dimensions of “General political behaviors”, “Go along to get ahead”, “Coworkers”, “Self-serving behaviors” and “Pay and promotions”. The relevant research aimed at pondering the antecedents, moderators, results of organizational politics (e.g. Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999; Valle & Witt, 2001). In time the concept, whose holistic picture is provided below, developed further. It is also remarkable that as Valle and Perrewe (2000) claimed researchers tend to pore over perceptions of politics in organizations rather than actual political behavior. The visual below represents organizational politics situating it in a central position towards some other related terms and concepts in the field.

Figure 2. Perceptions of Organization Politics (Buchanan & Badham, 2008)
It is noteworthy that one of the striking points here is job satisfaction’s being located in the figure and its being banded together with organizational politics perceptions. The conceivable outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational politics concepts can influence all the stakeholders at least in the long run. Even so “the mainstream model of organizational politics needs a more critical theory of power and the hidden dimensions of organizational politics that it elucidates.” (Fischer, 2004, p.1). It would then be reasonable to speak of job satisfaction as one of the hidden components of workplace dynamics on this spot.

A handful of studies attempted to shed more light to the terms above with a specified group of employees (e.g. Ojiabo & Aalagah, 2017) are witnessed in the literature amongst the vast number of others. Such studies outlined a negative relationship between job satisfaction and organizational politics (Drory, 1993), put forward that workers with lower levels of perceived organizational politics reached higher degrees of job satisfaction (Kodisinghe, 2010) and vice versa (Luqman, Javaid, & Umar, 2015). It is paramount to state here that reduce in job satisfaction levels across workers is on account of organizational politics (Schneider, 2016) in many reports. For sure research to be conducted in different socio-cultural contexts-various workplaces like educational institutions in countries other than the North American is required to gain thorough understanding of job satisfaction and organizational politics.

The study aims to investigate:

a) faculty members’ views on job satisfaction and their perceptions of organizational politics,

b) the relationship between job satisfaction and the perceptions of organizational politics,

c) how well faculty members’ job satisfaction can predict the perceptions of organizational politics.

Method

Research Model

It was a descriptive study, which examined the research phenomenon as it was (Erkuş, 2005), designed in relational survey model (Mertens, 2010). The hypothetical research model, depicted in Figure 3 was tested with the data collected. Figure 3 indicates dependent and independent variables as well.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3.** Research model showing the relationship between faculty members’ job satisfaction and their perceptions of organizational politics

Dependent variables were "Go along to get ahead", "General political behavior", "Honesty / Work ethics" subscales of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS)
Questionnaire. Independent variables were the "Intrinsic job satisfaction" and "Extrinsic job satisfaction" dimensions of the Job Satisfaction Scale for Academicians (JSSA) and the JSSA total.

The Study Group

The study group consisted of 240 faculty members who work for 7 state and 7 private universities located in Ankara city. 111 of the participants were women and 129 were men. Of the participants, 31 work as research assistants, 12 as lecturers, 37 as assistant professors, 41 as associate professors, and 119 as professor doctors. 176 of them were over 40 years old.

Data Collection Tools

Data were collected using the Job Satisfaction Scale for Academicians (JSSA) developed by Kelecioğlu, Bilge and Akman (2006) alongside Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) Questionnaire developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991), which was adapted to Turkish by Erol (2015) and lastly a demographic information form developed by the researchers was referred to.

Job Satisfaction Scale for Academicians (JSSA)

The JSSA consists of 2 dimensions; intrinsic job satisfaction dimension (IJSD) in which the items are related to the nature of the job and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions (EJSD) and where the items are related to organizational policy. For the reliability of JSSA, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient were .94 for IJSD and .91 for EJSD (Kelecioğlu et al., 2006). On the other hand, no information was detected regarding Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for JSSA in any of the relevant studies like Kelecioğlu, Bilge and Akman’s (2016). Yet Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient were calculated as .94 for JSSA overall, .93 for IJSD and .89 for EJSD in this study. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) indicated that the goodness of fit indices, which are $\chi^2/sd=2.679; RMSEA=.088; GFI=.083; CFI=.903; NFI=.856; RMR = .056$ and $SRMR = .053$, indicate good fit. The Table 1 illustrates one of the 25 items within a 5-point Likert Scale (“1” being least and “5” the most) presenting two-fold nature of the very concept. The first dimension is related to the existing situation which measures the extent to which the statement is valid for the participants bearing in mind their current workplaces and the second measures participant perceptions of the same conception i.e. the extent to which it (the relevant statement) needs to be the case in the workplace.

