

Received on (11-01-2019) Accepted on (02-04-2019)

The Reality of Applying Governance at the University of Jordan: An Academician's Perspective

Main Researcher:

Dr. Msallam Fuad Abu Qattam

Second Researcher:

Dr. Mamon Salim Al Zboun

Researcher:

Dr. Saif AL Deen AL Ghammaz

University Name & City (Main)

Department of Human Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, Amman

University Name & City (sec)

Department of Education Technology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan, Amman

University Name & City (sec)

Languages Center, University of Jordan, Amman

E-mail address:

m_abuqattam@yahoo.com

The Reality of Applying Governance at the University of Jordan: An Academician's Perspective

Abstract

The aim of the current study is to identify the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan based on academicians' perspectives and to reveal the statistically significant differences according to the variables of the categorizing study. These variables namely include gender, academic rank, years of experiences, and type of faculty. To achieve these objectives, the researchers developed a questionnaire, which includes thirty-seven items distributed on four domains: accountability, transparency, participation in university decision-making, and organizational efficiency. The descriptive analytical approach was adopted. A sample of (184) male and female faculty members from the University of Jordan was randomly selected. The results of the study showed that the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan (from the study sample members' point of view) was generally medium. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of applying governance at the University of Jordan due to gender, academic rank, or years of experience. However, there were statistically significant differences in the degree of applying governance at the University of Jordan due to the variable of faculty type in the field of organizational efficiency and in favor of humanities faculties. The study concludes with a number of recommendations that could contribute to the application of governance at higher educational institutions, such as, enhancing trust between the university administration and faculty members through their participation in decision-making process and reforming and changing laws and regulations which are clear, strict, and enforceable, particularly with regard to transparency and accountability.

Keywords: Governance, Academicians.

درجة تطبيق الحوكمة في الجامعة الأردنية من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية

الملخص:

هدفت الدراسة الحالية إلى معرفة درجة تطبيق الحوكمة في الجامعة الأردنية من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية، والكشف عن الفروق ذات الدلالة الإحصائية بين متوسطات تقديرات استجابات أفراد عينة الدراسة لدرجة تطبيق الحوكمة في الجامعة الأردنية التي تُعزى لمتغيرات الدراسة (الجنس والرتبة الأكاديمية وسنوات الخبرة ونوع الكلية). ولتحقيق هذه الأهداف تم تطبيق استبانة مكونة من (37) فقرة موزعة على أربعة مجالات وهي: (المساءلة، الشفافية، المشاركة في صنع القرار، والفاعلية التنظيمية) على عينة مكونة من (184) دكتور ودكتورة من أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعة الأردنية تم اختيارهم بالطريقة العشوائية. وقد أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن واقع تطبيق الحوكمة في الجامعة الأردنية من وجهة نظر أفراد عينة الدراسة بشكل عام كانت بدرجة متوسطة. كما أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود فروق دالة إحصائية في متوسطات تقديرات أفراد عينة الدراسة في درجة تطبيق الحوكمة في الجامعة الأردنية تعزى لمتغيرات الدراسة التصنيفية وعند كافة المجالات، باستثناء مجال نوع الكلية، فقد أظهرت النتائج أن هناك فروق بين الكليات العلمية والانسانية عند مجال الفاعلية التنظيمية ولصالح الكليات الانسانية.

كلمات مفتاحية: الحوكمة، أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية.

Introduction

The institutions of higher education have witnessed a remarkable development in previous decades as they are indispensable artery in building societies and educating their members. This is confirmed by the unceasing increase in the number of public and private universities with a lot of various specializations, the numbers of students and faculty members and administrative staff, and the amount of spending on them in the light of the increasing demands of the labor market. Accordingly, the universities themselves faced challenges beyond their abilities forcing their chancellors to develop long-term administrative and educational strategies based on modern concepts. These concepts help in directing the activities of the universities to achieve their visions and missions and in aligning outputs with labor market needs, ensuring their administrative development and dissemination of knowledge, culture and cooperation.

The administrative development is one of the issues that have attracted the attention of senior officials in higher education institutions as a natural result of the universities' vital role in the human capital industry. This has led the higher education administration to shift to advanced management methods to play its role in the construction and development process. The success of university education is closely connected with the success of its management and its ability to achieve its aims in quality and excellence. This is attained by achieving high quality outputs that guarantee the progress and growth, in addition to raising its competitiveness to the highest levels. Thus, it is necessary for universities to be aware of the methods of governance, and how universities are run to achieve the required administrative development (AL-Zahrani & Maqbool 2011).

Since the late 1980s, much attention has been paid to the concept of governance. It strongly emerged in the early 1990s after the World Bank introduced the concept of Corporate Governance, which has also been used widely by specialists. The interest in the concept increased in 1997 due to the bursting of the Asian financial crisis, which was a crisis of confidence in the institutions and legislation governing business and relations between enterprises and government that made the world improve its outlook at the concept of governance (Hafi, 2015).

Study's Problem and Questions

The Jordanian universities have found themselves facing a major challenge. They have been forced to dispense with traditional administrative methods and introduce modern administrative methods based on modern concepts such as corporate governance to ensure improvement of their performance,

quality of outputs and efficient and effective completion of their functions. In this regard, many studies have pointed to the significance of corporate governance and the reality of its application in universities from the point of view of the administrative and academic bodies working in them, such as the study of Nasser Al-Din (2012) and the study of AL-Shannak (2009), that emphasized the importance of governance in universities in carrying out the tasks efficiently and effectively, ensuring justice, objectivity and impartiality that eliminate conflicts of interest and the balance between the transparency of educational policies and the justice of laws and regulations. Hence, Jordanian universities should recognize the importance of adopting the rules of corporate governance for having a positive impact on this vital sector.

