

\*

(314) (2905)  
 : (77) (582)  
 (Cheney, 1982)  
 (3.97)  
 (5) (3.78)  
 (0.49)  
 :

**.1**

(.87 2003 )

(Johnson, Johnson and

Heimberg, 1999)

.(Organizational Identification)

(Johnson, Johnson

2006/11/5

: andHeimberg, 1999, p160)

.2007/10/7

\*

:  
(1989 )

(Stuart, 1999, p.200-202)

:(9 1414 )

:(Street, 1994)

(Fiol and

.Huff, 1992, p. 270)

( )

(Nadler and

)

(

Tushman, 1980)

: (Nadler and Tushman, 1980)

: **Organizational Identification**

.2

: **Job Performance**

:

.1

.2

) :

.(

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

.3

: **Faculty Member**

:

:

:

.1

. 2006/2005

.2

**Organizational Identification** :

)

.3

(

.4

.(Hant and Morgan, 1994, p. 1568)

(32-31 2003 )

:

.1

.2

.3

)

.4

.(13 2003

:

(Ashforth and Mael,

.5

1989. p21)

.6

( )

( )

(Tompkins and Cheney, 1985)

.7

(Mael and Ashforth,

(Duncan, 2002, p.3)

: 2001, p.199-201)

:

(Hall, Schnider and Nygren, 1970, p177)

**Job Performance :**

:

" :

) "

:

.(20 1996

(Albert, Ashforth and Dutton,

(Wagner,

.2000)

.John &Hollenbeck, 1992, P.106)  
(Tomy, 1996)

.2

.3 (Avolio and  
(76 2002)

Waldman)

:

.4

.5

:

.(415 2002 )

)

.(227 1991

1997

)

.(441-434 1993

.3

.1

:

.(1995 )

:

(Johnson,

:(1990 )

Johnson, and Heimberg, 1999)

.1

.2

(1300)

(Cheney)

(Neumann,

:2000)

.1

(Knippenberg and Schie, 2000)

)

.(

(2005)

:

( Kuhn and Nelson, 2002)

.2

(Doyle, 1978)

(Jeffry, 2002)

(Puurula and Lofstrom,

(5)

2003)

(7)

(175)

:

(Mansour, 1988)

(2003)

(1997)

---

(Selmes, 1989)

(1998)

(1990)

(1999)

(1991)

(Marsh, 2001)

(Watkins and

Thomas, 1991)

(Marsh, 1984)

(1993)

(2004)

(77) (4.05)  
(3.79)

(591) (9) .4

(582) (%94)  
:(%100)

:(  
(Organizational Identification -1  
Questionnaire "OIQ")  
(Cheney, 1982)

)  
(  
(2005) (2003)  
(Job Performance Questionnaire) -1 .(2005/2004)  
(2905)  
(314)  
(1991) ) : (8)  
( 1414) (2001)  
(2004) (1994) (  
) : )  
(  
(2006

(622)  
(77) (%21)  
(%24)  
)  
(20) (622) .(259 2001

(test-retest) (20) (%80)

(23)

(35)

(0.91) (5) (Likert )  
 (0.89) (4) (5) :

(Cronbach's - (1) (2) (3)  
 Alpha)  
 .(1)

(1)  
 (Cronbach's Alpha) )  
 (test-retest)

(test-retest)	(Cronbach's Alpha)	
0.89	0.94	
0.87	0.92	
0.84	0.91	
0.86	0.92	
0.89	0.98	

(2)

.5

(3.97)

(0.74)

" (5) " :  
 :

(0.84) (4.40)

" (3)  
 (4.37) "

(8) (0.81) (2)

(3.64) (21)

" (1.06)

(21) "

(1.07)

"

(3.62)

"

(2)

	1	0.84	4.40		5
	2	0.81	4.37		3
	3	0.88	4.32		23
	4	0.91	4.28		4
	5	0.94	4.26		10
	6	0.96	4.18		19
	7	0.92	4.16		2
	8	0.89	4.14		11
	9	0.91	4.11		6
	10	0.94	4.07		1
	11	0.99	4.02		7
	12	1.07	3.97	" " " "	22
	13	0.95	3.90		18
	14	0.87	3.87		15
	15	1.16	3.84		13
	16	1.14	3.80		14
	17	1.27	3.77		20
	18	1.02	3.75		17
	18	1.05	3.75		9
	20	1.11	3.65		12
	20	1.06	3.65		16
	22	1.06	3.64		8
	23	1.07	3.62		21
		0.74	3.97	/	

(3)

	1	0.74	4.14		4
	2	0.73	4.12		9
	3	0.79	4.08		11
	4	0.72	4.05		12
	5	0.83	4.00		15
	5	0.76	4.00		3
	7	0.70	3.99		8
	8	0.81	3.97		1
	9	0.75	3.93		16
	10	0.83	3.91		2
	11	0.75	3.90		22
	11	0.72	3.90		13
	11	0.84	3.90		14
	14	0.83	3.88		7
	15	0.83	3.87		20
	15	0.80	3.87		24
	17	0.79	3.86		10
	18	0.80	3.84		27
	19	0.75	3.83		17
	20	0.82	3.82		6
	21	0.83	3.80		5
	22	0.86	3.75		21
	22	0.78	3.75		26
	24	0.84	3.71		23
	25	0.77	3.68		28
	26	0.76	3.65		29
	27	0.92	3.57		34
	28	0.90	3.54		33
	29	0.87	3.49		18
	30	0.82	3.48		30
	30	1.03	3.48		31
	32	1.00	3.42		25
	32	0.97	3.42		35
	34	0.98	3.39		32
	35	0.89	3.38		19
		0.62	3.78	/	

(4)

	2	0.61	3.85	
	4	0.72	3.57	
	3	0.65	3.78	
	1	0.64	3.97	
	-	0.62	3.78	

(5)

	1	0.72	4.05		5
	2	0.70	3.99		4
	3	0.81	3.97		1
	4	0.75	3.93		7
	5	0.83	3.91		2
	6	0.72	3.90		6
	7	0.83	3.88		3
	8	0.75	3.83		8
	9	0.84	3.71		9
	10	0.76	3.65		11
	11	0.92	3.57		12
	12	1.00	3.42		10
		0.61	3.85		

(3)

(3.78)

(0.62)

(4)

(4.14)

(0.74)

(9)

(3)

" (4.12) "  
 (3.38) " (32) (0.73)  
 (0.89) (3.39) (34)  
 " (0.98)  
 : (19) "

**(6)**

	1	0.86	3.75	.	1
	1	0.78	3.75	.	2
	3	0.77	3.68	.	3
	4	0.90	3.54	.	7
	5	0.82	3.48	.	4
	5	1.03	3.48	.	5
	7	0.97	3.42	.	8
	8	0.98	3.39	.	6
		0.72	3.57		

**(7)**

	1	0.79	4.08	.	3
	2	0.84	3.90	.	4
	3	0.83	3.87	.	7
	3	0.80	3.87	.	8
	5	0.79	3.86	.	2
	6	0.83	3.80	.	1
	7	0.87	3.49	.	5
	8	0.89	3.38	.	6
		0.65	3.78		

(0.62)

(4)

" " (3.78)

(3.57) (3.97) (0.64)  
 .(0.72) " " (0.61) (3.85)  
 (3.78) " (0.65)  
 : " "  
 (8)

	1	0.74	4.14	.	2
	2	0.73	4.12	.	4
	3	0.76	4.00	.	1
	3	0.83	4.00	.	5
	5	0.75	3.90	.	6
	6	0.80	3.84	.	7
	7	0.82	3.82	.	3
		0.64	3.97		

(7) (5) : :1  
 " " (3.78) (0.65) (5) (5)  
 " (0.65) (5) " "  
 (8) : :4 (0.61) (3.85)  
 : " "  
 (8) (3.97) " " (6) : :2  
 " " (0.64) : (6) " "  
 : : (0.72) (3.57)  
 (α ≤ 0.05) " "  
 : :3  
 (Pearson) (7)  
 (9) :

(9)

**0.56	
**0.51	
**0.43	
**0.44	
**0.49	

.( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )

\*\*

(9)

(2005)

(2003)

: .2 ( ) (0.49)  
 ( ) (0.56)

(0.62) (3.78) ) ( ) (0.51)  
 ) (0.44) ( )  
 ( (0.43)

(0.64) ( ) (3.97)

: .1

( ) (0.61) (3.85) (5) (3.97) (0.74)

( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ ) ( )  
 (0.264) (3.78)  
 ( ) (0.65)  
 .( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )  
 ( )  
 (0.43)  
 ( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )  
 ) (0.187)  
 ( )  
 .( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ ) (0.72) (3.57)  
 ( )  
 ( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ ) (0.44)  
 (0.197)  
 ( )  
 .( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )  
 .6 : .3  
 :  
 .1 )  
 : - ( )  
 ( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ ) (0.49)  
 (0.24)  
 .2 .( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )  
 : - (0.56) ( )  
 ( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ )  
 ) (0.31)  
 .( $\alpha \leq 0.01$ ) ( )  
 . (0.51) ( )

:  
 ".(2004  
 ) "  
 ( 2001  
 1989  
 : 1999  
 1996  
 : 1 (26)  
 " 1998 1 1997 .482-472  
 ".272-255 (25) 1993  
 1990  
 .50-28 25 :  
 ".(2005 .462-427  
 ( ) " : : 2001  
 " 1990 1991  
 " 26  
 .72-37 .82-67  
 2003 : 2003  
 :  
 : 2002 1414  
 1995 (38)  
 2006  
 2006/2005 1991  
 :

Albert, S., Ashforth B. E. and Dutton J. E. 2000.  
 Organizational identity and identification: Charting new  
 waters and building new bridges, *Academy of  
 Management Review*. Vol. 25, No. 1, 13-17.

Ashforth, B.E., and Mael, F.A. 1999. Social identity theory  
 and the organization, *Academy of Management Review*,  
 14, 20-39.

" 1994  
 "  
 .135-101 (6)

: " 2002  
 : "  
 .95-63 (1)17

- Mansour, S. 1998. *An Assessment of the Current Practice of Teacher Evaluation in Saudi Arabian Universities*. Unpublished Dissertation Portland State University, Portland.
- Marsh, W. H. 2001. Student's Evaluations of University Teaching. University of Western Sydney. Available.
- Nadler, D.A., and Tushman, M.T. 1980. A model for diagnosing Organizational behavior, *Organizational Dynamics*, 9 (2), 235-251.
- Neumann, R. 2000. Communication student evaluation of teaching results: Rating interpretation guides (RIGS), *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25 (2), 121-134.
- Puurula, A. and Lofstrom, E. 2003. Development of Professional Identity in SMEs. Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) "Accountability for Educational Quality: Shared Responsibility" 84th, Chicago, IL, 2003.
- Selmes, C. 1989. *Evaluation of Teaching*. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 14 (3), 167-178.
- Street, M.D. 1994. Cognitive Moral Development and Organizational Commitment: Two Potential Predictors of Whistle-Blowing, *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 11, No. 4.
- Stuart, H. 1999. Towards a definitive model of the corporate identity management process, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. Vol. 4 (4): 200-207.
- Tompkins, P.K. and Cheney, G. 1985. Communication and Unobtrusive Control in Contemporary Organizations. In R. D. McPhee and P.k. Tompkins (Eds), *Organizational Communication: Traditional Themes and New Directions*, 179-210, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Tomy, A. 1996. *Nursing Management and Leadership*. 5th Ed, Mosby.
- Wagner, I., John, A. and Hollenbeck, J.R. 1992. *Organizational behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc.
- Watkins, D. and Thomas, B. 1991. *Assessing Teaching Effectiveness: An India Perspective*. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 16 (3), 185-198.
- Cheney, G. 1982. On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification, *Communication Monographs*. 50: 342-362.
- Doyle, K. and Crichton, L. 1978. Student Peer and Self Evaluations of College Instructors. *Journal of Education Psychology*, Vol. 70, 815-826.
- Duncan, J.E. 2002. *Organizational Identification: An Insight in to Republic Bank and Trust*, University of Kentucky, 1-17.
- Fiol, C.M., and Huff, A. 1992. Maps for managers: Where are we? Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management Studies*, No. 29, 267-285.
- Hall, D.T., Schneider, R.B. and Nygren, H.T. 1970. Personal Factor of Organizational Identification, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.15, 176-190.
- Hant, S.D. and Morgan, R.M. 1994. Organizational Commitment: One of Many Commitment or Key Mediating Construct, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 6, 1568-1587.
- Jeffry, T.P. 2002. Explaining the Varying Effects of Organizational Identification on Cooperation: The Moderating Role of Subgroup Reputations, *Working Papers, Harvard Business School*, Morgan Hal, 333.
- Johnson, W.L., and Johnson, A.M., and Heimberg, F. 1999. A Primary- and Second-Order Component Analysis of the Organizational Identification Questionnaire, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 59, No.1, 159-170.
- Knippenberg, Daan van, Schie, Els C. M. Van. 2000. Foci and correlated of organizational identification, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 137-147.
- Kuhn, T., Nelson, N. 2002. Reengineering Identity: A Case Study of Multiplicity and Duality in Organizational Identification, *Management Communication Quarterly*, V.16 N.1, 5-38.
- Mael, F. A., and Ashforth, B. E. 2001. Identification in Work, War, Sports and Religion: Contrasting the Benefits and Risks, *The Executive Management Committee*, 197-222.

---

## **Organizational Identification of Faculty Members at the Jordanian Public Universities and its Relationship to their Job Performance**

*Rateb Al-So'ud and Khaled A. Al-Srayrah\**

### **ABSTRACT**

The Purpose of this study was to examine the Organizational Identification of the faculty members at the Jordanian public universities, and its relationship to their job performance.

The population of the study consisted of all 2905 Jordanian faculty members and 314 department heads, appointed on full-time basis at the Jordanian public universities. The sample of the study (n. 582; 77) was randomly selected.

Two instruments were developed for data gathering; the first instrument, a portfolio of respondents, is an Organizational Identification questionnaire which was first designed by Cheney (1982). The second is a questionnaire of the instrument to the heads of academic departments. It included a portfolio and a scale of job performance.

The results of the study indicated that the degree of Organizational Identification was high (3.97). The results also revealed that job performance of the faculty members from the department heads' perspective was high (3.78).

A positive correlation was revealed between the Organizational Identification and job performance and the correlation coefficient was (0.49).

**Keywords:** Jordanian Public Universities, Organizational Identification, Job Performance.

---

\* Faculty of Graduate Educational Studies, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies; and The Deanship of Academic Research, Mu'tah University, Jordan. Received on 5/11/2006 and Accepted for Publication on 7/10/2007.