

Organizational Support, Participation in Organizational Decision-Making, Organizational Politics, and Perceived Social Status among Faculty Members: The Mediating Effects of Status Seeking Styles

Hamid Khanipour^{1*}, Elham Fathi²

1. Institute of Educational, Psychological, and Social Research, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran
2. Department of Counseling, Hazrat-e Masoumeh University, Qom, Iran

(Received: September 25, 2019; Revised: April 8, 2020; Accepted: May 6, 2020)

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine a psychosocial model of predicting perceived social status among faculty members. To this end, 135 faculty members in one of the state universities in Tehran, Iran, were recruited through convenient sampling. We used Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS), Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS), Participation in Organizational Decisions Making Scale (PODMS), and Dominance and Prestige Scale (DPS) to collect data. Findings showed that 40% of participants believed that social status of academic careers has decreased in Iran since they have entered into their jobs. Perceived organizational support, perceived organizational politics, and participation in decision-making were associated with perceived social status directly and indirectly by the mediating role of prestige-based status-seeking style. The link between perceived organizational politics and perceived social status were negative, but there were positive associations between other factors in model and perceived social status. Then, we might conclude that perceived social status is determined by the quality of organizational support, political atmosphere in organization, participation in organizational decision-making, and prestige-based status-seeking styles. Faculty members with prestige-based status-seeking style had better feelings toward their job as a high social status job, which may facilitate their self-actualization.

Keywords

Social status, Perceived organizational support, Perceived organizational politics, Management.

* Corresponding Author, Email: h.khanipour@khu.ac.ir

Introduction

Social status is regarded as one of the main dimensions of faculty members' professional life in university and society. Social status is a multidimensional phenomenon consisted of sociological and psychological aspects (Bourdieu, 1988; Giddens, 1991; Sidanius, Pratto, Van Laar, & Levin, 2004; Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013). Everyone needs recognition and respect from self and others. This need, that is called the need for social status or the need for esteem, is mentioned in some theories of personality that are based on needs (Maslow, 1948). Social status is important for faculty members, because their social roles are related to authority and if authority is ruined or endangered, some kinds of status-role conflict arises, such as underachievement in academic work or unethical academic behaviors, especially in research domains.

Universities in Iran have faced new challenges in recent years such as pressure to increase research publications, and socio-economic problems. It seems that these social and economic issues have had negative impacts on the social status of faculty members. On the one hand, faculty members have experienced lower social status, and on the other hand, there has been a competitive atmosphere to reach higher status that might activate pathological status seeking strategies such as plagiarism in scientific works (Butler, 2009). Previous studies indirectly explored the negative influence factors related to social status (e.g. class position) on discomfort and frustration among faculty members through direct and indirect stigmatization (Lee, 2017; Haney, 2015). Furthermore, social class that consists of PSS is recognized as a shaping factor in how faculty members try to research, or the ways they teach to students and how they act as a role model for their students (Francis, 2018). Therefore, it seems that social status can be regarded as an important process that has a role in the social class and the scientific activities of the faculty members. Also, social status – as one aspect of social class in studies on the faculty members of developed countries – has been regarded as one of the possible sources of social inequality and social closure that hinder people from any social class to achieve power and prestige (Blome, Möller, & Böning, 2019). However, in developing countries, social status is

considered as a prerequisite for professional development or is one of the factors related to role stress and role conflict (Eshraghi, 2017; Ahmady, Changiz, Masiello, & Brommels, 2007). Gaining social status among faculty members in Iran is influenced by some problems such as pressure to publish as many articles as possible, promotion policies that are not related to talent, skills or knowledge, and problems related to low salaries (Arani, Kakia, & Malek, 2017). These special problems might produce a condition for gaining social status for faculty members that is qualitatively different from the conditions experienced by faculty members in other countries. Therefore, understanding the process and mechanism of social status can produce new insights about how social context can influence the social life of faculty members.