The difficulties and challenges faced by higher education in the Arab world in general and in Jordan in particular (such as policies, strategy plans, improving learning outcomes, among others) necessitate fundamental and real reforms in the structure of higher education. Such reforms will enable the universities and other educational institutions to face these challenges in various forms and carry out the related goals. For this reason, one of the tools of reforming the higher education sector is the governance of the universities which will be the subject of this study for the benefits and gains of the economic sectors and international institutions and companies. As previously detailed, governance helps decision makers in higher education institutions move towards the desired direction and achieve the desired goals and aspirations. By viewing that, the problem of the study was determined by investigating the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan by answering the following questions:

Q1: What is the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan from the academician's perspective?

Q2: Are there statistically significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) level in the mean scores of the participants of the study on the degree of applying governance at the University of Jordan due to gender, academic rank, years of experience, and type of faculty variables?

Importance of the Study

The institutions of higher education are one of the national institutions involved in the preparation and development of human resources (in addition to the major roles of education, scientific research and community service) in order to meet the community needs in accordance with the comprehensive development plans. These roles will help find solutions to the problems and challenges that the community encounters. The importance of this study is that governance has become a contemporary organizational management concept concerned with the success of the organizations and ensuring their survival and continuity. In addition, many studies on governance were related to the economic sectors

of business and companies.

The importance of the current study stems from recognizing the importance of applying governance at the official Jordanian universities from the point of view of the teaching staff through the principles of governance which help in performing the work cooperatively and contribute to achieving transparency, fairness and justice. Furthermore, this study may benefit faculty members and administrators in universities by knowing their rights and responsibilities.

Study's Objectives

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- Identifying the reality of applying the rules of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members.
- Examining whether the participants' perspective of applying governance at the University of Jordan is affected by their gender, academic rank, years of experience, and type of faculty or not.

Study Terms: The terms of the study were conceptually and procedurally defined as follows:

Governance in universities: It is the methods and means by which the university determines its direction to achieve the purpose of its existence, including the important rules of accountability, responsibility, transparency, justice and collective independence in decision-making and the invocation to law (Mohammad, 2011).

Governance in universities is also defined as the system that requires the resistance of administrative corruption created by the hierarchical relationship between high-ranking officials and the staff members or the decision makers and implementers, in accordance with a mechanism that ensures transparency, objectivity, equality and putting all parties in front of their responsibilities away from conflicts of interest (Ezzat, 2010).

Procedurally: it is a range of actions, including transparency, accountability, participation in university decision-making, and organizational efficiency, which aim at achieving quality and excellence in performance by selecting effective and appropriate procedures to achieve the University's plans and objectives.

-Degree of Application: Procedurally, it is defined as the extent of applying governance at the official Jordanian universities as measured by the study instrument (questionnaire) prepared by the researchers from the point of view of the faculty members and administrative cadre.

Limitations of the Study: The study limits are as follows:

- Human limitations: This study was limited to faculty members at the Faculty of Educational Sciences.
- Spatial limitations: The study was conducted at the University of Jordan.
- Time limitations: The study was implemented during the first semester of the academic year 2017/2018.

Literature Review and Previous studies

1- Literature Review:

The term of corporate governance is the first term used to refer to governance. In Arabic, it has been translated into many terms such as: community management, wise governance, good governance and governance management. Regardless of the term used, the concept of governance is the same. In other words, it is the transformation of management from traditional management, which is based on division of labor according to unclear goals and criteria, and its centrality in the hands of senior management, into a more interactive and integrated management among its components, which will lead the university as a body with organizational structure to achieve its objectives efficiently and effectively within an administrative framework that does not depend on the authority of someone (Al Kayed, 2003).

Governance has a very important effect on economies as it helps institutions direct, control and lead their performance. Since governance includes the distribution of responsibilities, activates the criteria for decision-making, specifies objectives, and monitors performance, it is important for educational institutions to focus on standard institutional activities that are undertaken with due diligence and accountability to meet organizational objectives and develop the core values of the market economy in a democratic society (Obiete, Nwazor, & Ifeoma, 2015).

As universities are primarily organizations that lead the community towards development at the state level, they have adopted the concept of corporate governance to bridge the gap between the principal, students, academic and administrative bodies and allow them to make decisions, take action to achieve goals and discuss issues of concern to individuals inside and outside the institutions of higher education (Abdel Hakim, 2011).

In order to achieve and improve excellence and dynamism in educational institutions, it is important to apply a cooperative approach of management between administrative and academic members.

Therefore, it seems that the qualitative approach, management experience, and the views of faculty members on governance can help overcome the challenges and pave the path toward achieving a solution in the cultural context of the country (Sattarzadeh-Pashabeig, Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, Sadoughi, Khachian, & Zagheri-Tafreshi 2018).

Applying governance in education is very significant, as it is a key element in focusing on trends of reforming education throughout the world. The concept of educational governance is at the forefront of the world's initial classification methods, which show how educational institutions achieve and implement their goals, manage their institutions and monitor their achievements. Educational governance does not refer, very much, to what educational institutions do, but to how they do it, i.e. the ways and means that determine the institution through organizing itself for the purpose of its existence (Felity, 2013).

The process of promoting higher education requires an integrated system of governance that includes all decision-makers, whether at the level of the sector as a whole or universities, and is considered the key to access to higher education of high value, level and content. The promotion of the scientific and educational job at any university requires the development of corporate governance and institutional performance in order to ensure transparency at work and accountability for performance and results, and institutional participation of all parties according to the legislative authority governing the work, so that the academic decision goes according to academic principles starting from the Department Council, the College Council, the Deans Council, the University Council and ending with the Board of Trustees. This applies to both public and private universities (Saleh, 2010 and Nasser Eddin, 2012).

