The Duality Of Decision-Making In University Institutions And The Question Of Professional Stability – A Field Study At The University Of Algiers 03

Hemal Abdelmalek Lecturer A, University of Algiers 03, digitalization and economic supervision laboratory in Algeria, Algeria. Hemal.abdelmalek@univ-alger3.dz

Assema Amouri University of Tipaza, Algeria. assema.amouri@gmail.com

Abstract.

A stable organisation is not only defined by the clarity of the necessary organisational units, the appropriate allocation of material resources or the appointment of competent personnel at each organisational level. Rather, it requires the interconnection of these levels, achieved vertically and horizontally, often manifested in the legal and legitimate power of individuals.

In the university institution, the phenomenon of the exercise of authority is characterised by a duality of decision making: administrative authority (professional), held by senior management, and scientific authority (elected), held by those who manage scientific work, namely scientific councils and committees.

This research aims to shed light on the issue of the dual decision-making system and its relationship with professional stability in university institutions.

Keywords: administration, administrative authority, organisation, administrative decision, professional stability.

Introduction

Administrative reform and the changes and developments it brings are crucial to the progress of institutions, especially in the context of intense competition for sustainability and success. The development of strategies to adapt to change and meet future challenges is essential. The duality of organisational decision-making and professional stability plays an important role in this context, as it involves both organisational oversight and decision-making, as well as loyalty and a sense of belonging, which are indicators of professional stability within these institutions.

What distinguishes higher education institutions today is the management of administrative and educational affairs through organised and gradual collective processes, where departments serve as a basis for decisions taken by the highest authority of the university. Thus, the management of higher education institutions and their operations in the pursuit of stability is linked to the activation of the distribution of power in decision-making.

For the institution to maintain its performance and stability, there must be active participants within the organisational structure. No institution can achieve stability if its staff are not satisfied with the decisions imposed on them.

In particular, the organisational chart of higher education institutions shows that the hierarchical structure is more horizontal than vertical. This is due to the existence of two decision-making systems: one formed by the administration and various relevant bodies, and the other by the scientific organisation, which is hierarchically structured according to academic qualifications and status through elections.

Given the recent increased interest in reforming university institutions in the context of various changes, including the way organisational decisions are distributed and exercised - whether organisational authority is distributed in a way that makes employees more inclined to keep their jobs and feel the importance of professional stability, or whether it is concentrated in the hands of a few - the following central question arises:

To what extent does the decision-making system in higher education institutions affect the achievement of job stability?

To answer this question, we will conduct a field study in a university institution, supported by statistical evidence.

Study questions:

1. To what extent does the clarity of the decision-making hierarchy in higher education institutions affect professional stability?

2. What is the impact of the balance of organisational power between academic and administrative bodies on professional stability?

3. How does the extension of participation in decision-making within the university contribute to professional stability?

Defining concepts

The process of defining concepts is fundamentally based on the construction of theoretical frameworks that facilitate understanding (Said Saboun, Hafsa Gradi, 2012, p. 127).These frameworks include.

Definition of organisation:

The term "organisation" refers to the efforts made by individuals to achieve set goals. The structure of the organization is designed to meet the needs of people and improve their well-being; therefore, organization is about achieving desired goals (Rabeh Kabbash, 2006, p. 27).

Administrative authority:

This refers to the relationships that arise between different units at the level of superiors and subordinates, characterised by a hierarchy and distribution of administrative power (Afeef Haidar, Sabah Hashim, 2012, p. 151).

Management:

Management is a human activity with a unique nature related to the existence of societies. Since the dawn of humanity, management has organised the relationship between

individuals and the role of the manager is central to the equation of total quality. The progress of societies is attributed to the presence of advanced management philosophy and thought (Al-Meligi Abdul Raouf Saleh, 2022, p. 12).

Field study

1. Scope of the study

- **Spatial scope**: This study was conducted at the University of Algiers 03, specifically at the Faculty of Economic and Commercial Sciences and Management, Department of Commercial Sciences.

- **Human scope**: The Department of Commercial Sciences was selected by random sampling as the focus of the study, concentrating on the faculty members. This is in line with the theme of the study, which examines the relationship between the decision-making system in university institutions and professional stability.

- This phase began in October 2024, with the distribution of questionnaires from 2 October to 26 October.

