

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER AND STAFF MOTIVATION AND PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING ON JOB SATISFACTION WITH ADVERSITY QUOTIENT AS A MODERATOR IN INDONESIA

Vallyrina Trysia Sapulete¹, Fachrudin Hidayat²

^{1,2}Doctoral Research Management, University Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Vallyrina Trysia Sapulete

E-mail: vallyrina@gmail.com

Volume: 7
Number: 3
Page: 704 - 721

Article History:

Received: 2026-02-09

Revised: 2026-03-19

Accepted: 2026-28-04

Abstract:

This study aims to examine the relationship between motivation and participatory decision-making and job satisfaction, with adversity quotient as a moderating variable, among teachers and staff in Indonesia. Using a quantitative correlational approach, data were collected from 101 respondents through an online questionnaire using a Likert scale, supplemented by semi-structured interviews. The variables analyzed included motivation and participatory decision-making as independent variables, job satisfaction as a dependent variable, and adversity quotient as a moderating variable. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS using correlation and multiple regression techniques, along with classical assumption tests to ensure the validity and reliability of the model. The results showed that motivation has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction, indicating that higher levels of motivation contribute to increased satisfaction among teachers and staff. Participatory decision-making also demonstrated a strong positive relationship with job satisfaction, highlighting the importance of involving employees in organizational decision-making processes. Furthermore, it was found that adversity quotient strengthened the relationship between participatory decision-making and job satisfaction, suggesting that individuals with greater resilience and ability to cope with challenges experience greater benefits from participation in decision-making. This study contributes to the literature by emphasizing the critical role of psychological resilience in enhancing the effectiveness of participatory management practices. These findings suggest that schools should foster motivation, encourage participatory decision-making environments, and develop resilience among teachers and staff to improve overall job satisfaction.

Keywords: Motivation, Participation, Job Satisfaction, Teacher, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Quality schools require competent teachers. Teachers are essential resources for schools. It is challenging for a school to achieve its educational goals without teachers. Therefore, teachers play a crucial role in schools.

In addition to educating students, teachers are also school employees who naturally seek job satisfaction—reflected in the happiness or fulfillment they experience when their expectations are met, and they perceive real benefits and advantages in their roles.

Satisfaction with work can be one of the factors driving increased teacher performance. Schools naturally benefit from improvements in teacher performance. Besides teachers, staff also play a supporting role in school progress. Therefore, schools need to make efforts to increase the satisfaction of both teachers and staff. Several strategies to raise job satisfaction include providing better facilities and infrastructure, supporting teachers' and staff performance, awarding



scholarships to teachers who wish to continue their education, offering training to improve teachers' professionalism, and other similar actions.

High job satisfaction results from strong motivation. Motivation is the driving force that energizes employees to act and reach objectives. When teachers and staff are motivated, they demonstrate greater enthusiasm for their work. Without motivation, teachers and staff may seem disengaged, and their performance declines.

Motivation is generally divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation stems from internal drives within an individual, while extrinsic motivation comes from external influences. Besides motivation, workplace involvement is crucial. Teachers and staff show engagement by participating in decisions that impact them. Increased involvement leads to a greater sense of purpose in their work. Those included in decision-making feel valued at school. Teachers encounter diverse challenges influencing their effectiveness, such as student behavior, shifting policies, limited parental support, and inadequate teaching resources. Addressing these issues is vital to prevent negative effects on teachers.

The ability to overcome problems is linked to fighting spirit. This fighting spirit, called the adversity quotient, is the ability to overcome difficulties and is important for success. The adversity quotient helps a teacher survive and face challenges.

Some schools in Indonesia experience high turnover rates. One reason is low job satisfaction. Dissatisfaction among teachers and staff stems from factors such as motivation, participative decision making, and adversity quotient, as previously discussed.

Research has demonstrated positive relationships between employee motivation, participative decision making, and work satisfaction. However, the impact of the adversity quotient on these relationships remains unclear. Bukhari, Saeed, and Nisar (2011, 8396) state that the adversity quotient has not been studied in relation to psychological contract breach, turnover intent, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. Therefore, this research examines the link between teacher motivation, participative decision making, and job satisfaction, while considering the adversity quotient as a moderating factor in Indonesia.

Motivation. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) say motivation is the set of factors that make a person start an effort, choose to keep trying, and stick with something over time (quoted from Roos and Eeden 2008, 55). Motivation includes anything that drives a person to try something and continue.

Luthans (1998) defines motivation as an energetic force and catalyst for behavior, prompting employees to exert considerable effort and achieve objectives (as cited in ArunKumar 2014, 83). Motivation enables employees to attain predefined goals.

Janićijević (2008) defines motivation as the process of starting, directing, and maintaining behavior toward a goal (quoted from Perić, Gašić, and Ivanović 2015, 66). Motivation starts action, guides behavior, and keeps going until the work is done.

Based on the above definitions, motivation is all the factors that drive a person to start tasks and stay motivated until the set goals are achieved.

As explained earlier, motivation includes intrinsic and extrinsic types. Intrinsic motivation means doing an activity for its own satisfaction (Ryan and Deci 2000, 56). Individuals act from internal satisfaction, not from expected results. Extrinsic motivation means doing an activity for rewards or outcomes separate from the activity (Ryan and Deci 2000, 60). Extrinsic motivation is driven by results, not just the activity itself.

According to Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee (2008), four fundamental drives underpin motivation, as conceptualized in their four-drive theory. These drives are: the drive to acquire, the drive to bond, the drive to comprehend, and the drive to defend.