For that reason, governance is not just a comprehensive management of the university, but rather a broader and wider concept. It is an integrated system of legislation aimed at achieving the quality and distinction of operations, outputs and the academic and administrative management through the selection of appropriate strategies to achieve the goals of the university (Bazawiah and Salami, 2011). It is also a comprehensive set of integrated and interactive human and material elements that create harmony and balance within the university, as losing it causes a major imbalance in the operations of the university, and then in the outputs.

Good governance is considered to create an integrated mass balance within the work, which causes the loss of a major disruption in the university, for example, participate in governance system as leaders, teachers or students. So the key points of interest in governance include issues of transparency and accountability, and understanding these points of governance will have a

significant effect on educational systems (Aazhory, 2009).

Generally, governance is based on three principles namely transparency, participation and accountability

Transparency means the design and application of systems, procedures, policies and legislation. It is also one of the most important international standards in the classification and arrangement of countries and even universities (Bazawiah and Salami, 2011).

Participation means allowing the governing bodies of the academic and administrative bodies, students and society to participate in policy-making and the development of work rules in various areas of university life (Lee & Land, 2010).

Accountability means enabling individuals inside and outside the university to monitor work without disrupting or disturbing others (Khorshid &Yousef, 2009), as well as transparently applying regulations and instructions to all university staff and students (Corcoran, 2004).

Graham, Plumptre, & Amos (2003) added more new principles to these principles:

Direction: it is the broad and long-term interest of leaders in the public concerning good governance and human development.

Performance: it is the response of universities in an effort to serve all stakeholders within the framework of efficiency, efficiency and operations with a view to achieving results that meet the overall needs and make maximum use of available resources.

Fairness and justice: in the sense of achieving justice for all, promoting them, meeting their needs and ensuring the rule of law. Legal frameworks should be fairly implemented concerning human rights' laws.

Nasser Eddin (2012) pointed out that the application of governance at the university is of great significance in the contemporary world. Its application maximizes the value of the university and its competitiveness, especially in the field of its outputs and its regional and global status. Thus, it works to determine the strategic direction of the university by making the right strategic decisions to preserve the resources and material and moral gains of the university. Halawa and Taha (2011) emphasized that the application of governance creates a good atmosphere for collective action that seeks to achieve specific goals and is aimed at optimizing the use of the university's resources and enhancing accountability. The good distribution and management of tasks and services reduces differences in the university and increases integration and interaction among stakeholders, by increasing the efficiency of

disclosure, accountability, oversight and motivation (Bazawiah and Salami, 2011).

2- Previous Studies:

A number of studies have been carried out to examine the governance phenomenon from different angles. For example, Maloney (2003) sought to measure the participation of faculty members in the decision-making process and its impact on job satisfaction in colleges in Connecticut State in USA. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between participation in the decision-making process and its impact on job satisfaction for full-time faculty members in 12 community colleges in Connecticut. Besides, demographic variables were selected to explore the impact of job satisfaction of faculty members in joint governance. Since Participation in university decision-making and governance exists in organizational and motivational theories, it is acceptable and has positive effects on institutional job. The term "joint governance" appeared in the dictionary since 1966, and meant to be a description of a social system of self-government where the responsibility for decision-making was shared by all those affected by the decision. The result of this study was to pay more attention to the faculty members and make their opportunity to participate in the process of decision-making is greater in proportion to their functional status.

Hénard & Mitterle (2008) conducted a study which aimed at discussing the distinction between governance arrangements and quality guidelines. This study also emphasized the need to define appropriate guidance for institutions, and it explored the relationship between governance and quality assurance and the relevance of guidance to help higher education institutions fulfill its mission effectively. The study also reflected on the major theoretical approaches developed by researchers over the past ten years, including the main university governance models. The study showed a number of results, namely: governance has become a major pressure tool to improve the quality of education, an essential means of raising the economics of higher education, and that educational institutions seek to balance the principles of governance and quality standards.

Al-Shannak's study (2009) aimed at identifying the concept of governance among the academic leaders and the degree of practicing their standards at the private Jordanian universities. The results of the study showed a number of results, namely: the level of understanding of the academic management of the concept of governance and their practice of the fields of governance at Jordanian private universities was high. There are also statistically significant differences among the arithmetic means of the degree of practice of the areas of governance among the academic and administrative bodies, noting that the differences were in favor of the faculty member in the transparency's standard

In their study entitled "The Use of Governance in Universities in Spain", Fernandez and Loren (2009) aimed at strengthening the framework of the use of governance in Spanish universities, using the method of qualitative approach. The study showed a number of results such as the governance will be very useful if the development procedures in universities were previously applied which would have a positive impact on the management of universities, and that the Spanish higher education system will provide related information for all of its universities to compare and design required international procedures. The results showed that Spanish universities should provide a good reference by which to gain experience in the field of governance to attain beneficial changes. Universities should also consider how to design IT governance networks that depend on information technology. Besides, the results showed that the Spanish higher education system has common tools able to provide information that helps in designing and reaching the highest levels of IT governance.