The Perceived Social Status (PSS) has been studied in some domains of psychological studies. For example, research on social identity and self-related process (Tajfel & Turner, 2004), adolescents' peer relationships (Parkhurst & Hopmeyer, 1998), organizational identification and social hierarchy (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Fouad & Brown, 2000; Thompson & Subich, 2007; Anderson & Kennedy, 2012) are the main fields in which PSS has been studied. Research about social status includes three aspects: (1) antecedents of social status, (2) dimensions of social status, and (3) consequences of social status (Cheng & Tracy, 2014). It seems that the theoretical backgrounds of antecedents of PSS in organizational settings are more concerned with organizational identification and social hierarchy process (Anderson & Kennedy, 2012). Reviewing the models related to antecedents of PSS reveals that many of these studies pay more attention to the personality and self-related processes (Anderson & Kennedy, 2012, Cheng et al., 2013), but the role of social factors and the interaction between social and individual factors have not been considered in previous studies.

As mentioned in the previous lines, sociological and psychological reasons lie behind defining and explaining social status as a psychosocial phenomenon in general (Tajfel, 1982; Bourdieu, 1988; Giddens, 1991; Cheng et al., 2013). Although the role of social status is investigated as a very robust factor in career decision-making and career development (Thompson & Subich, 2006; Thompson &

Dahling, 2012), the information about antecedents of PSS in occupations such as university faculty members is scant. A psychosocial model like the one proposed in this study can help better identify the contributing process of PSS and apply this kind of knowledge to enhance PSS among faculty members. Therefore, according to these theoretical underpinnings, we proposed a conceptual model for explaining PSS based on Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Participation in Organizational Decision-making (POD), Perceived Organizational Politics (POP) and status seeking strategies (i.e., dominance and prestige). We hypothesized that these factors interact with each other and can predict PSS. Furthermore, prestige and dominance seeking strategies might be mediating factors for the effects of organizational, managerial, and political factors on the PSS. In sum, some distinctive features of a psychosocial model that are considered in this study could be summarized as follows. First, previous theories about social status have focused more on the individual factors as antecedents of PSS, but in this study, we tried to combine individual and social factors in the proposed model. Second, the findings of this model (as of our best knowledge) form the first psychosocial model of PSS in faculty members, at least in Iran. Third, the findings of this study could be regarded as an investigation of prestige-dominance model (Cheng et al., 2010), social dominance theory (Sidanius, 1993) organizational identification model (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004) in a population (i.e. faculty members) that has not been studied in previous works. Some previous studies have examined dominance-prestige model and social dominance theory (Sidanius, 1993) among children and lay people (Sijtsema, Veenstra, Lindenberg, & Salmivalli, 2009; Von Rueden, Gurven, & Kaplan, 2010). However, the role of these strategies has not been investigated in organizational setting, especially among faculty members of university.

Literature Review

Analyzing the literature about social status showed two main strands. In one line of studies, social status has been considered as something that is given to individuals by the group and in other line, it is

regarded as something that is taken by the individual (Anderson & Kennedy, 2012). But it seems that the perception of social status by every individual is the function of his or her personality characteristic (Cheng et al., 2013; Redhead, Cheng, Driver, Foulsham, & O'Gorman, 2018) and his/ her group characteristics, including social support, political atmosphere, managerial style, and cooperation in the social context or in his or her job (Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Frey, Relyea, & Beu, 2006; Potipiroon & Ford, 2019; Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2017). We assume that a psychosocial model that considers both the social factor in university and a personality process such as status seeking style could better conceptualize the whole picture of perceived social status in occupations like academic works.

Management might be considered an expression of the need for social status in an evolutionary perspective (Cheng et al., 2010). It is also known that managerial styles can influence many personal and interpersonal processes in organizations, including universities (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). High commitment management is regarded as an empowering managerial style that focuses on team working and cooperative working atmosphere (Wood & De Menezes, 1998). One of the main aspects of high commitment management is to encourage employees to participate in organizational decisions-making (Bailey, Berg, & Sandy, 2001). Furthermore, Participation in Organizational Decision-making (POD) may be related to judgment about social status through organizational identification. According to the organizational identification model, employees will identify with their organization if they perceive congruence between their values and those of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004). Previous studies of participation in decision-making and organizational indices indicated that this factor could explain perceived organizational prestige (Fuller et al., 2006). When employee's perspectives are valued and acknowledged by manager, they would experience more engagement with organizational issues and might experience higher PSS (Saks, 2008; Cooper-Thomas, Xu, & Saks, 2018). Therefore, based on the existing literature, the first hypothesis can be suggested as follows:

H1: Participation in decision-making (as one component of high commitment management style) will be associated with perceived social status.

