The Methods of Selecting Academic Leaders (Faculty Members) at New Saudi Universities and its Relationship to Some Variables

Share Aiyed M Aldosari[1]

[1] Department of Educational Sciences – College of Education, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia.

Correspondence: Share Aiyed M Aldosari, Department of Educational Sciences – College of Education, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia.

Abstract

The study aims to identify the current method used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of faculty members working there, and whether there is a correlation between the method used and the following variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, productivity motivation, and institutional loyalty and affiliation. In order to achieve this, the present researcher designed a questionnaire consisting of (32) items divided according to the variables mentioned. This questionnaire was distributed to the study sample, i.e. 300 faculty members who were randomly chosen from the study community (2382 members). The results show that there is a correlation between the method used and the foregoing variables (i.e. job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, productivity motivation, and institutional loyalty and affiliation) which was at an intermediate level, with the exception of the productivity motivation which was at a high level for university professors, despite the fact that these variables are lower than expected. This made the present researcher recommend that the university and the Ministry of Education would review that mechanism and hold conferences and workshops in order to address it before it causes these positive professors to suffer from disappointment and job burnout. The study also revealed that there were statistically significant differences related to experience, academic rank, and officiality and contracting.

Keywords: academic leaders (faculty members), appointing academic leaders (faculty members), new Saudi universities

1. Introduction

Universities as institutions in most countries of the world are considered a beacon of thought and scientific methodology, and a pioneer of the participatory or democratic approach. That is why, universities need to set an example of organizational justice, organizational commitment, system efficiency, and the quality of the organization.

The majority of literature in management agrees on the fact that management represents capabilities and skills. In fact, management is a process intended to direct a group of individuals in an organization to achieve the goals and objectives of the organization. This evolves to reach the stage of leadership which is a balanced human interaction influenced by internal and external factors, whether quantitative or qualitative. It rather extends to include the determination of the level of efficiency and effectiveness, or perhaps the lack thereof.

Among the top leadership jobs is selecting faculty members. In some new universities, such as Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, the mid-level and low-level leaders are nominated, assigned and appointed in a way that appears to the present researcher to be depending only on personnel selection based on direct dealing or the nomination of the candidate by officials such as the deans or the deputy rectors. This process takes place according to sequences and steps that start with assignment and may end up with appointment for a certain period (one to three years), and then renewal may follow for an equal period. This renewal may be repeated for other years, which may extend to nine years and possibly more.

2. Research Problem

The present researcher worked at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University for more than ten years, moving between a number of leadership positions, from a supervisor of the College of Education to become the head of the department, then the vice-dean and then the assistant vice-dean. During this period, he found that the mechanism of assigning and appointing faculty members, especially the lower-level, middle-level, and high-level leaders, is based on vague,

unspecified criteria and often or always through personal nomination without performance assessment supported by indicators or evidence that can be viewed and discussed to prove merit, without any monitoring differential points such as experience, years of experience, academic rank, specialization in leadership, or leadership qualification, and without any announcement or call for nomination or for standing for elections, which – from the present researcher's point of view – violates the principle of equal opportunities. This led the present researcher to probe this issue from the viewpoints of the faculty members and reveal the relationship of this practice to some internal and external variables.

3. Significance of the Study

Theoretical Significance: The study derives its theoretical importance from the fact that it deals with the topic of selecting academic leaders (faculty members) which is a crucial issue that has important implications. The study contributes to this topic through establishing organizational methods and ideologicalizing institutional thought, especially in universities, in addition to the fact that the study attempts to develop a theoretical conceptual framework that can add to libraries in the field academic leadership.

Practical Significance: The practical importance of the study arises from the expectation that it will be useful in directing the attention of officials in Saudi universities, especially new universities, to review the mechanisms through which faculty members are selected. The study is also expected to be useful in contributing to assisting decision makers, policy-makers and the drafters of the regulations of new university system – which is still in development even after it has been approved by the Council of Ministers – through reviewing the recommendations and suggestions in this regard.

4. Objectives of the Study

1- Identifying the method currently used for selecting faculty members at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of faculty members.

2- Detecting whether the advantages of the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities are more than its disadvantages or equal to them from the viewpoint of faculty members.

3- Detecting whether there is a correlation between the method currently used for selecting faculty members at new Saudi universities and some of the following internal and external variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, productive motivation, institutional affiliation and loyalty.

4- Detecting whether there are statistically significant differences in the viewpoint of the study sample on the subject of the research related to gender, academic rank, experience, or officiality and contracting.

5. Study Variables

The Independent Variable: the method of selecting faculty members at new Saudi universities.

The Dependent Variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional loyalty and affiliation, competitive advantage.

The Fixed Variables: academic rank, experience, or officiality and contracting.

6. Research Questions

1- What is the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of their faculty members?

2- What is the dominant feature of the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of their faculty members? Do the advantages outweigh the advantages, do the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, or are they equal?

3- Is there a correlation between the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities and some of the following dependent variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional affiliation and loyalty, and the creation of a competitive advantage?

4- Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the viewpoints of the study sample about the dependent variables related to academic rank, experience, or officiality and contracting?

7. Operational Definitions

Academic Leaders: The present researcher uses it to refer to department heads, deans, assistant vice-deans, and deputy rectors.