Second: Methodology

The researcher relies on research methodologies to address specific problems and phenomena, as the choice of methodology varies according to the phenomena and issues being studied. Researchers emphasise that the nature of the phenomenon under study dictates the appropriate methodology. The methodology is considered the backbone of the research design and represents the approach the researcher takes to explore the problem and uncover the truth (Mahmoud Irfan Sarhan, 2015, p. 119). In line with the nature of the topic and the objectives of this study, a descriptive methodology was adopted.

Third: Sample

The study adopted a multi-stage sampling technique. A random selection was made from three colleges and institutes under the supervision of the University of Algiers 03. The selected college is the Faculty of Economic and Commercial Sciences and Management (Department of Commercial Sciences), from which 25% of the total faculty members were sampled. This gives a sample size of 116 professors out of an estimated total of 464.

First: Data analysis on the clarity of the hierarchy of authority and its relationship to stability

Table 01: Clarity of the hierarchy of responsibility in higher education institutions.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Very clear	41	35.34
Mostly clear	29	25
Some of it is clear	19	14.66
Mostly unclear	17	16.38
Not clear at all	10	08.62

Total	100	100%

Table 01 shows that 35.34% of respondents consider that the hierarchy of responsibilities within the organisational structure of the higher education institution is very clear. Meanwhile, 25% feel that the hierarchy of responsibilities is fairly clear. Conversely, 16.38% of the sample feel that the hierarchy is not very clear and 8.62% feel that it is not at all clear.

The results from the table suggest that the majority of respondents perceive the hierarchy of responsibilities in the higher education institution to be clear. This suggests that the clear organisational coordination implemented by the university management varies in its structures in order to achieve organisational stability.

As far as the reasons for the lack of clarity in the hierarchy of responsibilities within the university institution are concerned, they can be attributed to the unfamiliarity of some faculty members with the various laws that govern the management of university institutions, as well as the policies regarding amendments and changes made by the authorities to these laws. This situation leads to a lack of clarity in the hierarchy of responsibilities among university professors.

Table 02: Function of the hierarchy of authority in higher education institutions.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Means of control and regulation	31	26.72
Means of enforcing discipline	19	16.38
Means of maintaining consistency	13	11.21
Means of achieving stability	47	40.52
Means of asserting control	06	05.17
Total	116	100%

The hierarchy of authority within university institutions is one of the most important elements of organisational control and plays a crucial role in maintaining stability. It serves as a means of control, regulation, discipline and achieving stability. The data presented in Table 02 shows that 40.52% of the research sample believe that the hierarchy of authority aims to achieve organisational stability. In addition, 26.72% of the respondents see the hierarchy as a means of control and regulation, while 16.38% believe that it is primarily used to enforce discipline.

Analysing the results of this table, we can see that a well-structured hierarchy of authority within higher education institutions contributes to stability by organising different working relationships between members of the organisation and by regulating the

relationship between superiors and subordinates, as well as between subordinates themselves.

Table 03: Contribution of levels of authority in higher education institutions to professional stability.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Always	23	19.83
Often	29	25.00
Sometimes	27	23.28
Rarely	19	16.38
Never	18	15.51
Total	116	100%

To assess the contribution of levels of authority in higher education institutions to organisational stability, Table 03 shows that the responses of the sample fell into two categories. One category, comprising 44.83%, believes that levels of authority contribute most to stability. The second category, representing 31.89%, believes that levels of authority do not contribute to organisational stability in most cases. Meanwhile, 23.28% of respondents were in between these two views.

The results from the table indicate that levels of authority within higher education institutions play a crucial role in organisational stability, as they help to mobilise all organisational resources to achieve the institution's goals. In addition, there is a focus on the relationships between these levels, which ensure a high degree of cohesion and solidarity, thereby contributing to organisational stability.

Table 04: Governance structures and their effectiveness in achieving organisational stability.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Rigid control model	16	13.79
Flexible control model	39	33.62
Self-control model	61	52.59
Total	116	100%

From Table 04 we can see that 52.59% of the respondents believe that the self-regulatory model is the supervisory style that leads to the achievement of organisational stability. In addition, 33.62% of respondents consider the flexible supervision model to be the optimal supervision style for organisational stability, while 13.79% of respondents consider the strict supervision model to be the best for maintaining stability.