The other factor that might be related to PSS regards organizational factors such as Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Perceived Organizational Politics (POP). POS is regarded as the appraisals that employees may consider as the importance, care, or support they receive from their organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Some meta-analyses have supported the effective role of this factor in predicting some of the organizational behaviors and organizational productivities (Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Furthermore, we can infer from needs theories in psychology (Maslow 1948, Deci & Ryan, 2012) that one of the preconditions that creates status is the support and care that individuals receive from their organizational environments and the satisfaction of their primary needs. The support people get from their organization can be important to create professional or social identity (Tajfel, 1982; Ashforth & Mael 1989). It seems that faculty members, who perceive support from their university, are more likely to identify with their university and, in turn, might experience higher social status. Therefore, based on the existing literature, the second hypothesis can be suggested as follows:

H2: Perceived social support will be associated with PSS.

POP refers to the evaluation that people ascribe to the existence of hypocrisy in their colleges to receive their self-interest, even at the expense of others (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). Furthermore, social status would be influenced by the assessment of justice and fairness in the organization (Tyler & Blader, 2002). Also, POP represents the existence of a dominant group that could influence the payment and promotion practices and the amount of dictatorship in the organization atmosphere that pushes employees to conform to power authority (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991; Ferris & Kacmar 1992). Previous studies indicate the negative association between POP and job satisfaction as an important predictor of PSS (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999; Thompson & Subich, 2011). Also, the result of a study on faculty members revealed that the increase in evaluation of negative political behaviors and atmospheres leads to less

commitment to university and decreases the rate of academic citizenship behavior in university (Atta & Khan, 2016). Therefore, it might be expected that high POP can lead to lower PSS. So, based on the existing literature, the third hypothesis is presented as follows:

H3: Perceived organizational politics will be associated with PSS.

In addition, there are individual differences in the way people try to achieve social status (Cheng et al., 2010; Sidanius, 1993). Some people are more prone to use dominance-based status-seeking style. These people try to achieve status goals by intimidating others. However, other people might want to achieve these goals by prestigious behaviors (Cheng et al., 2013). People can be divided based on their preferred social status seeking strategies into dominance-based and prestige-based status seekers (Cheng et al., 2013). People with dominance-based status-seeking style may use fear and intimidation to gain status (Sidanius, 1993). This strategy is found to be associated with dark personality traits that consist of narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism (Cheng et al., 2010), whereas individuals with prestige-based status-seeking styles might earn social status through cultivating virtues and moral / prosocial behaviors. This status seeking strategy is associated with higher score in conscientiousness and agreeableness (Cheng et al., 2010). Therefore, based on the existing literature, the fourth and fifth hypotheses can be suggested as follows:

H4: Status seeking style (including prestige-based and dominance-based) will be associated with PSS.

H5: Status seeking style (including prestige-based and dominance-based) will mediate the relationship between structural factors (including POS, POP, POD) and PSS.

Method

As a correlational study, this research project recruited 135 faculty members at one of the state universities in Tehran. The total population of the faculty members of the university was 450. The participants filled out a series of self-report instruments. In addition, we explained objectives of the study, and gave consent forms to the participants before they started writing out the questionnaires. We first explained the objectives of the study and the way they can fill out the

questionnaires. In addition, we mentioned that participation in the study is voluntary and the information is blind for other faculty members or the top managers of the university. We ensured them that the data will be used for this research only, and will not affect their organizational outcomes such as their payment or promotions.

Instruments

The first instrument used in this study was the Dominance and Prestige Scale (Cheng et al., 2010). This scale has 17 items that are designed to assess the ways that people might seek social status. Dominance and prestige are two subscales of this scale. Previous studies have revealed appropriate psychometric properties (Cronbach's alpha = 0.83–0.88 and 0.80–0.85 for dominance and prestige styles, respectively) for this scale (Cheng et al., 2010). The results of conducting exploratory factor analysis in this study revealed the existence of two factors (KMO= 0.679, Bartlett coefficient= 389.09, $p < 0.001$) similar to original form of this scale.