New Saudi Universities: According to the National Registry of Higher Education (2014), these are the newly established universities as either an independent university or a branch of a long-established university. Al-Ruwaili (2015) believes that the term "new universities" is used to refer to all the Saudi universities that were established after 2005.

The present researcher used it to mean procedurally the Saudi public universities that are independent of others, and that were established after 2005, and still exist.

8. Limitations of the Study

Time Limitations: The study was carried out in the academic year 2019/2020.

Spatial Limitations: The study is limited to the area south of Riyadh, which includes Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Al-Kharj Governorate and its branches in the governorates of Hotat Bani Tamim, Al-Aflaj, Al-Sulayyil, and Wadi Al-Dawasir.

Research Limitations: The research was limited to studying the method of selecting faculty members and its relationship to some internal and external variables.

9. Theoretical Literature and Previous Studies

9.1 Theoretical Literature

9.1.1 Selection of Faculty Members

It is wise to place the right person in the right place, and this is what the literature of this field talks about, as it describes this matter as merit. Merit is one of the most important criteria that studies and research call for adopting and using in the process of selecting faculty members. The leader's merit reflects his ability to lead effectively, so that he is capable of performing the required activity with the greatest degree of proficiency, accuracy, and intelligence in accordance with the criteria established for that, in addition to saving time, effort, and cost. Achieving this meets the need of organizations looking for leaders who are committed to their values and to the efficient administrative behavior and who are able to realize their vision, perform their mission, and achieve their goals. These leaders are also able to invest the tangible and intangible assets of the university, i.e. the "intellectual capital", create and gain a competitive advantage, and make decisions without relying solely on the authority given to them.

Al-Thubaity (2015) believes that if the mechanism of selecting leaders in government institutions continues to be lacking governance and control, and dependent on personal choice and subjective selection, these institutions will not succeed in achieving national visions, fulfilling the intended institutional goals, executing the strategic plans drawn up, or implementing the intended programs. Rather, transparency, administrative oversight, and accounting liability will inevitably be absent. Work will be under the control of the leader not the control of procedures. This will also contribute to the emergence of a number of adverse consequences, the most important of which are the following:

– The extreme centralization in the delegation of authority, due to their lack of administrative skills and leadership characteristics that the leader must possess.

–Inefficiency and wasting of effort, money, and time as a result of wrong or discretionary administrative practices.

– Low productivity and low performance efficiency.

– The spread of a culture of administrative and procedural complications, which causes work disruptions and delays in transactions.

– Weak management of the tangible and intangible assets of the institution and weak investment of them in order to achieve the desired goals.

– Disruption or delay in the implementation of institutional programs and projects, which leads to weak performance and low productivity.

There are serious trends to setting clear criteria for selecting faculty members. The present researcher examined some of what was approved by some universities, including, but not limited to, the Faculty of Fundamentals of Religion at Al-Azhar University (2017) that approved specific stated and clear criteria which are the Egyptian nationality , professional competence, integrity, academic rank, scientific activity, administrative skills and leadership capabilities, participation in student activities and services, participation in community activities, and cooperation and good relationships with colleagues and superiors. The same was true in the Faculty of Pharmacy at the University of Suez (2017) which adopted ten criteria for selecting the academic leaders (faculty members) of the faculty, namely career progression, administrative competence and leadership capacity, the extent of participation in the various activities of

the faculty and the university, planning to develop the relevant field, taking courses in the field of management, taking specialized training courses in the related field, contributions in the fields of development and quality, scientific activity and publishing, cooperation with colleagues, and the relationship with subordinates and superiors. As for the Faculty of Medicine at Tanta University (2018), it adopted five stated criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members): commitment and integrity, competence and scientific activity, participation in national activities, student services, development and quality, personal characteristics, administrative and leadership competence. In addition, many Egyptian universities adopted the same approach in order to achieve the objectives of supportive development and continuous improvement, fulfill the goal of raising institutional efficiency and effectiveness, and ensure the quality of education outcomes. The Supreme Council of Universities Resolution No. (11), dated (26/2/2018), was issued to establish a specialized committee in order to study setting criteria for selecting university presidents and deans of faculties and institutes.

In Saudi Arabia, Al-Jouf University (2018), one of the new universities, adopted specific and stated criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members), namely Saudi nationality, professional competence, administrative skills and leadership capabilities, scientific and research competence, participation in student activities and services, and community service.

The present researcher believes that such interest and trend reflect the importance of this issue and its urgent need for treatment and consideration. The continuation of the present situation in the selection of academic leaders (faculty members) in some universities without clear and specific criteria, and without transparent and impartial procedures is considered an exercise of futility and a kind of administrative corruption.

At King Saud University (2019) – which is a long-established Saudi university – the process of selecting deans is carried out through an electronic system on the university's website. This enables the Saudi faculty member to nominate himself, and also enables Saudi and non-Saudi faculty members to evaluate and recommend candidates. Then a candidate is selected and evaluated electronically by the committee members according to specific and announced procedures, models, and criteria that are supervised by an advisory committee consisting of seven professors with long experience at the university, representing the key majors therein.