1. The drive to acquire is wanting rare goods, both physical, like food, clothing, housing, and money, and non-material goods, like travel and entertainment. This drive increases well-being (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 2). The drive is relative because people compare what they get with others and always want more (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 2).
2. The drive to bond. The drive to bond involves strong, positive emotions like love and attention. If not met, it leads to negative emotions like loneliness (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 2). At work, this drive motivates employees when they feel proud to be part of the organization. Losing this can reduce morale (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 2).
3. The drive to comprehend. The drive to comprehend is the urge to understand the world, producing scientific, religious, and cultural insight. At work, it is the desire to make a meaningful contribution (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 3).
4. The drive to defend. The drive to defend is the urge to protect oneself, belongings, achievements, and beliefs from threats (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 3). It supports institutions that value justice, clear goals, and allow people to express opinions (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 3).

All four drives are important and should be supported by organizations. Each drive can be satisfied through different organizational aspects (Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee 2008, 3). Main instruments include reward systems, organizational culture, job design, performance management, and resource allocation. Nohria, Groysberg, and Lee (2008, 3) describe each drive with these organizational instruments (quoted from Perić, Gašić, and Ivanović 2015, 68).

Participative Decision Making. Participative decision making means employee participation in making decisions (Ugwu, Okoroji, and Chukwu 2018, 60). Employee participation refers to the opportunities given to employees to be involved in discussing issues concerning their work and to influence managerial decisions. However, management still retains the right to make final decisions (Sofijanovna and Chatleska 2013, 32).

Employee participation is a process where employees can influence the work they do by being involved in decisions about their tasks (Straus 2006, cited from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). In this context, employees contribute directly to the decision-making process.

Employee participation is generally defined as a process in which influence is shared among qualified individuals, regardless of hierarchy (Locke and Schweiger, 1979; Wagner, 1994). There is always a need for more participating employees, as greater influence can be achieved when more employees are involved.

Participation is a mechanism through which organizations give employees the right to make decisions, increasing their awareness of their contribution to organizational performance (Irawanto 2015, 161). The more opportunities employees have to participate in decision-making, the greater their contribution to the company, which leads to improved organizational performance.

Employee participation programs play a role in increasing employee commitment and retention (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Allen (2015) explains that employee participation schemes promote equal opportunities and incentives that enhance commitment and retention (quoted from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3).

Based on the definitions above, researchers define participation as a mechanism by which organizations provide opportunities for employees to contribute to the company by giving them rights to be involved in decisions and delegating duties and responsibilities according to the organization's hierarchy.

Khalid and Nawab (2018, 3) divide employee participation into six categories as follows:

1. Direct participation. Direct participation is a capacity for influence on design or change in system organizations that involve employees and can shape consultation about problem more organizations, broad and broad in nature term long (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Morgan and Zeffane (2003) illustrate participation direct with give right decision to employees and participation representative with give employee right to make decisions on a number of representative types, such as directors, workers, works councils and union workers (quoted from Bhatti 2013, 37).

More carry on again, Strauss (2006) divides direct participation into three dimensions, namely voice employees, influence current employees to decisions, and provide relevant information to employees (quoted from Bhatti 2013, 38).

2. Delegative Participation. Delegative participation is seen as the extent to which subordinates are allowed to influence duties and responsibilities as they are implemented (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Delegation is interpreted as giving a task from the manager to others and sharing work, such as appearance, so that it can be executed in an effective way (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3).

Bhatti (2013, 40) explains that there are two types of delegation. The manager himself carries out the first by assigning tasks, while the second is carried out in a participatory context where the employees themselves take part in the act of delegating tasks.

3. Consultative participation. According to Ruiz and Rivero (2018), in consultative participation, subordinates provide input to managers before making decisions in the form of suggestions or recommendations, but managers still retain control over the final decision (cited in Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Fleetwood and Hesketh (2010) added that this allows for the exchange of different ideas between management and employees, and among employees themselves (cited in Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Cotton et al. (1988) define consultative participation as A situation Where employee is involved in participation for a long, formal and direct period, and the content.

Taking a participatory decision focused on the problem work (quoted from Bhatti 2013, 42). The only difference between participative and participatory delegative is that participation consultative involving level of authority for more employees, low Because although employees give their opinion, management still has the strength in making a decision (Bhatti 2013, 42).

4. Indirect participation. According to Akkerman, Sluiter, and Jansen (2015), employees participate in a way No direct, through representative those who are chosen in the governing council or board of directors (quoted from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Form participation No direct covering representative employee in the committee consultative joint, works council, and members, directors (workers director) or committee management (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 3). Sometimes an employee is appointed by management, a union worker or a combination of both and sometimes also chosen by employees (Bhatti 2013, 42).

5. Worker director. A director worker is a representative of employees who become member of the board of directors or the supervisory board organization (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 4). Addison and Schnabel (2011) added that an appointment director worker needs agreement from the worker director and can be chosen from the union body worker or employees (quoted from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 4).

The role of the worker director is limited because they face a conflict of role (Bhatti 2013, 48). As council members, they are required to act for the corporation in a way that overall compared to promote interest narrow group of employees, regardless of constituency, those who are clear (Bhatti 2013, 48).

6. Worker union. Worker unions are often also known as union workers. According to Levine (1995), the goal formation union is to negotiate together as a tool to force the organization to develop

welfare programs for employees and make work good (quoted from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 4). In general, unions worker Work The same as management and assistance in related issues with subtraction compensation, restructuring, or engineering reorganization (Khalid and Nawab 2018, 4). Nam (2003) explains that they are usually interested For participate in taking decision level strategic planning to protect the rights employee in matter justice and equality in matter distribution of power (quoted from Khalid and Nawab 2018, 4).