Table 1. JSSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Item</th>
<th>1. Dimension (The extent to which the statement is valid for the existing situation)</th>
<th>2. Dimension (The extent to which it (the relevant statement) needs to be the case in the workplace)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My job gives me the opportunity to use my skills</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
<td>O O O O O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job satisfaction - the measurement is carried out in the following way: The first dimension is subtracted from the second one. The minimum measurable score for any item is “-4” and the maximum is “+4”. The less the difference score is, the more job satisfaction gets.
Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) Questionnaire

The POPS consist of 3 subscales: Go along to get ahead subscale (GAGAS), General political behavior subscale (GPBS), Honesty / Work ethics subscale (H/WES). The total score for the POPS cannot be calculated because each dimension of the POPS itself constitutes a subscale. It is a 5-point Likert Scale including 21 items and the minimum score that can be obtained from one item is 1 and the maximum score is 5. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient were 0.94 for POPS overall (Erol, 2015). On the other hand, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient were calculated as .88 for POPS overall, 0.86 for GAGAS, .65 for GPBS and .76 for H/WES in this study. CFA indicated that the goodness of fit indices, which are $\chi^2/\text{sd} = 2.88$; $\text{RMSEA} = .089$; $\text{GFI} = .895$; $\text{AGFI} = .872$; $\text{CFI} = .908$; $\text{NFI} = .868$; $\text{RMR} = .081$ and $\text{SRMR} = .070$, indicate good fit.

Data Collection and Analysis

Google Forms for survey were used to collect the data in September and October in 2019. The participants’ email addresses were obtained through the YÖK AKADEMİK system (https://akademik.yok.gov.tr/AkademikArama/) and emails containing the form link were sent to those addresses. Moreover, WhatsApp groups and other online platforms were made use of to be able to reach participants. It takes around 9 minutes to complete the form. The ultimate dataset included 240 data once evaluating the outliers. The relevant emails were sent to around 9000 faculty members in Ankara. 260 of them completed the form sent and 20 of these responses were excluded in the study as these were of outlier nature. This constitutes a 2.89 % response rate.

The skewness and kurtosis values of the JSSA overall were .46 and -.60 respectively. And they were .96 and .28 for JJS dimension and .26 and -.70 for EJS dimension. They were -.17 and -.23 for Go along to get ahead subscale; .25 and -.19 for General political behavior subscale; .24 and -.55 for Honesty / Work ethics subscale. The skewness and kurtosis values were between +1.96 and -1.96 (Field, 2009). The skewness and kurtosis values point out that the normality assumption was met for the dataset. 0.05 was considered as the level of significance. Descriptive statistic (mean, standard deviation), reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient), correlation (Pearson coefficient) and Multiple Linear Regression were used to analyze the data. SPSS v. 23 was resorted to. According to Russo (2004), the correlation coefficients between 0.10 - 0.29 show a weak correlation; 0.30 - 0.49 a moderate correlation and above 0.50 a strong correlation.

Findings

1. The Perceptions of the Participants of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Politics

Table 2 indicates the perception levels of participants on job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The scale total and dimensions</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$S_s$</th>
<th>$\text{Min.}$</th>
<th>$\text{Max.}$</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction dimension</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction dimension</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ scores on job satisfaction scale total and intrinsic job satisfaction dimension were ($\bar{X} = .93$) and ($\bar{X} = .71$) respectively. It was observed that the less the scores got, the more the
job satisfaction became (Kelecioğlu et al., 2006). Their scores on extrinsic job satisfaction dimension were $\bar{X}=1.20$. These scores exhibit that faculty members’ job satisfaction regarding the nature of the job were at a very high level while regarding organizational policy were at a high level. And the total job satisfaction scores were at a very high level. Table 3 displays the perception levels of participants of “Go along to get ahead”, “General political behavior” and “Honesty / Work ethics” subscales.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of POPS Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$S_s$</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behavior</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/work ethics</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ scores on Go along to get ahead were the highest ($\bar{X}=3.46$) and General political behavior being the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.97$). These scores propose that faculty members’ “go along to get ahead”. However, they somehow exhibited general political behavior and they were uncertain about honesty / work ethics.

2. The relationship between the perceptions of the participants of job satisfaction and organizational politics

Table 4 indicates the correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and organizational politics.

Table 4. The correlations coefficients between job satisfaction and organizational politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrinsic job satisfaction (IJS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extrinsic job satisfaction (EJS)</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Satisfaction Total (JST)</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Go along to get ahead (GAGAS)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General political behavior (GPBS)</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Honesty / work ethics (H/WES)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 240; **p <.01

There was a positive and “moderate” correlation between IJS and GAGAS ($r=.37; p<.01$); between IJS and GPBS ($r=.40; p<.01$) and between IJS and H/WES ($r=.37; p<.01$). There was a positive and “moderate” correlation between EJS and GAGAS ($r=.38; p<.01$); between EJS and GPBS ($r=.40; p<.01$) and between EJS and H/WES ($r=.37; p<.01$). There was a positive and “moderate” correlation between JST and GAGAS ($r=.47; p<.01$); between JST and GPBS ($r=.45; p<.01$) and between JST and H/WES ($r=.48; p<.01$). The correlation between JST and H/WES were very close to “strong”.