The literature of the current study that is related to the methods of selecting academic leaders (faculty members) in universities is almost identical, including Al-Toukhi (2008, 12) and Al-Thubaity (2015). The most prominent methods are the following:

a) Personal choice, which relies more on trust than competence, and also recommendation by leaders and close associates plays a role in that.

b) Announcing the available or potential vacant leadership positions in order to ask faculty members to apply for them, and then the process of screening the applicants is carried out.

c) Nomination by faculty members in order to compile a database when vacancies are available and offering them according to the CVs and the information submitted according to compatibility.

d) Evaluation where differentiation and selection are made according to the distinction that draws upon the annual evaluation of the files of faculty members in order to offer them the vacant leadership positions.

e) Monitoring and follow-up by secret collaborators, whether employees or administrators, in order to report on faculty members who can be nominated for these vacant leadership positions.

f) Making an official announcement available to everyone with specific criteria and regulated specifications related to academic differentiation, the length of working experience, the diversity of its student and societal fields, academic ranks, research, and personal leadership characteristics.

The mechanism of selecting academic leaders (faculty members) and its relationship to some internal and external variables is the problem of the current study. In order to learn about these variables, the present researcher believes that it is important to include the most prominent aspects of the literature on scientific research related to them. The researcher chose and identified them after he had familiarized himself with the literature and references relevant to his study and found that they focus on those variables more than others. He also found that they are closer to the problem of his study and to achieving its goals. These variables are as follows:

9.1.2 Internal Variables

Job Satisfaction: It means the employee's positive emotional state in relation to his work as a result of the leadership style, colleagues' dealings, work environment, and the benefits he gets. Job satisfaction is considered an incentive for work, creativity, team spirit, continuation of serviceableness, giving, and balanced performance (Al-Amri, 2003).

Organizational Justice: It means impartiality, fairness, and dealing with employees equally. A number of studies established that organizational justice is the foundation of a healthy work environment, and that it plays a major role in stimulating consensual trends and promoting positive behaviors among subordinates. A study entitled "The relationship between organizational justice and the behavior of organizational citizenship of educational supervisors in the city of Tabuk" conducted by Abdul Majeed and Al-Awfi (2016) revealed a direct relationship between organizational justice and the organizational behavior of altruism, civility, cultural behavior, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness.

Organizational Commitment: It means the employee's willingness to do his best for the organization, his desire to remain in it, his acceptance of its main values and goals, and his endeavor to achieve these goals. Some researchers believe that organizational commitment is stronger than job satisfaction as an indicator predicting the employee retention. Policies represent one of the factors that enhance the organizational commitment among individuals in organizations. Policies include equal opportunities and opportunities for promotion and holding leadership positions and non-exclusion from them, as well as developing individual participation in the organization, improving the work environment, applying appropriate incentive systems, and building an ideal organizational culture and an effective positive leadership style. (Greenberg and Baron, 2004: 154)

Organizational Support: It means that the employees feel their employer's interest in their level of psychological well-being, appreciation of their creativity and ideas, recognition of their efforts, and confidence in them, in addition to supporting, backing, defending, and assisting them. This makes them grateful and willing to increase the effectiveness of the organization. A study conducted by Al-Salloum and Al-Adayleh (2013) (2013) confirmed that organizational support has a positive effect on employee behavior and on the efficiency of their professional performance. The study of Al-Anzi and Al-Qarni (2018) also revealed a positive correlation with high statistical significance at the level ($\alpha = 0.01$) between the level of organizational support and the level of organizational behavior represented by altruism, courtesy, civilized behavior, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness.

Organizational Culture: It means the matrix of ideals, beliefs, and practices prevailing in the behavior of the organization, as it evolved and was well-established with subsequent times and events until it became the characteristic of the organization. It generated awareness among the members of the organization about the characteristics of its organizational behavior. Studies including the study of Odeh (2010) revealed a positive correlation between organizational culture and organizational behavior represented by altruism, courtesy, civilized behavior, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness.

Productivity Motivation: The present researcher used it to mean the group dynamics that motivate effective performance and increase production efficiency. Perhaps equal opportunity to assume leadership positions is considered an incentive that can develop positive interaction by individuals in organizations. Organizational policies in institutions, which include promotions, employment status, and leadership positions, are among the most motivating factors. (Al-Arifi, 2019)

Institutional Loyalty and Affiliation: It means the feeling that reflects the employee's sense of pride and pleasure in his affiliation with the institution or organization and his loyalty to it as an essential part of it. This results in making the employee enthusiastic to do his best for its success, create competitive advantages for its continued superiority, implement its goals, and achieve its targets in order to ensure its survival and development. (Abu Al-Nasr, 2005: 45)

9.2 Previous Studies

In her doctoral thesis titled "Developing Criteria for Selecting Academic Leaders in Jordanian Public Universities in the Light of the Reality and Contemporary Trends", Khalifa (2007) prepared a tool for collecting the study data in order to determine the criteria that academic leaders (faculty members) must meet. The tool consisted of (53) items divided into five domains: personal, academic, administrative, professional, and technical. Each item represented a criterion for selecting the academic leader in order to achieve the goals of the study that are related to developing criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) in Jordanian public universities. The study population consisted of all academic leaders (faculty members) including the deans and heads of departments in the Jordanian public universities. Of the (405) academic leaders (faculty members) who took part in the study, (90) were deans and (315) were department heads. One of the most remarkable results of the study was that the criteria agreed upon in public universities do not go beyond the following points: seniority, competence, seniority and competence, scientific ranks, and academic training. The results also revealed that there is a disparity in applying the criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) in Jordanian universities, as favoritism and nepotism still play a significant role in the process of selecting the academic leader. The results showed that there is agreement on a set of criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members), the most prominent of which are academic qualifications, seniority,

and merit. The researcher recommended adopting criteria for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) based on objectivity, accuracy, and flexibility. She also suggested conducting more studies on the same topic in other educational institutions due to the importance of the subject.