Abu Mailesh (2013) examined the impact of institutional governance in administrative and academic decision-making at the Jordanian universities. The sample of the study consisted of (181) members of the Board of Directors of the Jordanian universities. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher prepared a special questionnaire consistent with the problem of the study and its objectives. The functions of the councils were adopted as a tool to measure the institutional governance as stated in the Jordanian Universities Law. The results of the study showed that there is an effect of institutional governance in administrative and academic decision-making, and there were no statistically significant differences in the responses of the sample members regarding the institutional governance and administrative and academic decisions due to variables of gender, academic qualification, university type and specialization. The study showed that there were statistically significant differences in the responses of the study sample members in terms of institutional governance and administrative and academic decisions due to the age variable in favor of the age group (55 and over). There were also no statistically significant differences in the responses of the study sample members regarding academic and administrative decisions due to variable of academic qualification, university type and specialization. Likewise, there are statistically significant differences in the responses of the members of the study sample in relation to the academic and administrative decisions in the field of administrative decision-making due to gender variable, which is statistically significant, noting that the differences were in favor of males.

The current study agreed with all the reviewed studies by addressing the concept of governance as an independent variable.

The current study also agreed with the reviewed studies, as they all were applied at universities, such as the study of Zahrani (2011) that aimed at identifying the reality of application governance in private universities in Saudi Arabia. Also, the current study is consistent with Al-Shannak's (2009) study, which aimed at identifying the concept of governance among academic leaders and the degree of practicing their standards in Jordanian private universities.

Though these studies reflected awareness of the importance of corporate governance, they did not address the relationship between the application of their rules in universities and their potential impact on academic and administrative leadership. This led the researchers to address the subject in an attempt to understand and explain the significance of corporate governance and the reality of applying it in Jordanian universities.

Study's Methodology

This study aimed at identifying the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan. The researchers adopted the descriptive analytical approach as it suits the purposes of this study.

Sample of the Study

The study sample consisted of (184) members, who were randomly selected from the academic staff at the University of Jordan, after excluding (16) questionnaires that were not valid for statistical analysis. This sample constitutes approximately 10% of the size of the original population. The sample members were distributed according to the categorizing variables of the study as shown in table (1):

Table (1): Distribution of the study sample according to the categorizing variables of the study

Categorizing Variable	Categories	Frequencies	Percentages
Gender	Male	107	58.20
	Female	77	41.80
	Total	184	100 %
Academic Rank	Professor	61	33.20
	Associate Professor	80	43.50
	Assistant Professor	43	23.40
	Total	184	100 %
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	28	15.20
	5-10 years	103	56.00
	More than ten years	53	28.80
	Total	184	100 %

Type of Faculty	Scientific	50	27.20
	Human	134	72.80
	Total	184	100%

The Study Instrument

For the purposes of data collection, the researchers developed a questionnaire to measure the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of academicians, after reviewing the theoretical literature and previous studies such as the study of Al-Shannak (2009), Al-Zahrani (2011), Al-Areeni (2014) and what has been presented in conferences and periodicals. The instrument's final form includes two parts; the first pertains to demographic characteristics which are defined as information about participants in terms of gender, academic rank, years of experience and type of faculty. The second part represents the degree of applying governance at the University of Jordan. This part consists of (37) items that are divided into four domains: accountability domain contains (9) items, transparency domain contains (10) items, participation in the university decision-making domain contains (10) items, and organizational efficiency domain contains (8) items.

Instrument's Validity

The apparent validity of the study instrument was verified by presenting it in its first form to (10) experienced and competent specialists in the fields of educational administration, measurement, and evaluation working at the University of Jordan to determine the clarity of the questionnaire items, their relevance, and significance. The researchers worked on (80%) of the observations made by the members of the rating committee in terms of re-wording, deletion, or correction of some items. The instrument in its final form consists of (37) items.

Instrument's Reliability

To verify the reliability of the instrument, the Alpha Cronbach equation was used to calculate the coefficient of internal consistency for each domain of study. The instrument has been applied on a sample of (30) faculty members from the whole faculty members at the University of Jordan and outside the study sample. This is illustrated in table (2):

Table (2): Values the coefficients of internal consistency for each domain of study

Domain	Cronbach's Alpha
Accountability	0.808
Transparency	0.866
Participation in university decision-making	0.915
Organizational efficiency	0.740

Instrument's Correction

The researchers used a Likert Scale of five points; 1-5, which is used to allow the participants of the study to express how much they agree or disagree with items of the questionnaire, (Strongly disagree = 5 degrees, Disagree = 4 degrees, neither agree nor disagree= 3 degrees, Agree= 2 degrees, strongly agree= 1 degree), In analyzing the data of the study, the researchers adopted the following three scales: (1) Low degree of acceptance represented by the grades between (1-2. 33), (2) medium degree of acceptance represented by the grades between (2.34 -3.67) and(3) the high degree of acceptance represented by the grades between (3.68 – 5).

Statistical Processing

In order to analyze the data of the study, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the questionnaire data. In response to the first question, the arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for each item of the scale. To answer the second question, MANOVA test was used to measure the differences among the arithmetic means of the variables of the study (gender, academic rank, years of experience, and type of faculty).

Study's Results and Discussion

First: The results that relate to the first question, which says: What is the reality of applying of governance at the **University** of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members?

To answer this question, the arithmetic means and the standard deviations of the estimates of the sample study's members were calculated on applying governance at the University of Jordan, as shown in table (3).

Table (3): Means and standard deviations of study instrument domains and the whole instrument (ranked in descending order)

No of Domain	Domain	AM	SD	Rank	Degree
4	Organizational efficiency	3.83	0.87	1	High

1	Accountability	3.55	0.69	2	Medium
2	Transparency	2.90	0.77	3	Medium
3	Participation in university decision- making	2.31	0.65	4	Low
Total		3.15	0.83	Medium	

Table (3) illustrates that the degree of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in general was medium, where the arithmetic mean was (3.15) with a standard deviation of (0.83). The domains of the study instrument were between medium and low, as organizational efficiency ranked first with a high degree. Accountability ranked second with a medium degree and transparency ranked in third place with a medium degree. As for participation in university decision-making, this section ranked fourth with a low degree.