3. The views of the participants of their job satisfaction and prediction of their perceptions of organizational politics

The results of multiple regression analysis were employed to examine how well faculty members’ job satisfaction predicted their perceptions of organizational politics. Table 5 shows the results of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead” subscale.
Table 5. The scores of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead” subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go along to get ahead</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 25.23; R = .42; R² = .18; **p <.01

The JSSA’s intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions significantly predicted the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead” subscale (F=25.23, p<.01). Those independent (predictive) variables together accounted for 18% of the total variance in the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead” subscale score (R=.42, R²=.18). The standardized regression coefficients (β) indicate that the predictive power of the extrinsic job satisfaction dimension is more than the intrinsic job satisfaction dimension. The mathematical model for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead” subscale is:

The score of “Go along to get ahead” subscale (Model 1) = 3.06 + 0.22 (Intrinsic job satisfaction score) + 0.20 (Extrinsic job satisfaction score)

Table 6 shows the results of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “General political behavior” subscale.

Table 6. The scores of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “General political behavior” subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General political behavior</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 30.16; R = .45; R² = .20; **p <.01

The JSSA’s intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions significantly predicted the POPS’s “General political behavior” subscale (F=30.16, p<.01). Those independent (predictive) variables together accounted for 20% of the total variance in the POPS’s “General political behavior” subscale score (R=.45, R²=.20). The standardized regression coefficients (β) indicate that the predictive power of the extrinsic job satisfaction dimension is more than the intrinsic job satisfaction dimension. The mathematical model for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “General political behavior” subscale is:

The score of “General political behavior” subscale (Model 2) = 2.62 + 0.20 (Intrinsic job satisfaction score) + 0.17 (Extrinsic job satisfaction score)

Table 7 shows the results of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Honesty/work ethics” subscale.

Table 7. The scores of the multiple regression analysis for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Honesty/work ethics” subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/work ethics</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 37.25; R = .49; R² = .24; *p <.05; **p <.01

The JSSA’s intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions significantly
predicted the POPS’s “Honesty/work ethics” subscale (F=25.23, p<.05). Those independent (predictive) variables together accounted for 24% of the total variance in the POPS’s “Honesty/work ethics” subscale score (R=.49, R²=.24). The standardized regression coefficients (β) indicate that the predictive power of the extrinsic job satisfaction dimension is more than the intrinsic job satisfaction dimension. The mathematical model for the JSSA’s dimensions as a predictor of the POPS’s “Honesty/work ethics” subscale is:

The score of “Honesty/work ethics” subscale (Model 3) = 2.44+ 0.17 (Intrinsic job satisfaction score) + 0.37 (Extrinsic job satisfaction score)

Discussion and Conclusion

The current research studied both the level of faculty members’ views on their job satisfaction and their perceptions of organizational politics and the relationship between faculty members’ job satisfaction and also the perceptions of organizational politics. And this research examined how well faculty members’ job satisfaction predicted their perceptions of organizational politics.

The faculty members’ job satisfaction total scores were at a very high level. This result was similar to other research results (Çelikkalp, Temel, & Bilgiç, 2019; Karadağ, Karataş, & Yücel, 2018; Masum, Azad, & Beh, 2015; Öztürk, & Şahbudak, 2015; Bilge, Akman, & Kelecioğlu, 2007). For example, Çelikkalp, Temel, and Bilgiç (2019) reported that the total job satisfaction of academics is good. However, this result was not consistent with the result gathered by Öztürk and Şahbudak (2017) and Bayar and Öztürk (2017). Öztürk and Şahbudak shared that the job satisfaction of the research assistants was below moderate level while Bayar and Öztürk reported a moderate level. The nature of the job scores as one of the sub-dimensions was at a very high level as well. However, organizational policy ones were at a high level. It can be inferred from the JSS items that the work carried out by faculty members in relation to their intrinsic job satisfaction allows for using their skills, gaining novel experiences and taking over responsibilities in the workplace. Also, it can be stated that the levels are high with respect to such work’s being consistent with their capacities and capabilities; their resorting to unique methods of their own and to creativity; their learning new things continuously and taking their own decisions. Additionally, as regards their extrinsic job satisfaction the levels are high for the following issues: colleagues’ being supportive of working hard, equal distribution of workload, recognition of experience, establishing a good rapport with managers, employees’ doing what they are supposed to be doing, clearly defined expectations.