The second instrument used in this study was the Participation in Organizational Decision-Making Scale (POD) (Steel & Mento, 1987). To assess this concept, we used five questions that were derived from a study related to organizational behavior in the organization (Steel & Mento, 1987). The scale had appropriate convergent and divergent validity in previous studies (Steel & Mento, 1987; Fuller et al., 2006).

The third instrument adapted in this study was the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). The scale consists of 31 items and 6 subscales. We used 12 questions of the Persian version of this scale from first, second, and last subscales. These items were selected based on the research goals and previous psychometric studies on this scale among Iranian population (Mokhtari, Safania, & Soltanpour-zarandi, 2019). The higher scores indicate more negative perception of organizational politics. The reliability of the original version of the scale has been 0.85 (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991).

The fourth instrument used in this study was the Perceived Organizational Support Scale (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Although the original scale consisted of 36 items, we adapted 16 items which showed more loadings in an Iranian study conducted for the validation

of this measure (Oreyzi & Golparvar 2010). The higher scores indicate better the perception of organizational support.

The last instrument applied in this study was the Perceived Social Status Scale (Porter, 1961). The need theories conceptualization of social status was chosen to define social status in this study. Porter and Lyman (1961) conceptualized and operationalized a measure for assessing basic needs such as social status. We adjusted the items for need satisfaction for faculty member's issues. This scale has been administered and examined in the previous study and has been found to have appropriate concurrent and construct validities (Schneider & Alderfer, 1973). The internal consistency of research variable is shown in Table 1.

Table1. Internal consistency of research variables

Construct	Cronbach's α
Dominance seeking style	0.73
Prestige seeking style	0.81
POD	0.89
POP	0.820
POSS	0.85
PSS	0.808

Results

Participants included 35 females (25.9 %) and 100 males (74.07 %) faculty members. Among these, 75 participants (55.6%) were assistant professors, 48 (35.55%) were associate professors, and 12 (8.88%) were professors. Forty percent of participants believed that the social status of academic work has decreased from the time when they got their jobs. Also, 45% of participants believed that the social status of academic works has not changed, while 16% of participants believed that the social status of faculty members has increased since they started to work as a faculty member. The mean score and the standard deviation of the PSS responses were 28.4 and 5.8, respectively. There were not significant differences in PSS among faculty members based on academic degrees ($\chi^2 = 3.30$, $df=2$, $p=0.192$). Zero-order correlations of variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Zero-order correlation between variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.POP	1					
2.PSS	-0.341**	1				
3.POS	-0.206**	0.188**	1			
4.Perstige style	0.114	0.255**	-0.137	1		
5.Dominance style	-0.160	0.036	-0.105	-0.205*	1	
6.POD	-0.504**	0.364**	0.159	0.151	0.043	1

Notes: POP: Perceived Organizational Politics, PSS; Perceived Social Status, POS: Perceived Organizational Support, POD= Participation in Organizational Decisions Making. $p < .05$., $p < 0.01$.

To evaluate the model, the conceptual model was tested through path analysis by AMOS software. The first indices of model revealed that the model needed to be revised ($\chi^2 / df = 44.54$, CFI=0.988, NFI =0.987, GFI=0.991, RMSEA= 0.180). Based on the feedback received from the path analysis model, we deleted non-significant paths and again evaluated the fitted model with data. Comparing the fitting indices of the revised model, it was found that these indices were changed ($\chi^2 / df = 13.24$, CFI=0.986, NFI =0.985, GFI=0.989, RMSEA= 0.095). It seems that the revised model has better fitness than first conceptual model. Beta coefficients and the significant status of direct and indirect variables' effects are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The standardized coefficients of direct and indirect paths in revised fitted model of PSS

Variable	Variable	B	S.E.	t	P
POS	→ Prestige	0.371	.023	8.630	0.001
POD	→ Prestige	0.253	.028	8.157	0.001
POP	→ Prestige	0.338	.022	7.830	0.001
POS	→ Dominance	-0.215	.026	-4.835	0.001
POP	→ Dominance	-0.188	.025	-4.247	0.001
Prestige	→ PSS	0.226	.026	9.807	0.001
POD	→ PSS	0.140	.026	5.400	0.001
Dominance	→ PSS	0.045	.023	1.940	.052
POS	→ PSS	0.394	.015	15.322	0.001