Likewise, the researchers calculated the arithmetic means and the standard deviations for estimates of the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of the faculty members to the items of each domain of the study instrument separately, as follows:

First: Organizational Efficiency: The arithmetic means and standard deviations for estimates of the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan were calculated from the point of view of the faculty members in the domain of organizational efficiency, as shown in table (4).

Table (4): Means and standard deviations of organizational efficiency domain (ranked in descending order)

No of Item	Item	AM	SD	Rank	Degree
30	The administration of the university grants faculty members enough time to develop their research.	4.51	0.69	1	High
34	The university administration provides an accurate description of the functions of each job.	4.00	0.89	2	High
33	The university administration provides training courses for all members of the academic staff to develop their teaching skills.	3.98	0.89	3	High
36	The university administration invests all its resources (financial, human and technical) to achieve its objectives.	3.84	0.98	4	High
35	The university administration seeks to achieve its objectives with the lowest cost, time and effort.	3.82	0.97	5	High
32	The university administration effectively employs the budget according to its	3.67	0.88	6	Medium

	development plan.				
31	The university administration takes into account the optimal use of material resources available when making decisions.	3.44	0.99	7	Medium
37	The university administration increases the competitiveness of university employees.	3.39	0.86	8	Medium
Total		3.83	0.99	High	

Table (4) illustrates that the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of the faculty members in the domain of organizational efficiency was between high and medium grades, and the highest estimate was for item (30), which states, “The administration of the university grants faculty members enough time to develop their research”, where it ranked first with a arithmetic mean of (4.51) and a standard deviation of (0.69). In fact, this result reflects the keenness of the university administration to implement the law of higher education and scientific research, while item (37) was at the last rank, stating “the university administration increases the competitiveness of university employees” with a mean of 3.39, a standard deviation of 0.86 and with a medium degree. The researchers attribute this result to the faculty members who believe that the university administration seeks to achieve the highest standards so as to compete locally and globally, through competing with the competing universities in more than one area such as academic programs or in the characteristics of faculty members. In general, the domain of organizational efficiency was high with a mean of (3.83) and a standard deviation of (0.99).

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the members of the sample of the study believe that the university administration has clear goals to achieve through the optimal utilization of its material, human and technical resources, which will lead to excellence and quality of performance so that it is qualified to compete with other local and foreign universities while preserving its independence. The findings of the current study are similar to the results of Al-Shannak (2009) who stated that the level of academic management's understanding of the concept of governance and their practice of governance at the Jordanian private universities was high.

Second: Accountability: The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the estimates of the reality of applying governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of the faculty members in the domain of accountability, as illustrated in table (5).

Table (5): Means and standard deviations of accountability domain(ranked in descending order)

No of Item	Item	AM	SD	Rank	Degree
4	The university administration provides clear	4.29	0.58	1	High

	criteria for evaluating faculty members.				
1	The university administration provides clear rules that define the role of boards of faculties.	4.22	0.83	2	High
2	The university administration provides clear foundations for observance and accountability for academic staff's performance.	4.19	0.39	3	High
3	The university administration seeks to apply accountability for academic accreditation.	4.01	0.07	4	High
7	There are laws to ensure accountability for every position.	3.40	0.56	5	Medium
9	The university administration provides a regular list of accountability for its employees.	3.26	0.72	6	Medium
6	The university has an internal review system that provides periodic reports.	3.22	0.64	7	Medium
8	The university administration works to combat all forms of corruption patterns (administrative and financial).	3.08	0.77	8	Medium
5	The university administration is keen to appoint an external evaluator to evaluate the university's performance.	2.29	0.69	9	low
Total		2.44	0.69	Medium	

Table (5) illustrates that the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in the domain of accountability was high, medium and low. The highest estimate was for item (4), which says “The university administration provides clear criteria for evaluating faculty members.” and ranked first with a mean of (4.28) and a standard deviation of (0.58). This result reflects the fact that the university administration recognizes the significance of formative evaluation of the competence and efficiency of the academic staff's performance and develops and raises the efficiency of the university teaching level in order to improve the quality of the outputs of university education. As for item (5) which states “The university administration is keen to appoint an external evaluator to evaluate the university's performance”, its mean was 2.29 with a standard deviation of 0.69. The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the members of the study sample believe of the importance of the external evaluator from outside the university's board of trustees and the president himself, in the evaluation process, to objectivity ensure the results of the evaluation. On the whole, the domain of accountability's degree was medium with a mean of (3.44) and a standard deviation of (0.69). The researchers attributed this finding to the fact that the members of the study sample believe that administrative accountability should be applied because of the conservation of workers' rights and the preservation of public interest, alongside the existence of a declared regulation that will punish the negligent. However, researchers believe that this result is ineffective and there is a

need for training programs that enhance the culture of accountability. Moreover, this result is different from the results of AL-Zahrani study (2011), which showed that the Saudi private universities exercise good governance to a high degree.

Third: Transparency: The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the estimates of the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in the domain of transparency, as illustrated in table (6).