On the other hand, faculty members’ scores of “Go along to get ahead” were highest and it means that they are inclined to Go along to get ahead. Faculty members seem to believe that irrespective of the quality of the work carried out, one can achieve whatever is wanted to be achieved through ‘being everyone’s friend’; getting on well with everyone, knowing the ‘right’ people with critical positions. In cases where rules are not explicitly set, it is thought that employees set rules for themselves and that during times of crisis and uncertainty the ones who can get out from under through surreptitious means make progress. Nevertheless, they somehow exhibit general political behavior and are uncertain about Honesty / Work ethics. The former result is not consistent with the result underlining that political behavior is frequently perceived in faculties of Education (Erol & Kunt, 2018). The participants neither agree nor disagree with the issues that could be listed as: not providing/partial providing of any information requested from them, others’ manipulating such information for the sake of their self-interest, informing employees about the policies of salary and promotion, colleagues’ being helpful to others. In addition to these, they neither agree nor disagree with these: disregarding...
workers who are ‘yea-sayers’, workers’ wishing to come up with good ideas though it may cause conflict with superiors, employees’ being encouraged to tell what they believe although this would mean criticism over the views ‘according to the book’, outperformers’ getting promotion and rewards.

Aybar and Marşap (2018) used the perception of organizational politics scale developed by Ferris and Kacmar (1992). They found that the perception of the faculty members working in the Faculties of Economics and Administrative Sciences was “weak”. However, in a similar study, Salam (2016) used the perception of organizational politics scale developed by Kacmar and Carlson (1997). He found that perception of faculty members in Thailand were at the level of very high.

The JSSA subscales were moderately and positively correlated with the POPS subscales. That is, the JSSA’s both IJS and EJS subscales and JST were moderately and positively correlated with the POPS’s subscales GAGAS, GPBS and H/WES. These correlations coefficients suggest that the higher the level of the faculty members’ view of job satisfaction in total (JST), intrinsic job satisfaction (IJS) and extrinsic job satisfaction (EJS); the higher the level of their perceptions of going along to get ahead (GAGAS), General political behavior (GPBS) and Honesty / Work ethics (H/WES) become. It can be disclosed that these results are not consistent with those reported by Salam (2016). He found out that there was a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and perceived organizational politics of faculty members in Thailand. Nonetheless, the “General political behavior” and “Pay and promotion policy” subscales of organizational politics have a significant negative relationship with job satisfaction while “Go along to get ahead” dimension does not (Salam, 2016).

In a similar study, Khali and Ahmed (2016) found a positive relationship between organizational politics and employee silence motives. Aybar and Marşap (2018) revealed that the perceptions of organizational policy were positively related to both organizational trust levels of the academicians and organizational commitment levels. Erol and Kunt (2018) found a positive relationship between the perception of organizational policy and bureaucratic climate. In another study, Öztürk and Şahbudak (2017) declared that there was a negatively and moderately significant relationship between psychological harassment and job satisfaction in the workplace. Through their research, İnandi, Tunç and Uslu (2013) informed the literature that there was a meaningful relationship between career barriers and job satisfaction of faculty members.

The regression results indicated that the JSSA’s intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction dimensions significantly and positively predicted the POPS’s “Go along to get ahead”, “General political behavior” and “Honesty/work ethics” subscales. Mathematical formulas to calculate the effect of the increase in the level of the job satisfaction on the increase in the perception of organizational policy are presented in Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3. In a similar study, organizational trust predicted the perceptions of organizational policy (Aybar & Marşap, 2018). Erol and Kunt (2018) notified that bureaucratic climate and supportive climate dimensions were found to be an important (significant) predictor of “Go along to get ahead”, “General political behavior” and “Honesty/work ethics” subscales, while the innovative climate dimension was not.

Two indispensable concepts of organizational dynamics: job satisfaction and organizational politics may interplay due to the fact that both include elements which chiefly impact attitude, behaviors, choices, and social networking of employees along with affecting managers and the
global characteristics of any institution/workplace. For this reason, managers of any organization/institution are expected to make sure that they gain more insights into the terms; job satisfaction and organizational politics so that they could stop their interfering with each other (Breaux et al., 2009).

In this respect, policies can be developed in the context of motivation resources and management of the members of the organization to increase the job satisfaction of academicians. Lecturing workload, research workload, working hours planning can carefully be done on the basis of the needs of the members of the organization. These political arrangements can also be seen in the findings of this study in which the members of the organization will have increased perceptions of organizational policy.

Last but not the least, the quantitative measurement tools and a descriptive relational survey model used to solve the problems, the date of the data collection, the universities in Ankara and the numbers of the participants all form the limitations of this research. To this end, future research can be carried out on faculty members of other universities in Turkey using different measurement tools and with a possibility of referring to qualitative mixed methods that investigate the job satisfaction and the perceptions of organizational politics.
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