In a study titled "The Preferred Leadership Qualities of Academic Leaders at Salahaddin University", Othman (2011) revealed that, in order to achieve the goals, set for the success of educational organizations, leadership plays a major role in influencing employee behavior despite their different psychological and social makeup and their diverse desires, goals, motivations, and interests. The study aimed to identify the preferred leadership qualities of academic leaders (faculty members). The research sample was limited to (10) deans and (26) department heads. In order to achieve the goals of the study, the researcher prepared a tool to measure the preferred leadership qualities. The tool consisted of (40) items divided into five basic qualities (awareness, emotions, personal motivation, empathy with others, and social skills). The results of the study revealed that these qualities are present in the deans and heads of departments. The arithmetic averages of all the skills were higher than the hypothetical averages.

Evans, Homer, & Rayner (2013) also conducted a study on university faculty members working at British universities who are elected as academic leaders (faculty members). The study aimed to reveal the beliefs of the voters (non-professorial academics, i.e. teachers and researchers at the university) who elected these leaders to take up academic positions. Then these leaders gave heed to the views of their fellow professors and ignored the views of the non-professorial academics who elected them. The main conclusion was that, while most respondents agreed that professors should provide academic leadership to junior colleagues as mentors or advisors, more than half of the sample reported that they do not receive the help and advice they want or need.

In her PhD thesis, Loomes (2014) argued that Australian universities are in a precarious position, as they face an array of challenges that can affect their sustainability. The purpose of this study was to gain a comprehensive understanding of how Australian universities appoint and select their senior academic leaders (faculty members). Moreover, the study sought to discover whether there are factors affecting this process of recruitment and selection, and if so, what these factors are, and what can be done to address them. A multiple case study methodology was used and a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm was adopted. Ten case studies were selected from (39) Australian universities, and three executive research firms also participated in the study. The multiple case study approach allowed the researcher to explore individual perspectives, activities, processes, and events that comprehensively describe the appointment and selection of senior academic leaders (faculty members), and the results of the study raised concerns in a number of areas regarding this. The results revealed that one of the most surprising points is the universities' fixation with rating high in world research rankings and Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA). However, their main criteria when hiring and selecting top academic leaders (faculty members) are only having a Ph.D. and an outstanding research profile. Whilst there is nothing wrong with a university aspiring to have an exemplary research profile, less attention paid is to quality learning and teaching and leadership when recruiting senior academic leaders (faculty members). This was considered a concern, as Australian universities are facing growing competition for staff and students from within Australia and overseas. Therefore, it is very important that they have effective leaders in place and remain competitive across all facets of higher education, including research, learning and teaching, and the student experience.

In her MA thesis titled "Developing the Skills of Second-Line Leaders and their Role in Enhancing Organizational Loyalty from the Viewpoint of Employees at King Saud University", Al-Arifi (2019) tried to answer the following main question: What is the role of developing the skills of second-line leaders in enhancing organizational loyalty from the viewpoint of employees at King Saud University? The researcher adopted the descriptive approach through using the questionnaire as a tool for collecting data. The original study population consisted of deans and senior officials at King Saud University (second-line leaders) who numbered (495), and a random sample consisting of (217) of them was chosen. The key findings showed that the respondents somewhat approved of the reality of developing the skills of second line leaders at King Saud University. In addition, there were also differences in their responses regarding the dimensions of the level of organizational loyalty which came in the following order (emotional loyalty, normative loyalty, continuous loyalty). The results also revealed that individuals in the study sample see "to some extent" a positive relationship between developing the skills of second-line leaders and enhancing organizational loyalty. The researcher recommended enhancing the work environment so that it becomes stimulating and encouraging for creativity, excellence, competitiveness, participation in decision-making, drawing policies, and developing work in preparing leaders to equip them for leadership at the university.

9.3 Commentary on Previous Studies

The present study agreed with all studies regarding the topic. It agreed with the studies of Khalifa (2007), Othman (2011), and Al-Arifi (2019) in the methodology and tool, and differed in the sample and the objective. It also agreed with the studies of Evans, Homer, & Rayner (2013) in the sample and disagreed with it in the methodology. It differed with the study of Looms (2014) in the methodology, sample, and objective. The current study agreed with the study of Khalifa (2007) in some of its findings and recommendations.

10. Methodology, Tools, and Procedures

10.1 Study Methodology

This study adopted the descriptive analytical approach to describe the reality of the mechanism used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University and its branches and to explain the correlation of this reality to some variables. This approach is suitable for analytical studies and studies on developing mechanisms and methods. The descriptive analytical method is defined as "one of the forms of structured scientific analysis and interpretation used to describe a specific phenomenon or problem, quantify it by collecting data and standardized information about the phenomenon or problem, classifying and analyzing it, and then examining it carefully." (Melhem, 2000, p. 324).