Table (6): Means and standard deviations of transparency domain(ranked in descending order)

No of Item	Item	AM	SD	Rank	Degree
10	The university administration provides a database of faculty members' updated CVs	3.55	0.68	1	Medium
17	The university administration provides a database of all its employees.	3.33	0.56	2	Medium
19	The university administration discloses its policy of awarding bonuses to all its members.	3.29	0.66	3	Medium
16	The university administration provides information to the beneficiaries (students, staff, and faculty members) on the strategic plan of the university.	3.06	0.78	4	Medium
12	The university administration sets a precise description of the duties of each job.	3.00	0.74	5	Medium
15	The university administration discloses the decisions resulting from its meetings.	2.98	0.96	6	Medium
14	The university administration announces the factors related to the core risks that threaten the university transparently.	2.71	0.52	7	Medium
13	The university administration utilizes its potentials to solve various academic problems	2.66	0.57	8	Medium
11	The university administration discloses the criteria for selecting deans or department heads.	2.48	0.72	9	Medium
18	The university council discloses the results of the analysis of the internal and external environment of the university.	1.97	0.16	10	low
Total		2.90	0.77	Medium	

Table (6) illustrates that the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the

point of view of faculty members in the domain of transparency was between medium and low degrees. Item (10), which says “The university administration provides a database of faculty members’ updated CVs”, was the highest and ranked first with a mean of (3.55) and a standard deviation of (0.68). This result, based on the opinion of the faculty members, reflects an official document for them because of its role in terms of knowledge and scientific sides in presenting experiences and qualifications that increase the strength of the institution (university). So, the university administration is keen to update the curriculum vitae of the faculty members and to demonstrate its human capabilities and abilities, which in turn increase its competitive advantage through the faculty member’s abilities. As for item (18), it states “The University Council discloses the results of the analysis of the internal and external environment of the university”, with a mean of 1.79 and a standard deviation of 0.16. According to the study sample’s members, the researchers attributed this result to the fact that the university seeks not to disclose the results of analysis of the internal or external environment, fearing that there is a strategic gap for human or material resources leading to losing credibility or weakening its competitiveness. In general, the transparency domain was medium with the mean of 2.90 and a standard deviation of 0.77. The researchers explain this result based on the fact that the faculty members in general believe that the university lacks transparency and tends to centralization or bureaucracy which is clearly seen through the policy of disclosure of decisions related to internal affairs. The results of the study were in line with the results of Al-Areeni study (2014), which showed that the reality of applying of governance at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University for all domains of study on transparency, participation, accountability, equality and organizational effectiveness was applied with a medium degree.

Fourth: The participation in the university decision-making: The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated of the estimates of the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in the domain of participation in university decision-making, as shown in table (7) below:

**Table (7): Means and standard deviations of participation in university decision-making
(ranked in descending order)**

No of Item	Item	AM	SD	Rank	Degree
26	The university administration interacts with faculty members on issues that functionally affect faculty members.	2.74	0.46	1	Medium
23	The university administration takes the suggestions of the beneficiaries (students, staff, and faculty members)	2.59	0.49	2	Medium

	regarding various university issues.				
20	The university administration forms inter-departmental working committees to activate the principle of collective action and work	2.54	0.55	3	Medium
24	The university administration holds meetings with the relevant committees and the board of trustees to take decisions.	2.44	0.60	4	Medium
25	The university administration assigns a special department for receiving and investigating students and employees complaints.	2.38	0.63	5	Medium
21	All academic staff are allowed to evaluate incumbents.	2.27	0.60	6	Low
29	The university administration announces its decisions clearly.	2.13	0.57	7	Low
28	The board of directors of the university may discuss decisions to make appropriate amendments.	2.03	0.65	8	Low
22	The university administration applies the election policy in the appointment of (deans and heads of departments) to ensure the participation of all.	2.00	0.58	9	Low
27	The university administration guarantees the right of objection practices for faculty members.	1.98	0.12	10	Low
Total		2.31	0.65	Low	

Table (7) shows that the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in the domain of participation in university decision-making was between medium and low degrees. The highest estimate was for item (26), which states “The university administration interacts with faculty members on issues that functionally affect faculty members”, was ranked first with a mean of 2.74 and a standard deviation of 0.46. This result reflects, based the opinion of the faculty members, the inaction of the university administration in terms of the issues of faculty members, which should originally be one of the priorities of the attention of the university because the most important element is the human element. So, faculty members believe that the university administration is keen on this aspect and take it to the attention so that it is more effective than it is. Item (27) states “The university administration guarantees the right of objection practices for faculty members” with a mean of 1.98 and a standard deviation of 0.12. This could be due to the fact that faculty members believe that the right of objection is a legislative act, and that this result reflects the practice of university administration for centralization and bureaucracy in its work style.

Over-all, the domain of participation in university decision-making came at a low degree, with a mean of (2.31) and a standard deviation of 0.65. This result reflects the opinion of the two faculty members that the university inadequately applies the principle of participation in university decision-making because it depends on the officials of senior management positions in the decision-making, and that the university lacks the existence of effective systems that support participation in decision-making because of the bureaucracy pursued by them. The findings of the present study agree with the results of Maloney (2003) who states that the participation of faculty in the decision-making process must be greater consistent with their functional characteristics.

Second: the results that relate to the second question, which says: Are there statistically significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) level in the mean scores of the participants of the study on the degree of applying governance at the University of Jordan due to gender, academic rank, years of experience, and type of faculty variables?