In order to gain more insight into this issue, during the interviews the respondents attributed their preference for one style of supervision over another to the following reasons:

- Strict supervision models: These rely on centralised control, which can create a psychological state of anxiety and boredom in employees, leading them to feel that their freedom is restricted. As a result, this model is generally undesirable for employees.

- Flexible supervision models: This is a type of supervisory style that emphasises human relationships and interactions.

- Self-regulation models: These are based on trust and understanding between superiors and subordinates, relying on professional and ethical conscience, making them more sustainable over time.

Second, data analysis on the balance in the distribution of authority and its relationship to professional organisational stability.

Table 05: Sources of information on job functions.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Appointed administrative bodies	19	16.10
Elected administrative bodies	10	08.47
Appointed and elected administrative bodies	21	17.80
Direct supervisor	53	44.92
Personal relationships and colleagues	15	12.71
Total	118	100%

From Table 05.on sources of information related to the job functions of staff within the higher education institution, the data show that 44.92% of respondents identified their line manager as their primary source of information. This highlights the importance of the line manager as a coordinator of efforts within the university, particularly given the specific and sensitive nature of the services provided.

Next, 17.80% of respondents indicated that their source of information was the elected administrative bodies, highlighting the need for coordination between these bodies in order to achieve new organisational goals. In addition, 16.10% cite administrative bodies as their source of information, while 8.47% cite elected bodies. The category that considers their source of information to be personal relationships and colleagues is 12.71%, which underlines the value and role of informal groups and informal communication as a complement to formal groups and formal communication in improving performance and organisational stability.

It should also be noted that the sample exceeds the expected response rate by four entries as some respondents selected multiple answers**.**

Table 06: Respondents' assessment of the position of elected scientific bodies.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Its presence is essential	17	14.66
Its presence is complementary to the administrative bodies	61	52.59
An obstruction to the administration's work	07	06.03
A guide for the administration's work	31	26.72
Total	116	100%

The results of Table 06, which assesses the framework of elected scientific bodies within the higher education institution, show that 52.59% of respondents believe that the existence of these elected scientific bodies complements the tasks of the relevant administrative bodies. Similarly, 26.72% of respondents consider that these elected bodies guide the work of the administration. Furthermore, 14.66% of the respondents stressed the necessity of having elected scientific bodies within the university, while 6.03% thought that their presence could hinder the administrative work.

From the analysis of these results, it is clear that the framework of elected scientific bodies is one of the most important levels of authority within the university. In order to increase their effectiveness, coordination between the various relevant levels of authority is essential to achieve effective performance and sustainable organisational stability.

Table 07: Contribution of decisions overseen by relevant administrative bodies to achieving professional stability.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Always	29	25.00
Often	19	16.38
Sometimes	51	43.97
Rarely	11	09.48
Never	06	05.17
Total	116	100%

Regarding the contribution of decisions supervised by relevant administrative bodies to achieving organisational stability in the performance of assigned tasks and activities, the results from Table 07 show that 43.97% of the sample believe that these decisions sometimes contribute to organisational stability. In addition, 25% believe that administrative decisions always contribute to organisational stability. The percentage of those who believe that most decisions contribute to stability is 16.38%, while 9.48% believe that these decisions rarely contribute to stability. Finally, 5.17% of respondents claim that decisions monitored by the relevant administrative bodies do not contribute to organisational stability at all.

From the data presented in the table, it is clear that decisions overseen by the relevant administrative bodies do contribute to achieving organisational stability. However, in order to achieve full and lasting stability within the higher education institution, there needs to be integration and coordination between the different levels of authority in order to arrive at consistent decisions.

Table 08: The impact of the dominance of one level of authority over another on organisational instability in the higher education institution.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Completely agree	53	45.69
Mostly agree	31	26.72
Somewhat agree	19	16.38
Mostly disagree	13	11.21
Do not agree at all	00	00
Total	116	100%

In order to assess the impact of focusing on one level of authority over another on the instability of the higher education institution, Table 08 shows that 45.69% of respondents believe that the dominance of one level of authority over another leads to organisational instability. Similarly, 26.72% agree that the prioritisation of one level of authority leads to a disruption of organisational stability. In addition, 16.38% sometimes agree that neglecting certain levels of authority in the organisation contributes to instability, while 11.21% mostly agree that focusing on one level of authority while neglecting others does not affect organisational stability.