10.2 Research Tools

A questionnaire consisting of two axes, seven domains, and (32) items was used. The aim was to gather the opinions of the study sample, analyze them, and reveal the relationship between the first axis (the reality of the mechanism currently used) and the second axis with all its domains that address the internal and external variables aforementioned in the study questions.

10.3 Study Population

The study population consisted of the (2382) teaching faculty members at the colleges of Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University.

10.4 Study Sample

The number of the respondents whose complete retrieved questionnaires were analyzed reached (300) faculty members, and they represented more than (10%) of the study population, which enabled them to be considered representative of the study population. The following table shows the distribution of the sample among the fixed variables of the study:

Table 1. Frequencies and percentages according to the study variables

	Categories	Frequencies	Percentages
	Teaching Assistant / Lecturer	50	16.7
Academic Rank	Assistant Professor	138	46.0
	Associate Professor	112	37.3
	Less than five years	80	26.7
Academic Experience	Less than ten years	70	23.3
	Ten years or more	150	50.0
	Official	192	64.0
Officiality and Contracting	Contracting party	108	36.0
	Total	300	100.0

10.5 Statistical Tests and Analyzes

10.5.1 Statistical Standard

Likert's three-point scale was adopted to correct the study tools, by giving each item one of its three ratings (Yes –I do not know – No) that are digitally represented by (3, 2, 1) respectively. The following scale was adopted for the purposes of analyzing the results:

Low	Intermediate	High
1.66 -1.00	2.33 -1.67	3.00 -2.34

The scale was calculated using the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{Upper limit of the scale (3) - Lower limit of the scale (1)}}{\text{Number of required categories (3)}} \qquad (1)$$

$$\frac{3-1}{3} = 0.66$$

Then the solution (0.66) was added to the end of each category.

10.5.2 Validity of the Scale Structure

To extract the indicators of the validity of the structure of the scale, the correlation coefficients of the items of the scale with the total score were extracted in an exploratory sample from outside the study sample consisting of (30) faculty members. The items of the scale were analyzed and the correlation coefficient of each item was calculated. The correlation coefficient here represented an indicator of validity with respect to each item in the form of a correlation coefficient between each item and the total score on the one hand, between each item and its relation to the domain to which it belongs, and between each domain and the total score on the other hand. The correlation coefficients of the items with the tool as a whole ranged between (0.60-0.87) and with the domain (0.62-0.90) (Table 13). It should be noted that all correlation coefficients were acceptable and statistically significant, and therefore none of these item was deleted. Also, the correlation coefficient between each domain and the total score and the correlation coefficients between the domains were extracted (Tabel 14). It was shown that all the correlation coefficients were statistically significant, indicating an appropriate degree of validity of structure.

10.5.3 Reliability of the Study Tool

To ensure the reliability of the study tool, the test-retest method was checked by applying the scale, and re-applying it after two weeks to a group outside the study sample consisting of (30) faculty members. The Pearson correlation coefficient was then calculated for their scores both times.

The reliability coefficient was also calculated using the method of internal consistency according to the Cronbach's Alpha formula. Table 2 shows the internal consistency coefficient according to Cronbach's Alpha and the retest reliability for the domains and the tool as a whole. These values were considered appropriate for the purposes of this study.

Table 2. Internal consistency coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha and the reliability of the domains and the overall scores

Domain	Retest Reliability	Internal Consistency
Job Satisfaction	0.91	0.83
Organizational Justice	0.93	0.88
Organizational Culture	0.89	0.89
Organizational Loyalty	0.88	0.76
Organizational Support	0.92	0.72
Productivity Motivation	0.93	0.79
Institutional Loyalty and Affiliation	0.90	0.92
Total scores	0.94	0.96

11. Results of the Study and their Interpretation

The first question: What is the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of their faculty members?

To answer this question, the frequencies and percentages of the methods that are currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities were extracted from the viewpoint of their faculty members, and the table below shows that.

Table 3. Frequencies and percentages of the methods that are currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities were extracted from the viewpoint of their faculty members

Academic Leadership Selection Methods	Frequencies	Percentages
Personal selection which relies on trust and recommendation by leaders and superiors and their advisors	260	86.7
An official announcement with specific criteria available to everyone	30	10.0
Monitoring and follow-up by secret collaborators, whether employees or administrators	10	3.3
Evaluation where the choice is based on excellence in order to offer the vacant leadership positions to distinguished faculty members	0	0
Announcing the available or potential vacant leadership positions without criteria	0	0
Nomination by faculty members in order to compile a database when vacancies are available	0	0
Total	300	100.0

Table 3 shows that personal selection ranked first, with the highest frequency (260) and a percentage of (86.7%), while monitoring and follow-up by secret collaborators, whether employees or administrative, ranked last with a frequency of (10) and a percentage of (3.3%).

The second question: Do the advantages of the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities outweigh its disadvantages, do its disadvantages outweigh its advantages, or are they equal from the viewpoint of faculty members?

To answer this question, the frequencies and percentages of the advantages and disadvantages of the method currently used for selecting academic leaderships at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of their faculty members were extracted, and the table below shows that.