Ugwu, Okoroji, and Chukwu (2018, 61) explain three indicators from participative decision making as follows:

1. Behavior leader refers to leadership approaches and behaviors that focus on getting things done or making their followers happy. (Goleman, 2000, cited by Ugwu et al., 2018).
2. Structure organization is defined as the formal lines of authority or decision-making that flow from top management levels to lower management levels. (Ugwu et al., 2018, 61).
3. Employee Commitment is defined as a sense of responsibility to fulfill tasks or efforts made by employees in completing work tasks (Manning & Curtis, 2009, quoted by Ugwu et al., 2018).

Satisfaction Work. Locke (1976) defines satisfaction Work as a type of pleasure or a condition growing affection in the evaluation process experience Work individual (quoted from Zhu 2013, 294). Satisfaction Work No arises suddenly, but needs an evaluation process from experience Work individual in period of time.

Satisfaction Work refers to the extent to which the work fulfil need base someone, consistent with their hopes and values, and will work with satisfying (Shah and Jumani 2015, 314). Thus, the more someone needs fulfillment, the higher the satisfaction his work. Satisfaction Work is not only about the need basic, but also related to the hopes and values held his employees.

Based on the definitions above, researchers define work satisfaction as degrees pleasure resulting from the evaluation process, the experience his work with a measure of the extent is needed foundation, hopes, and values are fulfilled.

Luthans (2005) explains a number of factor determinant satisfaction with work, namely jobs, salaries, promotions, and supervision (cited from Shah and Jumani 2015, 314).

1. Pay Satisfaction is closely related to salary (Shah and Jumani 2015, 314). According to Marginson (2003), quality education can be improved if given incentives specific to performance teaching by academics for superiority education (quoted from Shah and Jumani 2015, 314). Appropriate incentives, as expected, will push satisfaction high among the employees.
2. Work itself the researchers mention that employee satisfaction depends more on factors in the environment, compared to its characteristics, so that the atmosphere mode requires more work to be good (Tella 2007, quoted from Shah and Jumani 2015, 315). Employees value place friendly work or responsive (Masum, Azad, and Beh 2015, 5). Characteristics: good job No will give satisfaction, high work, without supported by factor good environment too.
3. Promotion when someone receives a true update, which is often a real assessment and gets a kan a kind of confession, then job satisfaction is also felt (Shah and Jumani 2015, 315). Luthans (2005) explains that this also strengthens workers' perceptions of the excellence of their work and increases job satisfaction and organizational commitment (cited from Shah and Jumani 2015, 315).
4. According to Koh and Neo (2000), supervision is an important element in the payment and reward system, and conducting effective supervision is a key element in this type of performance system and job satisfaction in the form of security for employees (quoted from Shah and Jumani 2015, 315). In this case, supervisors must be able to carry out their duties and responsibilities well and correctly, so as to instill trust from their subordinates.



Adversity Quotient. Adversity quotient is a person's intelligence in facing obstacles or difficulties regularly (Runtu, Aldrin, and Merdiaty 2019, 99). According to Ablaña et al. (2016), a diversity quotient helps individuals strengthen their abilities and perseverance in facing the challenges of everyday life. (quoted from Runtu, Aldrin, and Merdiaty 2019, 99). A diversity quotient shows how much Good somebody endures in difficulties and is able to rise above it (Parvathy and Praseeda 2014, 23). People who successfully implement a diversity quotient performance optimal in facing setbacks and challenges faced every day (Nikam and Uplane 2013, 303). Based on a number of definition above, researchers define diversity quotient as the form of intelligence that someone who looks at how much big himself capable face difficulty or challenges in life daily with still showing optimal performance.

Stoltz (2000) divides diversity quotient into four dimensions, namely control, origin ownership, reach, and endurance, which is shortened to CO 2 RE (cited from Runtu, Aldrin, and Merdiaty 2019, 99). More carry on. A gain explained by Runtu, Aldrin, and Merdiaty (2019, 99), as follows:

1. Control is the ability individual to influence a situation positively and to control responses to the situation.
2. Origin of Ownership Dimensions This show ability individual to put feelings for himself and the courage to bear consequences from conditions, so that he can repair problems that occur.
3. Reach is the ability of an individual to avoid reaching limit problems so as not to affect other areas of an individual's life.
4. Endurance Dimensions final. This showability individual for perceive difficulties and strengths. To face difficulty the with, create ideas in solution problem so that stubbornness heart and the courage to solve problems can be realized.

Framework of Thinking. Satisfaction with work is a very important thing. Attention in the world of work, including the world of education, especially for teachers. Satisfaction with this teacher's work can influence various factors, such as salary, work environment, promotion, supervision, and so on.

Motivation is the process of initiating, directing and maintaining behavior to achieve an objective. Certain factors that are influenced by the system include awards, culture, organization, design work, management process, performance and allocation of power. A teacher's motivation can come from within the teacher or from outside. Factors that drive a teacher's motivation can include the drive to obtain material or non-material goods, the drive to be emotionally attached, the drive to contribute to one's understanding, and the drive to create justice through the expression of ideas and opinions.

Teacher participation is the opportunity given to teachers to be involved in discussing issues concerning their work and to influence managerial decisions, which consists of direct participation, delegative participation, consultative participation, indirect participation, worker directors, and trade unions.

Adversity quotient is a person's intelligence in facing challenges or difficulties, which includes control over the situation at hand, the ability to put one's feelings in perspective, and the courage to take responsibility and improve the situation. A teacher's adversity quotient can determine how far the teacher can survive and overcome obstacles or challenges in daily work. Participation is high, employee push satisfaction is high workload is too. It has been proven by research that has been mentioned previously. Teachers who have high participation can experience high satisfaction high workload. However, the obstacles and challenges faced at work daily can influence his participation

and finally impact on satisfaction with work. Therefore, a teacher needs a good adversity quotient to face problems at work every day and still participate optimally.

Based on the exposure above, motivation and participation relate to work satisfaction, and the adversity quotient influence connection between participation and work satisfaction. Even if it is possible that, with the old learning model, students get better results. Good.

METHODS

Study This implemented in schools in Indonesia with subject of teachers and staff in the year 2021/2022 academic year through three stage, namely planning (December 2021-January 2022) which includes preparation of proposals and instruments, implementation (February - April 2022) in the form of data collection, as well as completion (April-May 2022) which includes data analysis and compilation report. Research objectives are descriptive, namely describe in a systematic and accurate way the phenomenon being studied without comparing variables, but in implementation, use a correlational method with a quantitative approach to test the connection between variables.

Variables studied consist of two variables free, that is, motivation and participative decision making, one variable bound, that is, satisfaction with work and one variable moderation, namely the adversity quotient. A population study of teachers and staff in schools in Indonesia, with a technique taking convenience sampling through the distribution online questionnaire, so that obtained 101 respondents.

Data collection was carried out use questionnaire Likert scale, which includes 45 items with system evaluation different for positive and negative items, as well as equipped with semi-structured interviews for deepen information. Data analysis using statistics inferential through analysis of correlation and multiple linear regression to test relationships and influences between variables. Before analysis, assumption testing is carried out, such as normality, linearity, homogeneity, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity, to ensure model feasibility and the accuracy of the results of the study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Distribution employees who fill in a questionnaire based on type, gender, characteristics, age, education level, and working period.

1. Discriminant Validity. Testing discriminant validity for every variable studied using Pearson correlation analysis. Test results of discriminant validity for the variables motivation, participative decision making, adversity quotient, and satisfaction. Work using SPSS shows that all questions from each variable own mark correlation above 0.25, which means all question Still own sufficient correlation, strong, to very strong. Thus, all questions contained in the questionnaire can be categorized as valid questions.
2. Convergent Validity. Testing convergent validity for every variable study done with the use of the analysis of average variance extracted. Test results convergent validity for variables motivation, participative decision making, adversity quotient, and satisfaction work done with using SPSS and MS Excel shows that all question from variables motivation, participative decision makin, adversity quotient, and satisfaction Work consecutive are 0.67, 0.59, 0.59, and 0.63 which means all variables the own mark correlation above 0.5 then all variables study can said to be valid.
3. Reliability. Testing reliability for every variable study done with using SPSS. Cronbach's alpha value for variables motivation shows the number 0.899 means that, overall variables motivation is reliable.



Table 1. Reliability Motivation

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Motivation1.1	69.18	75,348	.712	.888
Motivation 1.2	68.98	77,280	.622	.891
Motivation 1.3	68.97	76,909	.613	.892
Motivation 1.4	69.08	76,294	.616	.891
Motivation 1.5	69.48	79,092	.313	.903
Motivation 2.1	69.00	81,380	.346	.899
Motivation 2.2	68.39	83,939	.288	.900
Motivation 2.3	68.37	83,174	.380	.898
Motivation 2.4	69.39	76,839	.410	.900
Motivation 3.1	68.99	79,430	.451	.896
Motivation 3.2	68.85	79,528	.466	.896
Motivation 3.3	68.80	78,960	.575	.893
Motivation 3.4	68.84	78,935	.572	.893
Motivation 4.1	69.50	73,252	.710	.888
Motivation 4.2	69.43	73,267	.682	.889
Motivation 4.3	69.54	72,830	.732	.887
Motivation 4.4	69.56	73,748	.705	.888
Motivation 4.5	69.51	73,652	.683	.889

From the table above can be seen that with a use threshold of 0.3, researchers removed question motivation 2.2 because still below 0.3. After question motivation 2.2 was removed, researchers return test the reliability of motivation variables, and the results show that all questions on motivation variables are reliable variables. Because all questions show a mark, the correlation is above 0.3. The overall reliability value also increased to 0.9 after the removal of the motivation question 2.2. The following are the results of the reliability test of the motivation variable after the removal of motivation question 2.2.

Table 2. Reliability Motivation After Elimination

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Motivation1.1	64.40	73,082	.716	.889
Motivation 1.2	64.20	75,080	.619	.892
Motivation 1.3	64.19	74,694	.611	.892
Motivation 1.4	64.30	74,051	.617	.892
Motivation 1.5	64.69	76,875	.310	.904
Motivation 2.1	64.22	79,092	.345	.900
Motivation 2.3	63.58	81,065	.352	.900
Motivation 2.4	64.60	74,542	.413	.901
Motivation 3.1	64.21	77,126	.453	.897
Motivation 3.2	64.07	77,345	.459	.897
Motivation 3.3	64.02	76,780	.568	.894
Motivation 3.4	64.06	76,776	.562	.894





Motivation 4.1	64.72	71,022	.713	.888
Motivation 4.2	64.64	70,992	.688	.889
Motivation 4.3	64.76	70,603	.735	.887
Motivation 4.4	64.78	71,412	.715	.888
Motivation 4.5	64.73	71,418	.686	.889

Further testing of reliability was done to variables of participative decision making. Cronbach's alpha value for variables participative decision making shows the number 0.895, which means that, overall variable participative decision making is reliable.

Table 3. Reliability participative decision making

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Participative Decision Making 1.1	65.62	71,077	.654	.886
Participative Decision Making 1.2	65.37	73,934	.611	.888
Participative Decision Making 1.3	65.78	70,052	.650	.885
Participative Decision Making 1.4	65.57	71,787	.716	.884
Participative Decision Making 1.5	65.75	70,828	.521	.891
Participative Decision Making 1.6	65.95	68,788	.669	.885
Participative Decision Making 1.7	65.85	69,968	.678	.884
Participative Decision Making 2.1	65.40	73,082	.652	.887
Participative Decision Making 2.2	65.71	71,507	.592	.888
Participative Decision Making 2.3	65.82	69,228	.729	.882
Participative Decision Making 2.4	65.70	73,591	.508	.891
Participative Decision Making 2.5	65.65	72,989	.567	.889
Participative Decision Making 3.1	64.97	77,289	.421	.893
Participative Decision Making 3.2	65.39	77,159	.203	.902
Participative Decision Making 3.3	65.37	73,734	.614	.888
Participative Decision Making 3.4	65.21	78,126	.121	.906
Participative Decision Making 3.5	65.50	71,372	.641	.886

From the table above can be seen that with a use threshold of 0.3,0.3, researchers removed question participative decision making 3.2 and 3.4 because still below 0.3. After question participatory decision making 3.2 and 3.4 were removed, researchers return test the reliability of the variables participative decision making, and its results show that all questions on the variables participative decision making are reliable variables Because all questions show a mark correlation above 0.3. Reliability value in a way overall also increased to 0.914 after questions Participative decision making 3.2 and 3.4 were deleted. The following is results of testing reliability variables for participative decision making. Question. Question 3.2 and 3.4 have been deleted.

Table 4. Reliability participative decision making after elimination

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
--	----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------



Participative Decision Making 1.1	56.89	63,718	.659	.907
Participative Decision Making 1.2	56.63	66,294	.631	.908
Participative Decision Making 1.3	57.05	62,408	.678	.906
Participative Decision Making 1.4	56.84	64,295	.731	.905
Participative Decision Making 1.5	57.02	64,240	.477	.915
Participative Decision Making 1.6	57.22	61,232	.694	.905
Participative Decision Making 1.7	57.12	62,346	.706	.905
Participative Decision Making 2.1	56.66	65,866	.636	.908
Participative Decision Making 2.2	56.98	63,920	.612	.908
Participative Decision Making 2.3	57.09	61,742	.750	.903
Participative Decision Making 2.4	56.97	66,189	.506	.912
Participative Decision Making 2.5	56.92	65,654	.562	.910
Participative Decision Making 3.1	56.24	69,963	.389	.914
Participative Decision Making 3.3	56.63	66,334	.612	.909
Participative Decision Making 3.5	56.76	64,023	.645	.907

Next, the researcher test reliability of the adversity quotient. Cronbach's alpha value from the variable adversity quotient shows the number 0.863, which means, in a way overall variables adversity quotient is reliable.

Table 5. Reliability adversity quotient

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Adversity Quotient 1.1	63.37	72,394	.515	.855
Adversity Quotient 1.2	63.40	71,022	.571	.853
Adversity Quotient 1.3	63.77	68,638	.505	.855
Adversity Quotient 1.4	63.68	71,379	.401	.859
Adversity Quotient 2.1	63.36	73,152	.291	.864
Adversity Quotient 2.2	63.14	72,401	.485	.856
Adversity Quotient 2.3	63.59	75,404	.101	.876
Adversity Quotient 2.4	63.32	72,319	.373	.860
Adversity Quotient 3.1	63.83	67,821	.523	.854

Adversity Quotient 3.2	63.77	67,198	.581	.851
Adversity Quotient 3.3	63.79	67,026	.620	.849
Adversity Quotient 3.4	63.79	67,166	.605	.849
Adversity Quotient 3.5	63.73	67,718	.596	.850
Adversity Quotient 4.1	63.38	72,317	.556	.855
Adversity Quotient 4.2	63.50	70,612	.604	.852
Adversity Quotient 4.3	63.60	69,822	.662	.850
Adversity Quotient 4.4	64.01	68,110	.493	.856

From the table above can be seen that with a use threshold of 0.3, researchers remove the question adversity quotient 2.1 and 2.3 because still below 0.3. After question adversity quotient 2.1 and 2.3 were removed, researchers return test the reliability of the variables adversity quotient, and their results show that all questions on the variables adversity quotient are reliable variables because all questions show a mark correlation above 0.3. Reliability value also increased overall to 0.877 after question adversity quotient 2.1 and 2.3 were deleted. The following is results of testing reliability variables, the adversity quotient after question, adversity quotient 2.1 and 2.3 are deleted.

Table 6. Reliability adversity quotient after elimination

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Adversity Quotient 1.1	55.19	63,894	.504	.871
Adversity Quotient 1.2	55.22	62,532	.568	.869
Adversity Quotient 1.3	55.59	60,384	.495	.872
Adversity Quotient 1.4	55.50	62,792	.402	.875
Adversity Quotient 2.2	54.96	64,178	.448	.873
Adversity Quotient 2.4	55.14	64,161	.338	.878
Adversity Quotient 3.1	55.65	58,929	.557	.869
Adversity Quotient 3.2	55.59	58,444	.610	.866
Adversity Quotient 3.3	55.61	58,259	.653	.863
Adversity Quotient 3.4	55.61	58,559	.625	.865
Adversity Quotient 3.5	55.55	58,830	.634	.864
Adversity Quotient 4.1	55.20	63,920	.534	.871
Adversity Quotient 4.2	55.32	62,159	.599	.867
Adversity Quotient 4.3	55.43	61,467	.653	.865
Adversity Quotient 4.4	55.83	59,961	.479	.873

Testing the final reliability of the variables' satisfaction with work. Cronbach's alpha value for variables satisfaction Work shows the number 0.920, which means that, overall variable satisfaction Work is stated to be reliable.

Table 7. Reliability Satisfaction Work

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Satisfaction Work 1.1	65.35	106,709	.701	.913
Satisfaction Work 1.2	65.25	114,928	.364	.920
Satisfaction Work 1.3	65.48	108,532	.612	.915

Satisfaction Work 1.4	65.66	108,386	.644	.914
Satisfaction Work 1.5	65.59	108,604	.672	.914
Satisfaction Work 2.1	65.58	106,745	.635	.914
Satisfaction Work 2.2	65.93	107,465	.564	.916
Satisfaction Work 2.3	65.75	109,488	.527	.917
Satisfaction Work 2.4	66.15	106,068	.548	.917
Satisfaction Work 3.1	65.58	103,605	.721	.912
Satisfaction Work 3.2	65.36	107,592	.630	.914
Satisfaction Work 3.3	65.26	109,933	.557	.916
Satisfaction Work 3.4	65.75	107,728	.509	.918
Satisfaction Work 3.5	64.93	113,685	.452	.918
Satisfaction Work 4.1	65.44	107,928	.683	.913
Satisfaction Work 4.2	65.86	106,161	.592	.916
Satisfaction Work 4.3	65.52	107,212	.707	.913
Satisfaction Work 4.4	65.46	107,650	.701	.913

From the table above can be seen that with a use threshold of 0.3, all questions for the variables satisfaction Work can be stated as reliable questions.

Multicollinearity test. Researchers also conducted a multicollinearity test to see mark tolerance and VIF.

Table 10. Multicollinearity test with tolerance and VIF values

Model	Coefficients ^a				Collinearity Statistics		
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
1 (Constant)	1,137	5,225		.218	.828		
Total Motivation	.109	.114	.091	.953	.343	.342	2,921
Total Participative Decision Making	.954	.117	.745	8,171	.000	.374	2,674
Total Adversity Quotient	.046	.088	.035	.521	.603	.701	1,426

a. Dependent Variable: Total Satisfaction with Work

An output table produced from data processing with SPSS, the tolerance value for the motivation variable, participative, was obtained. decision-making, and adversity. The quotients are 0.342, 0.374, and 0.701, respectively. VIF values for variables motivation, participative decision-making, and adversity quotient are 2,921, 2,674, and 1,426, respectively. Referring to the basis of taking the multicollinearity test decision, where the value tolerance must be more than 0.1, and the VIF value must be more small out of 10 to show no occurrence of multicollinearity in the regression model, it can be stated that no multicollinearity occurs in the regression models studied.

Analysis of Descriptive Variables Study.

1. Variables Motivation. Researchers do descriptive analysis of the motivation variables. Appropriate with the indicator variables motivation listed in the DKDO table, there are 4 indicators used to measure motivation variables, namely reward systems, organizational culture, job design, and performance-management and resource-allocation processes. Following is a table that presents the results analysis of each indicator on the motivation variables.



Table 11. Analysis Descriptive Motivation

Indicator	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Reward System 1	1	5	3.99	.831
Reward System 2	2	5	4.19	.771
Reward System 3	2	5	4.20	.813
Reward System 4	2	5	4.09	.861
Reward System 5	1	5	3.69	1,084
Organizational Culture 1	2	5	4.17	.708
Organizational Culture 2	3	5	4.80	.425
Organizational Culture 3	1	5	3.78	1,137
Job Design 1	1	5	4.18	.780
Job Design 2	1	5	4.32	.747
Job Design 3	2	5	4.37	.674
Job Design 4	2	5	4.33	.680
Performance-Management and Resource-Allocation Processes 1	1	5	3.66	.993
Performance-Management and Resource-Allocation Processes 2	1	5	3.74	1,026
Performance-Management and Resource-Allocation Processes 3	1	5	3.62	.999
Performance-Management and Resource-Allocation Processes 4	1	5	3.60	.960
Performance-Management and Resource-Allocation Processes 5	1	5	3.65	.994

The descriptive data analysis table above shows that the highest average score was found for organizational culture indicator 2, with a mean of 4.80. It indicates that many teachers and staff agree that teamwork is important. The minimum score of 3 for the same indicator indicates that no teachers or staff disagreed with the importance of teamwork.

2. Variables Participative Decision Making. Analysis the next descriptive analysis on the variables of participative decision making. The following is a table that presents descriptive results analysis from each indicator on the variables of participative decision making.

Table 12. Analysis Descriptive Participative Decision Making

Indicator	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Leader Behavior 1	1	5	4.04	.871
Leader Behavior 2	2	5	4.30	.671
Leader Behavior 3	1	5	3.88	.962
Leader Behavior 4	2	5	4.09	.750
Leader Behavior 5	1	5	3.91	1,078
Leader Behavior 6	1	5	3.71	1,042
Leader Behavior 7	1	5	3.81	.935
Organizational Structure 1	2	5	4.27	.706
Organizational Structure 2	1	5	3.95	.910
Organizational Structure 3	1	5	3.84	.935





Organizational Structure 4	2	5	3.96	.824
Organizational Structure 5	2	5	4.01	.806
Employee Commitment 1	3	5	4.69	.524
Employee Commitment 2	2	5	4.30	.686
Employee Commitment 3	1	5	4.17	.861

From the table analysis, descriptive data above show that the highest average value is found on the indicator employee commitment 1, with a mean of 4.69. It shows that many teachers and staff stated that himself committed to their work. The minimum value of 3 found in the same indicator shows that there is neither a single teacher nor staff member who is not committed to their job.

3. Variables Adversity Quotient. Researchers also analyzed the adversity quotient variable. The following is a table that presents the results analysis of each indicator on the variables' adversity quotient.

Table 13. Analysis Descriptive Adversity Quotient

Indicator	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control 1	2	5	4.20	.664
Control 2	2	5	4.17	.736
Control 3	1	5	3.79	1,061
Control 4	1	5	3.88	.941
Origin Ownership 1	2	5	4.43	.698
Origin Ownership 2	1	5	4.25	.876
Reach 1	1	5	3.73	1,113
Reach 2	1	5	3.79	1,080
Reach 3	1	5	3.77	1,038
Reach 4	1	5	3.77	1,048
Reach 5	1	5	3.83	1,011
Endurance 1	3	5	4.19	.628
Endurance 2	2	5	4.07	.738
Endurance 3	2	5	3.96	.747
Endurance 4	1	5	3.55	1,136

From the table analysis, descriptive data above show that the highest average value is found on the indicator origin ownership 1 with mark mean of 4.43. It shows that many teachers and staff are improving previous error done as a response to criticism received. The minimum value of 2 was found on the same indicator show that there is possible teacher or staff the consider that not every criticism must be accepted as necessary errors to be repaired.

4. Variables Satisfaction Work. Analysis the last descriptive statistics done to adversity quotient variable. The following is a table that presents the results analysis of each indicator on the variables' adversity quotient.

Table 14. Analysis of Descriptive Job Satisfaction

Indicator	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Work itself 1	1	5	4.06	.915
Work itself 2	2	5	4.16	.689
Work itself 3	1	5	3.93	.897



Work itself 4	1	5	3.74	.868
Work itself 5	1	5	3.81	.821
Pay 1	1	5	3.82	.994
Pay 2	1	5	3.48	1,045
Pay 3	1	5	3.65	.943
Pay 4	1	5	3.26	1,180
Promotion 1	1	5	3.82	1,090
Promotion 2	1	5	4.05	.942
Promotion 3	1	5	4.15	.865
Promotion 4	1	5	3.65	1,117
Promotion 5	3	5	4.48	.687
Supervision 1	1	5	3.97	.854
Supervision 2	1	5	3.54	1,100
Supervision 3	1	5	3.88	.875
Supervision 4	1	5	3.95	.853

From the table analysis, descriptive data above show that the highest average value is found on the indicator promotion 5, with a mean mark of 4.48. It shows that many teachers and staff feel that the holidays given impact positive for himself. The minimum value of 3 found on the same indicator shows that there is neither a single teacher nor staff member who feels that the holidays have had a positive for himself.

Hypothesis Testing. The next stage for researchers is to test the hypothesis.

Table 15. Correlation variables: dependent and independent

		Correlations			
		Total Satisfaction Work	Total Motivation	Total Participative Decision Making	Total PDM* Total AQ
Pearson Correlation	Total Satisfaction Work	1,000	.697	.833	.741
Pearson Correlation	Total Motivation	.697	1,000	.789	.777
Pearson Correlation	Total Participative Decision Making	.833	.789	1,000	.860
Pearson Correlation	Total PDM* Total AQ	.741	.777	.860	1,000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Total Satisfaction Work	.	.000	.000	.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Total Motivation	.000	.	.000	.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Total Participative Decision Making	.000	.000	.	.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Total PDM* Total AQ	.000	.000	.000	.
N	Total Satisfaction Work	101	101	101	101
N	Total Motivation	101	101	101	101
N	Total Participative Decision Making	101	101	101	101
N	Total PDM* Total AQ	101	101	101	101



Based on the data shown in the table above, there is a strong correlation between motivation and satisfaction, amounting to 0.697. Participative decision making show very strong correlation to satisfaction with work of 0.833. Thus, H1 and H2 from the study are accepted. Adversity quotient as a moderating variables connection between participative decision making and satisfaction with work also shows a very strong correlation of 0.741.

Table 16. MMR Output
Model Summary ^c

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R-Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.835 ^a	.698	.692	6.102	.698	113,173	2	98	.000
2	.836 ^b	.699	.689	6.124	.001	.301	1	97	.584

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Participative Decision Making, Total Motivation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total Participative Decision Making, Total Motivation, Total PDM* Total AQ

c. Dependent Variable: Total Satisfaction with Work

Next, the researcher test adversity quotient as variables moderation with the use of MMR analysis in SPSS. The table above shows an increase in the R-squared value from 0.698 to 0.699. This 0.001 change in R-squared indicates that H3 is also accepted.

CONCLUSION

Based on results analysis statistics using SPSS, research This conclude that motivation own connection positive with satisfaction with work among teachers and staff, showing that level more motivation tall associated with improvement satisfaction Work. Likewise, the participatory retrieval decision found a positive connection with work satisfaction, showing that greater involvement from teachers and staff in the process of taking decision contribute to the level of satisfaction more work high. Furthermore, the existence of the adversity quotient as variables moderation strengthen connection between participatory decision-making and work satisfaction implies that individuals with greater resilience and capability can face challenges more successfully and experience possible improvement in satisfaction with work when in a way active involved in the process of taking decision.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. (2015). *Quantitative Research Methods*. Sleman: Aswaja Pressindo.
- Abubakar, R. (2021). *Introduction to research methodology*. Yogyakarta: SUKA-Press UIN Sunan Kalijaga.
- Arun, K. S. (2014). "An empirical study: relationship between employee motivation, satisfaction and organizational commitment." *International Journal of Management and Business Research* 4 (2): 81-93. https://ijmbr.srbiau.ac.ir/?_action=articleInfo&article=2488
- Bhatti, K. K. (2013). "Impact of Different Types of Employee Participation on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Pakistan and the United States of America." Muhammad Ali Jinnah University. <https://www.jinnah.edu/impact-of-different-types-of->



[employee-participation-on-organizational-commitment-a-comparative-study-of-pakistan-and-united-states-of-america/](#).

- Bhatti, K. K., & Tahir, M. Q. (2007). "Impact of employee participation on work satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity." *International review of business research papers* 3(2): 54-68. Academia.edu
- Bukhari, T. A. S., Muhammad, M. S., & Muhammad. N. (2011). " The effects of psychological contract breach on various level employee outcomes: The moderating role of Islamic work ethics and adversity quotient. *African Journal of Business Management* 5(21): 8393-8398. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1026>
- Chapagai, R. R. (2011). "Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction in Nepalese commercial banks." *PYC Nepal Journal of Management* 4(1):39-51. Academia.edu <https://doi.org/10.3126/pycnjm.v4i1.81515>
- Irawanto, D. W. (2015). "Employee participation in decision-making: Evidence from a state-owned enterprise in Indonesia." *Management-Journal of Contemporary Management Issues* 20(1): 159-172.
- Khalid, K., Hanisah, M. S., & Siew-Phaik, L. (2011). "The impact of rewards and motivation on job satisfaction in the water utility industry." *International Conference on Financial Management and Economics* 11(2): 35-41. <http://www.ipedr.com/vol11/7-R00013.pdf>
- Khalid, K., & Samina, N. (2018). "Employee participation and employee retention in view of compensation." <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244018810067>
- Masum, A. K., Md. Abul, A., & Loo-See, B. (2015). "Determinants of Academics' Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Private Universities in Bangladesh." *PLOS ONE* 10(2): e0117834. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117834>.
- Muhson, A. (2006). Quantitative analysis techniques. "Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University. [http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/lain-lain/ali-muhson-spd-mpd/Ali%20Muhson%20\(2006\)%20Analisis%20Kuantitatif.pdf](http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/lain-lain/ali-muhson-spd-mpd/Ali%20Muhson%20(2006)%20Analisis%20Kuantitatif.pdf)
- Nikam, V. B., & Megha, U. (2013). "Adversity Quotient and Defense Mechanism of Secondary School Students." *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 1(4): 303-308. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2013.010405>
- Ningsih, J. (2013). " Relationship between the adversity quotient and satisfaction with work among employees of PT. Bina Insan Sukses Mandiri." *Motivation* 1(1): 144-152. <http://ejurnal.untag-smd.ac.id/index.php/MTV/article/view/249/375>
- Nohria, N., Boris, G., & Linda-Eling, L. (2008). "Employee motivation". *Harvard business review* 86 (7/8): 78-84. http://www.ippn.ie/images/stories/EndaMcNulty_EmpolyeeMotivationAPowerfulNewModel.pdf?_cf_chl_tk=eQ8XEsiG_SsU0LaJLQuKGqhoTq4eYS3wsQOzbQ7o_A-1640587235-0-gaNycGzNA5E
- Noor, J. (2013). *Management Science Research*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Paramanandam, P., & Shwetha. (2013). "Adversity quotient (AQ) as a predictor of job satisfaction." *International Journal on Global Business Management & Research* 1(2): 27 -37.
- Parvathy, U., & Praseeda M. (2014). "Relationship between Adversity Quotient and Academic Problems among Student Teachers." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19(11): 23-26. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-191172326>

- Perić, G., Marko, G., & Vladan, I. (2015). "Research on employee motivation in the spa tourist centers in Serbia." *Proceedings of the Faculty of Economics in East Sarajevo* 10: 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.7251/ZREFIS1510065P>
- Prajitno, S. B. (2013). "Quantitative research methodology." *Journal. Bandung: UIN Sunan Gunung Djati*. <http://komunikasi.uinsgd.ac.id>
- Rahayu, N. (2017). "The Influence knowledge taxation, firmness sanctions, taxes, and tax amnesty for compliance must be taxes." *Dewantara Accounting* 1(1): 15-30. <https://journal.ustjogja.ac.id/index.php/akuntansidewantara/article/view/21/170>
- Risambessy, A. (2012). "The influence of transformational leadership style, motivation, burnout, towards job satisfaction and employee performance." *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research* 2 (9): 8833-8842. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1086.3961&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Roos, W., & René, V. E. (2008). "The Relationship between Employee Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Corporate Culture." *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 34(1): 54-63. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v34i1.420>
- Runtu, D, Neil, A., & Netty, M. (2019). "Effect of Work Ethics on Job Performance with Adversity Quotient as a Mediator." *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* 8(5): 98-103. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v8i5.457>
- Ryan, R. M., & Edward, L. D. (2000). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions." *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25(1): 54-67. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Shah, N. H., & Nabi, B. J. (2015). "Relationship of job satisfaction and turnover intention of private secondary school teachers." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 6(4): 313-323. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p313>
- Siyoto, S, & Ali, S. (2015). *Methodological Basis Research*. Sleman: Media Literacy Publishing.
- Song, Jung-Hee, & Hae-Young, W. (2015). "A study on AQ (adversity quotient), job satisfaction and turnover intention according to work units of clinical nursing staff in Korea." *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* 8(S8): 74-78. <https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2015/v8iS8/71503>
- Sofijanovna, E., & Zabijakin-Chatleska, V. (2013). "Employee involvement and organizational performance: Evidence from the manufacturing sector in the Republic of Macedonia." *Thracian Journal of Sciences* 11(S1): 31-36. <http://www.uni-sz.bg/>
- Ugwu, K. E., Okoroji, L. I, & Chukwu, E. O. (2018). "Participative decision making and employee performance in the hospitality industry: A study of selected hotels in Owerri Metropolis, Imo State." *Management Studies and Economic Systems* 4(1): 57-70. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0053651>
- Uyanık, G. K., & Neşe, G. (2013). "A study on multiple linear regression analysis." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 106: 234-240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.027>
- Zhu, Y. (2013). "A review of job satisfaction." *Asian Social Science* 9(1): 293-298. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n1p293>