The findings of path analysis showed that this model explained 33% of the PSS variance. The results of path analysis revealed that the prestige seeking style was the main mediating factor that links other organizational, managerial, and political factors to PSS, and 11% of prestige seeking style variance can be predicted by other factors in model. However, dominance-based status-seeking style could not mediate the associations between managerial, organizational and political factors with PSS ($R^2 = 0.05\%$).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the PSS among faculty members and to examine a prediction model for PSS. Forty percent of participants stated that the social status of academic work in Iran has decreased from the time when they started their job in university. Prioritizing material values over humanistic values in people living in countries with low economic growth (Kasser, Ryan, Couchman, & Sheldon, 2004) may be related to decreasing PSS among faculty members. Recent economic problems in Iran affect some prestigious job positions like academic works. Therefore, such positions lose their status in social hierarchy of social status. People who live in low economic levels might have high regards for materialistic values (Inglehart & Abramson, 1994), and get more involved with self-esteem (Kasser & Kasser 2001). These materialistic values can lead to diminished levels of well-being and self-actualization (Kasser, 2016; Pandelaere 2016). Well-being and self-actualization have a close relationship with PSS (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015), so we can say that economic problems and the subsequent development of materialistic values may lead to the downfall of PSS among faculty members. Another factor that can lead to a reduction of social status among faculty members is that they cannot play the consistent role related to their status. According to status role conflict (Macionis, 2006), when someone cannot play appropriate roles relative to social status, he/she may be exposed to conflict that can cause unpleasant feelings.

According to the findings of this study, the relationship between POS and PSS was stronger than other factors. This finding is consistent with previous studies related to the role of organizational

support in fostering positive social identity (Marique, Stinglhamber, Desmette, Caesens, & De Zanet, 2013). Although previous studies have shown that POS is related to job commitment (Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006), findings of this study revealed that POS can influence the perception of organization's members towards their social status. This finding is consistent with propositions of needs theory in psychology (Maslow, 1948; Ryan, Deci, et al. 2008). According to this theory, fulfilling basic psychological needs and the degree that organization cares about the wellness of employees, the productivity and commitment of employees to their organizations would increase and they would develop better occupational identity (Deci & Ryan, 2012; Kurtessis et al., 2017).

Furthermore, the link between social status and POS can be explained through social identity theory in organization (Ashforth & Mael 1989). According to this theory, the faculty member's perception of their social status, like other people, is embedded with the prestige and status of their reference group or university among other universities. Therefore, if the university – as a reference group that may be used by the faculty members for defining their social status or self-concept – is unable to respond to organizational needs of the faculty members, they could not develop high social status.

In addition, we found that participation in decision-making (as one dimension of managerial factors) could predict social status. This finding is consistent with organizational identification model (Ashforth & Mael 1989; Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004) and other studies that have shown high association between this factor and the perceived positive social image of employees in the international organizations (Fuller et al., 2006). When faculty members have the opportunity to participate in decision making at university, they feel they are respected by the executives of university. This may influence faculty members' judgment about their role in the university and this process may lead to the development of positive social status among them. The results of path analysis indicated that there was an interaction between the ways of status seeking (i.e., dominance vs. prestige) and managerial factors with PSS. However, there was a positive relationship between participation in decision-making and prestige style, but there was not any significant relationship between

this managerial factor and the dominance style. People with prestige-based status-seeking styles prefer democratic managerial styles, while people with dominance-based status-seeking style may be more inclined to the top-down style of management. This finding is consistent with psychological profiles of people with dominance-based or prestige-based status-seeking styles (Cheng et al., 2010, Cheng et al., 2013).

Moreover, attitude toward organizational politics was another factor in the model. According to the model, there were negative associations between POP and PSS and prestige-based status-seeking styles, but the association between POP and dominance-based seeking style was positive. The high POP is characterized by organizations with high negative atmosphere in which employees are fearful and hostile toward each other and the whole system and try to reach higher organizational positions by conformity or destructive strategies (Ferris & Kacmar 1992). Therefore, employee in this context could not develop high social status because their reference group could not provide opportunity for this kind of cultural development. People in any social setting with high levels of organizational politics are inclined to dehumanizing relations (Vigoda, 2002). Social status in this context may be a negative fake brand that each person tries to construct for themselves through immoral ways. According to the model, there was an interaction between POP and the ways adopted by different status seeking styles. People with dominance-based strategies tend to deny the existence of political pressures in the organization, while those with prestige-based status-seeking style tend to admit the political pressures in university. This pattern of association between POP and status seeking style is consistent with the prediction of Dominance-Prestige Model of social status (Cheng et al., 2010). This kind of association between dominance-based status seeking and favoring unjust political strategies is consistent with social dominance theory (Sidanius, 1993). This theory postulates that people high on the social dominance orientation are more inclined to the right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice (Whitley Jromy, Edward. 1999). Our study extends this literature by suggesting that the methods of social status seeking would be another individual difference factor that could contribute to the perception of political atmosphere in the university.

According to the fitted model, status-seeking style was the main mechanism that links organizational, managerial, and political factors to PSS. The pattern of association between dominance and prestige with PSS showed that people with prestige-based status-seeking style had higher social status and the association between dominance-based status seeking and PSS was small and insignificant. This pattern is consistent with prestige-dominance model of social status (Cheng et al., 2010) and Bordiou's Sociological Theory (Bourdieu, 1988) about prestige as a social capital in the university. Furthermore, previous studies have indicated that the dominance-based status seeking is associated with hostile behavioral patterns and deficiency in communication skills (Cheng et al., 2014), and high score in the dark side of personality features like narcissism, cheating, and aggressiveness (Cheng et al., 2010). In contrast, prestige-based status seeking was associated with positive personality traits like agreeableness, consciousness, and self-efficacy (Cheng et al., 2010). According to the findings of this study, it could be suggested that prestige-based style of status seeking is the main factor that predicts PSS among whole factors in the model. Although it is supposed that this manner of status seeking was stable like personality traits (Cheng et al., 2010), but it seems that structural factors like the psychosocial atmosphere of the organization can facilitate or inhibit the application of some sort of status seeking than other ones. In sum, it could be argued that social status as one aspect of faculty member's identity develops if university fulfills the socioeconomic needs of faculty members, engages the faculty members in organizational decision-making, decreases political pressures, and encourages the faculty members to adopt more prestigious ways of social status seeking.

This study has some limitations. Firstly, the sample was selected from one of the state universities in Tehran. Therefore, it is better to be cautious in the generalizations. Secondly, all of the measures in this study were based on participant self-report; this may lead to bias in reaching original information. Especially in the context of social status assessment, peer-rated measures have been advised for accessing better information about social status (Kennedy, Anderson, & Moore, 2013). Thirdly, although we tried our best to carry out the sampling based on the proportion of gender and academic degrees in the

population, unfortunately we failed to sample the participants based on the gender proportion. We suggest other studies to ask university students to assess the social status of faculty members and its predictors. This method of data gathering could help know more about the social status of faculty members and to identify factors related to ascribing high social status in faculty members based on the university students' viewpoints. Furthermore, comparing PSS and its predictors cross-culturally is recommended to reach a better prospective about the interaction between culture and PSS.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide information about organizational, managerial, and personality predictors of PSS among faculty members. Using the social identity model (2004), high commitment management model (Wood & De Menezes, 1998), organizational identification model (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), dominance-prestige model (Cheng et al., 2013) and Sociological model of social status (1988), a conceptual framework is proposed for the prediction of PSS among faculty members. According to the results of this study, PSS in faculty members is influenced by POS and satisfaction from POD. Prestige is the linking mechanism that connected different organizational and managerial factors to PSS. Furthermore, people with prestige-based status-seeking style were found to have better perception of their social status than people who predominately use dominance as a social status-seeking style. Also, the results of this study revealed that people who use prestige-based status-seeking style were more likely to report negative political atmosphere in university and participate in organizational decision-making.