Table 4. Frequencies and percentages of the advantages and disadvantages of the method currently used for selecting academic leaderships at new Saudi universities from the viewpoint of their faculty members

Categories	Frequencies	Percentages
Its advantages outweigh its disadvantages	71	23.7
Its disadvantages outweigh its advantages	169	56.3
Its disadvantages and advantages are equal	60	20.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 4 shows that the item stating that the disadvantages of the method used outweigh its advantages ranked first with the highest frequency (169) and a percentage of (56.3%), while the item stating that its disadvantages and advantages are equal ranked last rank with the lowest frequency (60) and a percentage of (20%).

The third question: Is there a correlation between the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities and some of the following dependent variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional loyalty and affiliation, and the creation of a competitive advantage?

To answer this question, the Pearson correlation coefficient was extracted between the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities and some of the following internal and external variables: job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional loyalty and affiliation, and creating a competitive advantage. Table 5 shows this.

Table 5. Pearson correlation coefficient of the relationship between the methods currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities and job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional loyalty and affiliation, and creating a competitive advantage

Variable	Method currently used
Job Satisfaction	.923)**(
Organizational Justice	.863)**(
Organizational culture	.939)**(
Organizational Commitment	.868)**(
Organizational Support	.856)**(
Productivity Motivation	.850)**(
Institutional loyalty and affiliation	.940)**(

** Statistically significant at the level of significance of (0.01).

Table 5 shows a statistically significant correlation between the method currently used for selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at new Saudi universities and job satisfaction, organizational justice, organizational commitment, organizational development, productivity motivation, institutional loyalty and affiliation, and creating a competitive advantage.

Since the prevailing method for appointing academic leaders (faculty members) at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University is personal selection, when reviewing the arithmetic means in Tabel 13, the present researcher found that this method is related to "the intermediate level" of job performance, organizational justice, organizational culture, organizational support, productive motivation, and institutional loyalty, and "high level" organizational commitment.

The fourth question: Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) in the viewpoint of the study sample about (rejecting / confirming) the correlation due to academic rank, experience, or officiality and contracting?

To answer this question, arithmetic means and standard deviations were extracted from the point of view of the study sample in relation to (rejecting / confirming) the correlation according to the variables of academic rank, experience, and officiality and contracting. To identify the statistical differences between the arithmetic means, a "T" test was used for the effect of officiality and contracting, while a one-way analysis of variance was used for the effect of the academic rank, experience. The Tables below show this.

First: Officiality and contracting

Table 6. Arithmetic means, standard deviations, and "T" test of the effect of officiality and contracting from the point of view of the study sample on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation

	Number	Arithmetic Means	Standard Deviation	T value	Degree of Freedom	Statistical Significance
Officiality	192	1.90	.526	-10.120	298	.000
Contracting Party	108	2.51	.444			

Table 6 shows that there are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between the officiality and contracting, and the differences were in favor of the contracting party.

Second: Academic rank

Table 7. Arithmetic means and standard deviations according to the academic rank variable

Categories	Number	Arithmetic Means	Standard Deviation
Teaching Assistant / Lecturer	50	1.85	.494
Assistant Professor	138	2.26	.455
Associate Professor	112	2.06	.678
Total	300	2.12	.567

Table 7 shows an apparent variance in the arithmetic means and standard deviations from the point of view of the study sample due to the difference in the categories of the academic rank variable. To illustrate the significance of the statistical differences between the arithmetic means, a one-way analysis of variance was used as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. One-way analysis of the effect of the academic rank

Source	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Average of Squares	P-Value	Statistical Significance
Between groups	6.688	2	3.344	10.715	.000
Within groups	92.685	297	.312		
Total	99.372	299			

Table 8 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) due to the effect of the academic rank. To illustrate the statistically significant differences between the arithmetic averages, post hoc comparisons were used according to Scheffé's method as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Post hoc comparisons according to Scheffé's method for the effect of academic rank on the viewpoint of the study sample on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation

	Arithmetic mean	Teaching Assistant / Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor
Teaching assistant / lecturer	1.85			
Assistant Professor	2.26	*.41		
Co-professor	2.06	.21	*.20	

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (α = 0.05).

Table 9 shows that there are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between the assistant professor on one hand and each of the teaching assistant / lecturer and associate professor on the other hand, and the differences were in favor of the assistant professor.

Third: Experience

Table 10. Arithmetic means and standard deviations of the point of view of the study sample on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation according to the experience variable

Categories	Number	Arithmetic Means	Standard Deviation
Less than five years	80	1.81	.506
Less than ten years	70	2.04	.474
Ten years or more	150	2.32	.577
Total	300	2.12	.576

Table 10 shows an apparent variance in the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the study sample's point of view on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation due to the different categories of the experience variable. To illustrate the significance of the statistical differences between the arithmetic means, a one-way analysis of variance was used as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. One-way analysis of the effect of experience on the point of view of the study sample on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation

Source	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Average of Squares	P-Value	Statistical Significance
Between groups	14.057	2	7.028	24.467	.000
Within groups	85.315	297	287		
Total	99.372	299			

Table 11 shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) due to the

effect of experience. To illustrate the statistically significant differences between the arithmetic averages, post hoc comparisons were used according to Scheffé's method as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Post hoc comparisons according to Scheffé's method for the effect of experience on the viewpoint of the study sample on (rejecting / confirming) the correlation

	Arithmetic Means	Less than five years	Less than ten years	Ten years or more
Less than five years	1.81			
Less than ten years	2.04	*.23		
Ten years or more	2.32	*.51	*.28	

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (α = 0.05).

Table 12 shows that there are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between less than five years on one hand and both less than ten years and ten years or more on the other hand. The differences were in favor of both less than ten years and ten years or more. There were also statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between less than ten years and ten years or more, and the differences were in favor of ten years or more.

Table 13. Arithmetic averages and standard deviations

Variable	Items	Arithmetic Means	Standard Deviation
Job Satisfaction	I feel positive toward my work as a result of the style of leadership prevailing there.	1.87	.484
	I am pleased with the homogeneity and positive relationships between colleagues.	2.37	.837
	The policy used by the university for selecting leaders satisfies me.	1.57	.805
	The university relies on indicators and evidence to monitor my academic and professional level.	1.79	.911
	I believe that opportunities for leadership and membership of permanent committees are available according to fair and impartial criteria.	1.50	.715
Organizational Justice	I think the decisions related to appointing leaders are made in an unbiased manner.	1.81	.795
	I find that the administrative decisions are applied to everyone without exception.	1.96	.800
	I see that the right person is in the right place at the university.	1.83	.784
	I believe that the faculty members are distinguished according to the effort made and not according to personal considerations.	1.91	.837
	I find that (democracy) is one of the most prevalent beliefs in work.	1.96	.843
	I believe that the prevailing practice at work is based on equal opportunity.	1.79	.752
Organizational Culture	I think that the dominant characteristic of my employer is providing opportunities to prove oneself.	2.21	.876
	I believe that the university respects the culture of academic quality when selecting leaders.	1.93	.855

Organizational Commitment	I find that the predominant characteristic of university leaders is honesty and credibility in dealing.	2.31	.826
	Thanks to participatory leadership, I am very encouraged to write books and publish scientific research.	2.03	.840
	I develop my leadership skills, knowing that the most deserving will have the opportunity.	2.29	.826
	I always observe office hours, thanks to the prevailing style of leadership.	2.35	.846
	I make sure to participate actively in the sessions of the department council.	2.39	.883
	I seek to participate in decision-making.	2.52	.773
Organizational Support	I feel that my employer is interested in my level of psychological well-being.	2.02	.916
	When I think about the future, I feel that the continuation of the university current policy of appointing its leaders is encouraging.	1.90	.834
	I have difficulty expressing my opinion on the controversial issues at work.	2.09	.794
	I think the university current policy of selecting its leaders generally emphasizes the meanings of organizational citizenship behavior.	2.18	.823
Productivity Motivation	I feel ready to exert extra effort for the university.	2.53	.764
	I think the effort made at the university offers opportunities to run for leadership positions.	2.19	.875
	I strongly wish to participate in any additional committees to serve the university.	2.59	.811
	I do my best to do my academic work (teaching - scientific research - community service).	2.72	.645
Loyalty and Affiliation	I trust the university's ability to achieve a high competitive value.	2.30	.783
	I believe that the university provides an environment that is conducive to creativity, advancement, and continuation of work.	2.26	.861
	I expect the university to build a distinct reputation locally and globally.	2.33	.797
	I think there is a real tendency towards retaining the highly qualified personnel and working to retain them.	2.16	.782
	I find the university keen on paying attention to the professionally competent faculty members so that they can be appointed in the appropriate leadership positions.	2.09	.794

Table 14. Correlation coefficients between the items, the total score, and the domain to which they belong

Item Number	Correlation Coefficient with the Domain	Correlation Coefficient with the Tool	Item Number	Correlation Coefficient with the Domain	Correlation Coefficient with the Tool	Item Number	Correlation Coefficient with the Domain	Correlation Coefficient with the Tool
1	.92(**)	.87(**)	12	.89(**)	.75(**)	23	.77(**)	.70(**)
2	.75(**)	.71(**)	13	.81(**)	.75(**)	24	.84(**)	.75(**)
3	.80(**)	.71(**)	14	.87(**)	.82(**)	25	.72(**)	.64(**)
4	.81(**)	.74(**)	15	.65(**)	.60(**)	26	.79(**)	.60(**)
5	.86(**)	.75(**)	16	.74(**)	.71(**)	27	.69(**)	.64(**)
6	.78(**)	.72(**)	17	.67(**)	.60(**)	28	.79(**)	.74(**)
7	.73(**)	.71(**)	18	.70(**)	.64(**)	29	.88(**)	.73(**)
8	.89(**)	.83(**)	19	.86(**)	.73(**)	30	.87(**)	.82(**)
9	.86(**)	.80(**)	20	.85(**)	.75(**)	31	.76(**)	.71(**)
10	.88(**)	.74(**)	21	.85(**)	.64(**)	32	.77(**)	.73(**)
11	.76(**)	.80(**)	22	.65(**)	.62(**)			

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (0.05).

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (0.01).

Table 15. Correlation coefficients between domains together and the overall score

	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Justice	Organizational Culture	Organizational Commitment	Organizational Support	Productivity Motivation	Total Score	
Job Satisfaction	1							
Organizational Justice	.812(**)	1						
Organizational Culture	.693(**)	.812(**)	1					
Organizational Commitment	.733(**)	.693(**)	.699(**)	1				
Organizational Support	.628(**)	.733(**)	.787(**)	.689(**)	1			
Productivity Motivation	.689(**)	.628(**)	.748(**)	.806(**)	.604(**)	1		
Loyalty and Affiliation	.861(**)	.689(**)	.854(**)	.843(**)	.733(**)	.939(**)	1	1
Total Score	1	.861(**)	.937(**)	.865(**)	.859(**)	.848(**)	.938(**)	

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (0.05).