Table 09: The impact of the balance in the distribution of organisational authority levels on organisational stability.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Completely agree	71	61.21
Mostly agree	39	33.62
Somewhat agree	03	02.59
Mostly disagree	02	01.72
Do not agree at all	01	00.86
Total	116	100%

The results of Table 09, which examines the balance in the distribution of authority between organisational levels within the higher education institution and its impact on organisational stability, show that 61.21% of respondents strongly agree with the need to balance power between different organisational levels. In addition, 33.62% largely support this idea, while only 1.72% generally disagree and 0.86% strongly disagree that a balanced distribution of authority leads to organisational stability. These last percentages are quite low.

From the analysis of the results it is clear that the vast majority of respondents emphasise the importance of a balance of power within the university institution for stability. This balance is a crucial requirement for a stable institution, which relies on the integration of all parts of the organisation. One form of this integration is the principle of alignment and fairness in the distribution of tasks. Therefore, in order to achieve stability within the university institution, it is essential to adopt the principle of balance in the distribution of authority.

Table 10: Satisfaction with the distribution and exercise of authority within the higher education institution.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Completely satisfied	00	00.00
Mostly satisfied	19	16.38
Somewhat satisfied	55	47.41
Mostly dissatisfied	35	30.17
Not satisfied at all	07	06.04
Total	116	100%

The results from Table 10 indicate that 47.41% of the sample are somewhat satisfied with the distribution and exercise of authority within the higher education institution. In contrast, 30.17% are generally dissatisfied, while 16.38% are mostly satisfied. In addition, 6.04% of respondents are completely dissatisfied with the way authority is distributed and exercised within the institution. It is noteworthy that there were no responses indicating complete satisfaction among staff with the distribution and exercise of authority.

This highlights the significant and vital role of the distribution of authority within the institution, particularly in the processes of law-making and the exercise of supervisory powers. In order to maintain stability and performance within the institution, it is essential to have active participants whose activities are directed and distributed through procedures, regulations and laws that ensure stable operations.

Analysis of data on the contribution of widening participation in decision-making to professional stability

Table 11: Collective participation in the formulation of decisions related to the organisation of the higher education institution.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
All decisions	15	12.93
Some decisions	21	18.10
Rare participation	41	35.35
They do not participate	39	33.62

Total	116	100%

The results of Table 11, which illustrates the extent of collective participation in the formulation of decisions related to the organisation of the higher education institution, show that 35.35% of respondents believe that participation in decision-making is rare. Meanwhile, 33.62% claim that there is no participation at all in decision-making, and 18.10% state that there is participation only in some decisions. Conversely, 12.93% feel that participation covers all decisions concerning the higher education institution.

The table shows that the reality of collective participation in decision-making within the higher education institution tends to be negative, with the majority of respondents indicating a lack of participation in the decision-making process. This lack of participation has a negative impact on staff members' sense of belonging to the institution, which can be a significant obstacle to achieving organisational stability.

Table 12: Respondents' opinions on the decentralisation of decision-making policy.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
A means of creating a spirit of cooperation and harmony	50	42.37
Provided opportunities to take on responsibility	37	31.36
Respect for the trust of authority	08	06.78
A means of encouraging initiative and creativity	22	18.64
Participation of all in decision making	01	0.85
Total	116	100%

The results from Table 12 highlight the aspects in which decentralisation of decision-making contributes to the higher education institution. The results are as follows:

- 42.37% of respondents believe that decentralisation promotes cooperation and harmony between different working bodies.

- 31.36% consider that it provides opportunities for taking responsibility.

- 18.64% see decentralisation as a means of encouraging initiative and creativity.

- 6.78% believe that it helps to respect the trust of civil servants.

- A very small percentage, 0.85%, think that decentralisation allows everyone to participate in decision-making.

From these results, we can conclude that the policy of decentralising decision-making contributes to achieving organisational stability by fostering a sense of cohesion and

cooperation between different levels of organisational authority within the university. Moreover, the decentralisation process allows all members of the organisation to take responsibility, which helps to contain and absorb organisational tensions, ultimately leading to improved performance and stability within the university institution.