The results of this study revealed that the lack of satisfaction with PSS was higher than the satisfaction with PSS among faculty members. As the faculty members of universities have special needs, the decline in PSS may lead to emotional distress in faculty members, block true scientific development, or decrease the probability of moral academic life. Therefore, attempts should be made to optimize social status among faculty members by the Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology of Iran. The findings of this study suggested that PSS could be predicted by organizational support and managerial styles

that focused on the engaging the faculty members in organizational decision-making. Therefore, it seems that enhancing the wellbeing and quality of life of the faculty members, increasing academic autonomy, and allowing faculty members to participate effectively in the university decision-making could improve their attitude toward their social status. Furthermore, the results of this study showed that the PSS in people with prestige-based status-seeking style is better and higher than people who use dominance-based status-seeking style. We can conclude that if universities try to enhance POS and POD, then faculty members would use prestige-based status seeking more and subsequently experience higher PSS. Future studies could examine the role of PSS as one of the possible mechanisms that could explain job burnout, job satisfaction, and work life quality among faculty members in Iran.

References

- Ahmady, S., Changiz, T., Masiello, I., & Brommels, M. (2007). Organizational role stress among medical school faculty members in Iran: Dealing with role conflict. *BMC Medical education*, 7(14); 1-10.
- Anderson, C., & Kennedy, J. A. (2012a). Status hierarchies in teams: Micropolitics and the negotiation of rank. *Research on managing groups and teams*, 15, 49-80.
- Anderson, C., & Kennedy, J. A. (2012b). Micropolitics: A new model of status hierarchies in teams. In *Looking back, moving forward: A review of group and team-based research* (pp. 49-80). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(3), 574-601.
- Arani, A. M., Kakia, L., & Malek, M. J. (2018). Higher education research in Iran: Quantitative development and qualitative challenges. In *Researching Higher Education in Asia* (pp. 315-326). Singapore: Springer.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Atta, M., & Khan, M. J. (2016). Perceived organizational politics, organizational citizenship behavior and job attitudes among university teachers. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 26(2), 21-38.
- Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Sandy, C. (2001). The effect of high-performance work practices on employee earnings in the steel, apparel, and medical electronics and imaging industries. *ILR Review*, 54(2a), 525-543.
- Blome, F., Möller, C., & Böning, A. (2019). Open house? Class-specific career opportunities within German universities. *Social Inclusion*, 7(1), 101-110.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. New York, Stanford University Press.
- Butler, D. (2009). Plagiarism scandal grows in Iran: Investigation finds more cases of duplication in publications co-authored by ministers and senior officials. *Nature*, 462(4274), 704-706.

- Cheng, J. T., & Tracy, J. L. (2014). Toward a unified science of hierarchy: Dominance and prestige are two fundamental pathways to human social rank. In *The psychology of social status*. Springer, New York.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *104*(1), 103-125.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *31*(5), 334-347.
- Cooper-Thomas, H., Xu, J. & M. Saks, A. (2018), The differential value of resources in predicting employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *33* (4/5), 326-344. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-12-2017-0449>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 416–436). Sage Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n21>
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*, *129*(4), 569-591.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, *71*(3), 500-507.
- Eshraghi, R. (2017). Factors affecting the professional development of faculty members: A case study of Ilam Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran. *International Journal of Agricultural Management and Development*, *7*(4), 509-515.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management*, *18*(1), 93-116.
- Fouad, N. A., & Brown, M. T. (2000). The role of race and class in development: Implications for counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 379-408). New York: John Wiley
- Francis, R. D. (2018). Book Review: Working in Class: Recognizing

- How Social Class Shapes Our Academic Work. *Teaching Sociology*, 46 (3), 280-282.
- Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., Relyea, C., & Beu, D. (2006). Perceived external prestige and internal respect: New insights into the organizational identification process. *Human relations*, 59(6), 815-846.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford university press.
- Inglehart, R., & Abramson, P. R. (1994). Economic security and value change. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2), 336-354.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of organizational politics scale (POPS): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51(1), 193-205.
- Kasser, T., & Kasser, V. G. (2001). The dreams of people high and low in materialism. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22(6), 693-719.
- Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., & Sheldon, K. M. (2004). Materialistic values: Their causes and consequences. *Psychology and consumer culture: The struggle for a good life in a materialistic world*, 1(2), 11-28.
- Kasser, T. (2016). Materialistic values and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 489-514.
- Kennedy, J. A., Anderson, C., & Moore, D. A. (2013). When overconfidence is revealed to others: Testing the status-enhancement theory of overconfidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122(2), 266-279.
- Kreiner, G. E., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Evidence toward an expanded model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(1), 1-27.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854-1884.
- Lee, E. M. (2017). Where people like me don't belong: Faculty

- members from low-socioeconomic-status backgrounds. *Sociology of Education*, 90(3), 197-212.
- Macionis, J. (2006). *Society: The Basics* (8th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Marique, G., Stinglhamber, F., Desmette, D., Caesens, G., & De Zanet, F. (2013). The relationship between perceived organizational support and affective commitment: A social identity perspective. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(1), 68-100
- Maslow, A. (1948). Some theoretical consequences of basic need gratification. *Journal of personality*, 16(4), 402-416.
- Mokhtari, R., Safania, A. M., Soltanpour-zarandi, H. (2019). Investigate the relationship between inter-organizational factors and political behavior, with emphasis on the role of mediator perception of organizational politics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11(1), 119-131. (In Persian)
- Oreyzi, H. and M. Golparvar (2010). The relationship between perceived organizational support and work and organizational factors: A path analysis. *Management Research in Iran*, 15(4), 147-177. (In Persian)
- Parkhurst, J. T., & Hopmeyer, A. (1998). Sociometric popularity and peer-perceived popularity: Two distinct dimensions of peer status. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 18(2), 125-144.
- Pandelaere, M. (2016). Materialism and well-being: The role of consumption. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 10, 33-38.
- Potipiroon, W., & Ford, M. T. (2019). Relational costs of status: Can the relationship between supervisor incivility, perceived support, and follower outcomes be exacerbated? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(4), 873-896.
- Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45(1), 1-15.
- Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 20(2), 159-174.

- Redhead, D., Cheng, J. T., Driver, C., Foulsham, T., & O'Gorman, R. (2018). On the dynamics of social hierarchy: A longitudinal investigation of the rise and fall of prestige, dominance, and social rank in naturalistic task groups. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 40*(2), 222-234.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of business research, 62*(10), 1027-1030.
- Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Schneider, B., & Alderfer, CP. (1973). Three studies of measures of need satisfaction in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 18*(4), 489-505.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In W. McGuire & S. Iyengar (Eds.), *Current approaches to political psychology* (.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 845-880.
- Sijtsema, J., Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Empirical test of bullies' status goals: Assessing direct goals, aggression, and prestige. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 35*(1), 57-67.
- Steel, R. P., & Mento, A. J. (1987). The participation-performance controversy reconsidered: Subordinate competence as a mitigating factor. *Group & Organization Studies, 12*(4), 411-423.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*(1), 1-39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). *The Social identity theory of intergroup behavior*. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Key readings in social psychology. Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 276-293). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Thompson, M. N., & Subich, L. M. (2006). The relation of social status to the career decision-making process. *Journal of*

- Vocational Behavior*, 69(2), 289-301.
- Thompson, M. N., & Subich, L. M. (2007). Exploration and validation of the differential status identity scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 227-239.
- Thompson, M. N., & Dahling, J. J. (2012). Perceived social status and learning experiences in social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 351-361.
- Thompson, M. N., & Subich, L. M. (2011). Social status identity: Antecedents and vocational outcomes. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39(5), 735-763.
- Tyler, TR., & Blader, S. L. (2002). Autonomous vs. comparative status: Must we be better than others to feel good about ourselves? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 813-838.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(5), 571-584.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). Stress-related aftermaths to workplace politics: the relationships among politics, job distress, and aggressive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(5), 571-591.
- Von Rueden, C., Gurven, M., & Kaplan, H. (2010). Why do men seek status? Fitness payoffs to dominance and prestige. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 278(1715), 2223-2232. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2010.2145
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126-134.
- Wood, S., & De Menezes, L. (1998). High commitment management in the UK: Evidence from the workplace industrial relations survey, and employers' manpower and skills practices survey. *Human Relations*, 51(4), 485-515.