*Statistically significant at the level of significance of (0.01).

12. Recommendations and Suggestions

The present researcher recommends that Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University and similar new universities would review their policies towards the method of selecting academic leaders (faculty members) and adopt the method that long-established and distinguished universities in Saudi Arabia or in the leading countries in the field of higher education use as a result of their experience. This method is the official announcement that is available to everyone with specific criteria based on objectivity, accuracy, and flexibility, especially since the level of organizational commitment of academics at the university is high and they still hope and wait for opportunities before they are filled with despair and suffer from frustration and job burnout.

It is also recommended that the Ministry of Education would hold conferences and accompanying workshops to address the topic of selecting academic leaders (faculty members) at universities in order to present relevant studies and discuss solutions.

References

Abd al-Majid, Ashraf Abd al-Tawab, & Al-Awfi, Zuhur Samran. (2016). The relationship between organizational justice and the organizational citizenship behavior of female educational supervisors in Tabuk. *Journal of Arab Studies in Education and Psychology,* (80), 329-382.

Abu Al-Nasr, & Medhat Mohamed. (2005). *Building and Supporting Institutional Loyalty among Employees in the Organization*. 1st Ed. Egypt: Itrac for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.

Al Azhar University. (2017). *Academic and Administrative Leaders Selection Criteria*. Available on the university's website through the following link: http: //www.azhar.edu.eg/ …on 30/11/2019

Al-Amiri, Ahmed Salem. (2003). The determinants and effects of organizational citizenship behavior in organizations. *King Abdulaziz University Magazine, 17*(2), 72. https://doi.org/10.4197/Eco.17-2.5

Al-Anzi, Haji Suleiman, & Al-Qarni, Yanallah. (2018). The perceived level of organizational support in secondary schools in Hafar Al-Batin Governorate and its relationship to organizational citizenship behavior among male and female teachers. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies, 1*(3), 49-73. https://doi.org/10.12816/0047957

Al-Arifi, Abeer Hammoud. (2019). *The Development of Second-Line Leaders' Skills and their Role in Enhancing Organizational Loyalty from the Viewpoint of the Employees at King Saud University*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Naif Arab University for Security Sciences. Al Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Jouf University. (2018). *Academic Leaders Selection Criteria*. http://www.ju.edu.sa/fileadmin/Deanship_of_Preparatory_Year_Staff_Regulations_and_Rules_for_Selecting_Academic_Leaders. pdf on 11/30/2019.

Al-Salloum, Mohamed, & Al-Adayleh, Ali. (2013). *The Effect of Perceiving Organizational Support on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Faculty Members at King Saud University*. Published Research. King Saud University House for Publishing, Riyadh.

Al-Thubaity, Khalid bin Awad. (2015). Future trends in scientific research on educational administration. *The Arab Gulf Message, Saudi Arabia, 37*(139), 15-37.

Al-Toukhi, Sami. (2008). *Management by Transparency*. Dar Alnahda Alarabia. Cairo, 1st Ed. p. 12.

Bribeche, Zohra. (2013). *The Role of Intellectual Capital in Achieving a Competitive Advantage for the institution – A Case Study*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Mohamed Khider University. Algeria.

Evans, Linda, Homer, Matthew, & Rayner, Stephen. (2013). Professors as Academic Leaders: The Perspectives of 'the Led'. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41*(5), 674-689. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213488589

Greenberg, Gerald, & Barron, Robert. (2004). *Organizational Behavior Management: Translated by Muhammad Bassiouni Ismail*. Dar Al-Marikh, Saudi Arabia, 1st Ed., p. 154.

Khalifa, & Amna Qasim Muhammad. (2007). *Developing Criteria for Selecting Academic Leaders in Public Jordanian Universities in the Light of the Reality and Contemporary Trends*. (PhD Thesis). Amman Arab University, Jordan.

King Saud University. (2019). *Selection of Deans*. Available through the following link: https: //daleel.ksu.edu.sa/ ... on 1/12/2019.

Loomes, Suasan Lee. (2014). *Recruitment and Selection of Senior Academic Leaders in Australian Universities*. PhD dissertation. (Wollongong: Wollongong University).

Odeh, Abdullah Ali. (2010). The Relationship between Organizational Culture and the Achievement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior by Members of Civil Community Associations. *Publications of the 23rd Scientific Conference on Social Work,* Faculty of Social Work, Helwan University, (7), 480-481.

Othman, Ronak Hameed. (2011). The preferred leadership qualities of academic leaders at Salahuddin University. *Journal of Education,* University of Mosul, ISSN: 1812125X, *18*(50), 329-357.

Suez University. (2017). *Academic Leaders Selection Criteria*. Available on the university's website through the following link: http: //scupharmacy.com/ad ... on 11/30/2019.

Tanta University. (2018). *Academic Leaders Selection Criteria.* Available through the following link: http: //med.tanta.edu.eg/... on 11/30/2019.