Table 13: Contribution of widening participation in decision-making to achieving professional stability.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Always	41	35.34
Often	29	25.00
Sometimes	23	19.83
Rarely	14	12.07
Never	09	07.76
Total	116	100%

The results of Table 13 show that:

- 35.34% of respondents believe that increasing participation in decision-making within the higher education institution always helps to achieve organisational stability.

- 25% of the sample believe that such participation often contributes to stability.

- 19.83% think that broadening participation sometimes contributes to stability.

- 12.07% of the respondents think that it rarely contributes to organisational stability.

- Finally, 7.76% of the respondents do not think that increased participation in decision-making contributes to stability at all.

From these results it is clear that broadening participation in decision-making within the university institution plays an important role in achieving organisational stability. It improves individual behaviour in discussions between the different parts of the organisation, thereby providing a more objective understanding of reality. This understanding, in turn, helps administrative authorities to guide and lead individuals towards achieving organisational stability.

Table 14: Satisfaction with task performance when participating in decision making.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Always	63	54.31
Often	31	26.72
Sometimes	22	18.97
Rarely	00	00.00
Never	00	00.00

Total	116	100%

The results of table 14 show that

- 54.31% of the sample believe that participation in decision making always contributes to satisfaction and increased comfort in performing assigned activities and tasks within the institution.

- 26.73% feel that participation often leads to satisfaction and comfort in performing tasks.

- 18.97% say that participation sometimes contributes to satisfaction and comfort.

- Notably, there were no responses indicating that participation rarely or never contributes to satisfaction and comfort in performing activities and tasks.

It is clear from this data that participation in decision making has a positive impact on employees' satisfaction and comfort with their assigned tasks. This involvement fosters a sense of importance in their activities, increases their sense of belonging to the institution and motivates them to contribute to its stability and growth.

Table 15: Stability of employees in their positions while participating in decision making.

Probabilities	Frequencies	Percentage
Always	73	62.93
Sometimes	32	27.59
Never	11	09.48
Total	116	100%

The results from Table 15 illustrate employees' feelings regarding their participation in decision-making within the university institution and how this contributes to their stability in their positions:

- 62.93% of respondents feel that participation in decision-making contributes to their sense of stability in their jobs.

- 27.59% indicate that participation sometimes makes them feel stable in their roles.

- 9.48% believe that participation does not contribute at all to their job stability.

Thus, involving employees in decision-making serves as a motivator, fostering teamwork and facilitating communication and consultation between superiors and subordinates. This interaction helps accurately transfer and build information among all organizational components, leading to effective monitoring of operations and ultimately achieving lasting stability within the institution.

Conclusion:

The main objectives of this research paper were to explore the relationship between the decision-making system in the university institution and its impact on professional stability. This required conducting a field study through practical issues observed in the academic environment.

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. The clearer the organisational levels dictated by the decision-making system in the university, the greater the tendency towards professional stability.

2. A balanced distribution of the decision-making system contributes to professional stability.

3. Widening participation in decision-making increases the degree of professional stability.

4. Overlapping levels in the decision-making system can lead to professional instability; as the overlap in authority increases, loyalty and organisational performance decrease.

5. The accuracy of task performance and execution is enhanced when there is a smooth flow of information, and the diversity of channels authorised to give orders can lead to increased conflict between different organisational levels.

6. A decision-making system based on clarity of hierarchy, control methods, balanced distribution of levels and expanded participation leads to a sense of belonging, loyalty, comfort and job satisfaction, ultimately resulting in employee stability and overall institutional stability.

This study has attempted to answer the questions posed; however, the results will continue to be influenced by changes in the organisation's external environment.

Bibliography:

Rabeh Kabbash, Sociology of Organisation, Sociology of Communication Laboratory, Constantine, Algeria, 2006.

Said Saboun, Hafsa Geradi, Methodological Guide for Preparing Theses and Dissertations in Sociology, Dar Al-Qissa Publishing, Algeria, 2002.

Afeef Haidar, Sabah Hashim, Public Administration, Damascus University, Syria, 2012.

Al-Maliji Abdul Raouf Saleh, Management of Excellence, 1st edition, Dar Al-Abdali, Jordan, 2022.