To answer this question, the arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated from the point of view of the faculty members due to the variables (gender, academic rank, years of experience, and type of faculty). Multivariate Analysis Test was used to examine the differences in the response of the study sample members to the items of each field of study, as illustrated in tables 8 and (9) below:

Table (8): Means and standard deviations among the means according to the study variables

Categorical Variables and Categories		No	Accountability		Transparency		Participation in University Decision-making		Organizational Efficiency	
			AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD
Gender	Male	107	3.53	0.59	2.31	0.35	2.31	0.39	3.81	0.81
	Female	77	3.57	0.40	2.88	0.15	2.30	0.72	3.86	0.42
	Total	184	3.55	0.51	2.60	0.26	2.31	0.52	3.75	0.64
Academic Rank	Professor	61	3.58	0.22	2.90	0.19	2.35	0.36	3.80	0.63
	Associate professor	80	3.55	0.42	2.92	0.09	2.30	0.55	3.88	0.64
	Assistant professor	43	3.18	0.08	2.89	0.71	2.28	0.72	3.76	0.73
	Total	184	3.44	0.51	2.90	0.26	2.31	0.53	3.81	0.65
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	28	3.22	0.92	2.90	0.84	3.04	0.52	3.80	0.83

e	From 5-10 years	103	3.17	0.63	2.91	0.02	3.09	0.61	3.86	0.47
	More than 11 years	53	3.22	0.01	2.89	0.44	3.03	0.40	3.79	0.96
	Total	184	3.20	0.51	2.90	0.26	3.05	0.53	3.82	0.65
Type of Faculty	Scientific	50	3.94	0.1	2.89	0.18	2.32	0.48	3.64	0.16
	Humanities	134	4.01	0.28	2.91	0.30	2.31	0.55	3.90	0.31
	Total	184	3.98	0.51	2.90	0.26	2.32	0.62	3.77	0.64

Table (8): Illustrates that there are apparent differences among the means of the estimates of the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members due to variables of (gender, academic rank, years of experience and type of faculty). To determine the significance of these differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), MANOVA Test was used, as shown in Table (9):

Table (9): Results of the MANOVA Test among the variables of (gender, academic rank, years of experience and type of faculty)

Categorical Variables	Domains	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Median of squares	F Value	Sig
Gender Hoteling=0.433 Sig=0.784	Accountability	3.97	1	3.97	0.62	0.43
	Transparency	5.11	1	5.11	0.47	0.50
	Participation in University Decision-making	0.09	1	0.09	0.01	0.91
	Organizational Efficiency	0.16	1	0.16	0.01	0.93
Academic Rank Lambda= 0.738 Sig=0.658	Accountability	2.50	2	1.25	0.20	0.82
	Transparency	0.94	2	0.47	0.04	0.96
	Participation in University Decision-making	20.61	2	10.31	1.59	0.21
	Organizational Efficiency	23.72	2	11.86	0.56	0.57
Years of Experience Lambda= 0.738 Sig=0.660	Accountability	6.36	2	3.18	.50	0.61
	Transparency	0.54	2	0.27	0.03	0.98
	Participation in University Decision-making	14.39	2	7.20	1.11	0.33
	Organizational Efficiency	39.16	2	19.58	0.92	0.40
Type of Faculty	Accountability	2.74	1	2.74	0.43	0.51

Hoteling=1.78 Sig=0.135	Transparency	0.24	1	0.24	0.02	0.88
	Participation in University Decision-making	4.12	1	4.12	0.64	0.43
	Organizational Efficiency	148.64	1	148.64	6.99	0.53
Total	Accountability	1122.44				
	Transparency	1928.24				
	Participation in University Decision-making	1138.63				
	Organizational Efficiency	3740.11				

Table (9) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) among the means of the estimates of the reality of applying of governance at the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members in all domains according to the different variables of study (gender, academic rank, years of experience and type of faculty). If the value of the statistical significance level (Sig) in all domains was greater than the value of $\alpha = 0.05$., this indicates that the male and female faculty members have similar estimates in the degree of applying of governance at the University of Jordan. As a result of the absence of differences between males and females, the researchers point out that faculty members work under one university environment. Besides, this result reflects the fact that there is agreement among the faculty members, regardless of the type of faculty, that it is important to practice governance effectively and the significance of standards that govern the governance process in order to achieve excellence and improvement. The findings of the present study were consistent with the results of the study of AL-Zahrani (2011) which showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the responses of the study sample's members on the reality of applying of governance at the private Jordanian universities due to the variables of specialization, gender and experience.

Conclusion

In a nutshell, there are bright and beneficial aspects seen when applying the rules of governance in the University of Jordan from the point of view of faculty members. Governance exists in the University of Jordan but not to the required level. There is no doubt that applying governance is greatly important in terms of its contribution to the follow-up of those responsible for the educational process at the University and to assess the level of their performance and reward those

showing excellence. Thus, good application of governance plays a leading role for the smooth operation and efficient management. It would also enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and overall performance of the institutional management, which is crucial for the continuous development of the institution.

In addition, developing an appreciation of the importance of involvement in university governance and understanding the roles that faculty members play in decision-making will strengthen faculty contributions to the university scholarly community and impact both its operations and its success. Also good governance would ensure the appropriate use of funds/resources in the best interest of the institution. This would also lay a solid foundation for the long-term development of the institution, which is crucial to quality of education. It is a call for all educational institutions to effectively apply governance, taking into consideration all its rules and various uses. In conclusion, governance helps organizations increase the ability to control the performance of their staff members.

Recommendations

In the light of the results of this study, the following recommendations can be provided:

1. Reforming and changing laws and regulations (organizing academic work) which are clear, strict, and enforceable, particularly with regard to transparency and accountability.
2. Conducting further studies on the status of governance at Jordanian public and private universities, from the administrative leaders' point of view.
3. Establishing and announcing accurate standards of accountability and transparency, and applying them to all persons and entities without prejudice.
4. Enhancing trust between the university administration and faculty members through their participation in decision-making process.
5. Organizing appropriate training and development programs for academic managers in the university system. This would enable them acquire the desirable management skills.
6. Reviewing obstacles that hinder applying the concept of university governance such as the university legislation and the university administration process.

References:

- Abdel Hakim, F. J. (2011). University Governance: An Introduction to the Development of Management through Participation, *Journal of Educational Sciences*, Cairo University, 19(1), 2313 -2326.
- Abu Mailesh, A. M. (2013). *The Corporate Governance and its Role on Making Administrative and Academic Decisions in Jordanian Universities* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Arabic Amman University, Amman, Jordan.
- Al-Areeni, M. A. (2014). The Reality of the Application of Governance from the Point of view of Members of the Administrative and Academic Bodies Working at the University of Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic, *specialized educational magazine*, 3 (12), 114-148.
- Alazhory, N. (2009). *Academic Governance Conference. Holy Spirit University of Kaslik*. Retrieved June 22, 2018 from: (<http://www.usek.edu.lb/Library/Files>).
- Al-Kayed, Z. (2003). *Governance Issues and Applications*, Arab Organization for Administrative Development, Cairo.
- Al-Shannak, R. M. (2009). *The Concept of Governance and Degree of Practice at the Jordanian Private Universities* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.
- Bazawiah, A. & Salmi, A. (2011October 3-4). *The Quality of Higher Education in Achieving the Principles of Governance: The UK's Experience in University Governance*. International Forum on Governance at the University: Evaluation of Governance in Higher Education.
- Corcoran, S. (2004). Duty, Discretion and Conflict: University Governance and the Legal Obligations of University Boards. *Australian Universities' Review*, 2 (46), 30-37.
- Ezzat, A. (2010). *The Concept of University Governance, its Purpose and Means of Implementation*. Dar Al-Falah, Amman, Jordan.
- Fernández, A. & Llorens, F. (2009). *An IT Governance Framework for Universities in Spain*, Department of Languages and Computing, University of Almeria, Almeria, Spain.
- Graham, J., Plumptre, T. W., & Amos, B. (2003). *Principles for good governance in the 21st century*. Ottawa: Institute on governance.
- Hafi, T. I. R. (2015). *The Extent of Compliance With Family Business Governance Guide in Palestine and Its Impact on its Performance* (Doctoral dissertation). An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
- Halawa, J. & Taha, N (2011). *The Reality of Governance at Al Quds University*, Al Quds University, Institute for Sustainable Development, Dar Al-Olom AL-Tanmouiah, Jerusalem, Palestine.
- Hénard, F.& Mitterle, A. (2008). *Governance and Quality in Higher Education*. Education program on institutional management in higher education. France: OECD.

- Ismail, A. & Al-Haj A. (2010). *The Relationship between the Level of Actual Application of Institutional Governance and the Quality of Financial Reports of Jordanian Public Shareholding Companies at the Banking and Industrial Sectors*, Unpublished Master thesis, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
- Khurshid, M. & Yusuf, M. (2008). *The Challenges of Reality and Future Vision: The Role of Students and Legislative Reform in the Management of the University*. Workshop organized by the Arab Reform Forum at Alexandrina Library.
- Khurshid, M. & Yusuf, M. S. (2009). *University Governance and Strengthening the Capacities of the Higher Education System and Scientific Research in Egypt*. Governance of University Education Conference organized by the Arab Reform Forum at Alexandrina Library.
- Lee, L. S., & Land, M. H. (2010 June 9). *What University Governance Can Taiwan Learn from the United States?*. Online Submission, Paper presented at the International Presidential Forum (Harbin, China).
- Maloney, M. M. (2003). *Faculty participation in the decision making process: Its impact upon job satisfaction at Connecticut community colleges*.1471.
- Mari, M. (2009). *Academic Governance between Strategic Planning and Measuring Institutional Performance*, a Paper Presented to the Third Scientific Conference of Academic Governance, held in Kaslik, Faculty of Business Administration and Administrative Sciences, University of the Holy Spirit, Lebanon.
- Mohammed, M. F. (2011). An Analytical Study of the Concept of Good Governance and Applicable Requirements at the Egyptian Universities, *Future Journal of Arab Education*, Egypt, 72 (18), 142-165.
- Mutagahywa, B. (2012). *The Role of ICT in University Governance in Tanzania*, University of Dar As-Salaam.
- Nasser Eddin, Y. A. (2012). A proposed Theoretical Framework for University Governance and Indicators of its Application in the Light of the Total Quality Requirements. *A Study accepted for publication in the forthcoming issues of the Journal of the Development of University Performance* - Mansoura University, Egypt.
- Obiete, I. A., Nwazor, J. C., & Ifeoma, V. M. F. (2015). Strategies for teaching business education students in Nigerian tertiary institutions for cooperate governance. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(18), 170-175.
- Qurashi, Z. (2011). Governance at the Saudi Universities, *Al-Eqtisadiya Newspaper*, Issue 6426, Retrieved October 16, 2018, from: (http://www.aleqt.com/2011/05/16/article_538675.html).
- Saleh, M. G. (2010). *The Extent of Implementation of the Principle of Disclosure and Transparency of Corporate Governance Principles at Bir Al Madwar Limited Company* (Unpublished MA Thesis). An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.

- Sattarzadeh-Pashabeig, M., Atashzadeh-Shoorideh, F., Sadoughi, M. M., Khachian, A., & Zagheri-Tafreshi, M. (2018). Characteristics of Shared Governance in Iranian Nursing Schools: Several Souls in One Body. *Iranian journal of nursing and midwifery research*, 23(5), 344.
- Taei, A. & Hamad, A. (2010). The Dimensions of Local Governance in Iraq: A Field Study in the Local Council for the Judiciary, *Baghdad Economic College Journal*, 25, 41-68.
- Wang, Li. (2010). Higher Education Governance and University Autonomy in China. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 8 (4), 477-495.
- Zahrani, K. & Maqbool J. (2011). *The Reality of the Application of Good Governance at the Saudi Private Universities and its relation to Job Satisfaction and Organizational Loyalty of Faculty Members* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia.