الادراكات والنوقعات لاعضاء هيئة التدريس لجودة الخدمات الإدارية والأكاديمية في الجامعات الاردنية

أ.م.خالدة خالد زيد الكيلاني/ استاذ مشارك .عمر تيسير بطاينة

أ. محمود خالد جرادات

قسم أصول التربية والادارة/ كلية العلوم التربوية

استاذ مشارك .عبد الحميد محمد احمد ابو صيني/ استاذ مساعد.شهناز كايد بريوش

قسم المواد الانسانية المساندة/ كلية الآداب

الباحثة. ايمان محمود المشاقبة/ماجستير إدارة تربوية

الجامعة الهاشمية /الاردن/ الزرقاء

ملخص :

هدف البحث التعرف على درجة الادراكات والتوقعات لجودة الخدمات الإدارية والأكاديمية لدى رؤساء الأقسام في الجامعة الهاشمية من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية، ومعرفة ما إذا كان هناك فروق دالة إحصائيا وفقا لمتغير الكلية. وقد اعتمد المنهج الوصفي بجمع البيانات وتحليلها من عينة عشوائية تكونت من (٢١٥) فردا بنسبة مئوية بلغت (٢٨%) من المجتمع الكلي، من خلال الاستبانة التي تكونت من (٢٦) فقرة موزعة على مجال الخدمات الإدارية ومجال الخدمات الأكاديمية،

وتوصل البحث إلى إن درجة الادراكات لجودة الخدمات الإدارية والأكاديمية لدى رؤساء الأقسام من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية جاءت بدرجة متوسطة، بينما أشارت النتائج إلى أن درجة التوقعات جاءت بدرجة عالية جدا، وعدم وجود فروق دالة إحصائيا بين تقديرات أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية وفقا لمتغير الكلية في تحديد درجة الادراكات والتوقعات. كما أشارت النتائج إلى وجود فجوة واضحة بين الواقع المدرك والتوقعات المأمولة في جودة الخدمات الإدارية والأكاديمية التي يقدمها رؤساء الأقسام من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية.

ويوصي البحث اعتمادا على النتائج إلى رفع مستوى الأداء لرؤساء الأقسام في تقديم الخدمات اللازمة التي تصل إلى طموح أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية وتطلعاتهم ، وقد يكون من الأهمية منح رؤساء الأقسام صلاحيات كافية متوازنة مع المسؤوليات والأدوار التي يقومون بها لتحقيق درجة عالية لنوعية الخدمات في الأقسام الأكاديمية في الجامعة الهاشمية.

كلمات مفتاحية: إدراكات وتوقعات، جودة الخدمات، الجامعة الهاشمية.

Faculty Members' Perceptions and Expectations of the Quality of Administrative Academic Services at Jordanian Universities

Assistant Professor/ Khaledah Kh Alkailanee, kilani@hu.edu.jo
Associate Professor /Omar T. Bataineh, dr.om.bat@hu.edu.jo
Mohmoud Khaled Al- Jaradat, Mohmoudk@hu.edu.jo
Department of Educational foundations and Administration
Faculty of Educational Sciences
Abdalhameed Mohammed Ahmed Abuseeni, a.abuseeni@hu.edu.jo
Shahnaz Kaeyed Ibrawish, shahnazmalo66@gmail.com.
Department of Alied Humanties /Faculty of Arts
Eman Mahmoud AL- Mashaqba. mshaqbayman@gmail.com
Department of Alied Humanties
The Hashemite University/ Jordan/ Zarqa

Abstract

The study aims to determine faculty members' perceptions and expectations of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by heads of departments at the Jordanian universities and whether there are any significant differences based on faculty affiliation. Data was collected from a random sample of 215 faculty members (28% of the population) using a questionnaire with 26 items related to administrative and academic services. The results indicated there are no significant differences based on faculty affiliation in the perceptions and expectations of the department heads' performance. Faculty members' expectations were found to be very high, while the perceptions of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by heads of departments were moderate. Furthermore, there is a noticeable gap between perceptions and expectations of the quality of administrative and academic services. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the effectiveness of department heads be improved to meet the needs and expectations of faculty members. Additionally, department heads should be granted appropriate authority commensurate with their duties and roles to ensure high standards of quality in academic departments at Jordanian universities.

Keywords: perceptions, expectations, quality of services, Jordanian universities

Introduction

Academic departments play a crucial role in the organizational structure of universities. They are responsible for carrying out various processes and making high-quality decisions that impact the university as a whole (Edet & Ekpoh, 2017). In addition to being essential for advancing the university's objectives, academic departments also serve as the foundation of the university's organizational structure (Sharma & Al Sinawi, 2021). The effectiveness of the university's performance is directly tied to the effectiveness of its organizational structure (Gerashchenko, 2022).

The importance of a department in the university's organizational structure is determined by the activation of various administrative and academic dimensions by the department heads (White-Lewis, 2022). They carry multiple administrative and academic burdens and roles, and the quality of services they provide as academic leaders is crucial. This is emphasized by the Jordanian Universities Law No. (18) of 2018, which recognizes the multiplicity of roles and responsibilities of departments.

The head of the department is the individual who holds formal responsibility for overseeing and managing the administrative and academic affairs of the department at the university (Gardner & Ward, 2018). It is the head's duty to translate the institution's goals, objectives, and policies into effective academic practices (Freeman et al., 2020). Through the head, the university can exert control over most of its decisions, including the selection of faculty members, the design of educational programs, the establishment of admission and graduation standards, and the monitoring of various decisions and activities (Butler, 2019; Gardner & Ward, 2018; Weaver et al., 2019).

Apart from his official position, the head of the department is also tasked with teaching and demonstrating personal abilities such as his leadership qualities and competencies in influencing others and improving the level of performance and quality of services offered through his various roles and responsibilities (Freeman et al., 2020). The efficiency and quality of the academic department depend on the head's leadership capabilities and self-preparation as a guide, influencer, and evaluator of performance levels (Morsi & Mustafa, 2011; Rehbock, 2020). The administrative responsibilities of the department head, include managing the department's council meetings, monitoring the affairs of faculty members, supervising the work of scientific committees, creating a productive and positive organizational climate, fostering human relations characterized by cooperation and integration, and establishing efficient communication channels with all department employees (Brinkley-Etzkorn & Lane, 2017; Butler, 2019; Gardner & Ward, 2018; Shoenthal, 2020).

The role of department head has evolved into a complex position that requires both administrative leadership and academic professionalism (Weaver et al., 2019). The duties and responsibilities of department heads fall under two categories: the administrative role and the academic scientific role (Freeman et al., 2020). The department head's responsibilities, include caring for faculty members and their

professional development, students' education, and training, organizing academic activities, creating the department budget, and planning for future human, financial, and material resources (Albashiry et al., 2015; Gardner & Ward, 2018; Shoenthal, 2020; Weaver et al., 2019). The head of the department is also responsible for leading educational programs' development and motivating faculty members (Albashiry et al., 2015; Beikzad et al., 2012). Hendrickson et al. (2013) stressed the department head's role in creating the department's vision and mission, resolving conflicts, leading the development process, and strategic planning. The department head plays an active role in facilitating all work and providing necessary resources for the academic and administrative process, given that their role is based on serving, leading, motivating, and achieving goals. The department head's role is not limited to the duties and powers officially delegated to them but includes being a creative leader who strives for excellence and competitive advantage, a future-focused problem-solver, and a planner who anticipates challenges.

Given the significance of their position, department heads were the focus of numerous research studies. For example, Al-Sisi (2012) investigated the performance of responsibilities by the department heads. Further, Morris and Laipple (2015) studied the department heads' readiness for the job requirements. Furthermore, Gmelch and Buller (2016) investigated the skill development needed for taking on the role of the department head. Cipriano and Riccardi (2016) explored department heads' views regarding their roles and duties. Also, Armstrong and Woloshyn (2017) investigated department heads' perceptions of their roles and the challenges they experience. Another line of research was focusing on department heads' training (Nguyen, 2012; Riley & Russell, 2013; Weaver, et al., 2019). The results of several studies pointed to the lack of sufficient professional development opportunities or formal training and showed that department heads have few opportunities for learning outside of on-the-job training (Brinkley-Etzkorn & Lane, 2019; Gardner & Ward, 2018). Additionally, research highlighted the challenges facing department heads, including globalization, the explosion of knowledge, scientific progress, the communication revolution, swift changes in the labor market's nature, and internal departmental challenges related to academic departments' inputs (Edet & Ekpoh, 2017; Paape et al., 2021).

Most of the above research studies utilized the qualitative or quantitative approach in which data was collected from department heads. The department head's primary responsibility is to interact with professors and administration to inspire them to excel. Mutual trust, creativity, and novel ideas are crucial for fulfilling this responsibility (Shoenthal, 2020). In the current study we argue that faculty members' perceptions and evaluations of the services offered by department heads may differ from those of the department heads themselves, reflecting what is practical and realistic versus what is expected and hoped for. Therefore, the current study aims to explore the gap between the perceived quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads and their expected quality based on the tasks

and roles of department heads at Hashemite University from the perspective of faculty members. This direction of research is concerned with identifying differences between reality and expectations.

Kassim, and colleagues (2013) emphasized the importance of department heads focusing on quality as a means of gaining a competitive advantage in higher education institutions at local and international levels. According to Cerri (2012) academic leaders are under pressure to raise the quality of services offered to faculty and students to obtain a competitive advantage. Therefore, heads must maintain a balance between their dual responsibilities of overseeing faculty affairs and student affairs. They switch back and forth between their teaching and managerial responsibilities to balance the demands of both duties.

It is crucial to investigate faculty members' perceptions and expectations of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads. Understanding these perspectives provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of departmental leadership and the overall satisfaction of faculty members. By exploring their perceptions, we can identify areas of improvement and address any concerns or gaps in administrative and academic services. This investigation allows us to align the expectations and needs of faculty members with the actions and decisions of department heads, fostering a more productive and supportive work environment. Furthermore, it enables us to identify successful practices and implement them across departments, leading to enhanced collaboration, communication, and overall academic excellence. Ultimately, investigating faculty members' perceptions and expectations empowers institutions to make informed decisions and create an environment that supports the professional growth and success of both faculty and students.

Statement of the Problem

Faculty members serve as the backbone of any higher education institution, as they are at the forefront of delivering quality education and shaping the intellectual development of students (Kassim, and colleagues, 2013). Their experiences and interactions with administrative and academic services can significantly impact their overall satisfaction, productivity, and professional growth (Gerashchenko, 2022). Hence, it becomes imperative to understand the disparities that may exist between the perceived quality of services by department heads, who are responsible for overseeing these services and the expectations of the faculty members who directly interact with them.

This research aims to shed light on the gap between the perceptions and expectations of faculty members regarding administrative and academic services provided by the head of the department. By examining this disparity, we can uncover potential areas of improvement and enhance the overall quality of services, leading to a more harmonious and productive academic environment.

Significance of the Study

The current study contributes to the body of knowledge already available in higher education administration. It is crucial for academic institutions and researchers in general and in Jordanian universities to investigate how faculty members perceive and anticipate the quality of the administrative and academic services provided by department chairs. The research offers insightful information that academic institutions in Jordan can use to improve their service delivery, foster stronger collaboration between faculty members and department heads, and ultimately enhance their overall educational experience.

Study Aims and Questions

The research aims to investigate the faculty members' perceptions and expectations of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the faculty members' perceptions of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?
2. Are there significant differences in the perceived quality of administrative and academic services among faculty members based on their faculty?
3. What are the faculty members' expectations regarding the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?
4. Are there significant differences in the expected quality of administrative and academic services among faculty members based on their faculty?
5. Is there a significant gap between the faculty members' perceptions and expectations regarding the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?

Study Terms

The research includes two main terms that are clarified operational definition in accordance with the research requirements and objectives as follows:

Administrative services: Operational definition as the quality of administrative services carried out by the heads of academic departments at the Jordanian universities, which is represented in developing and following up the organizational plans for the work of the department, and facilitating administrative matters related to faculty members and students in accordance with the university's goals and policy, which can be measured through the research tool (questionnaire).

Academic services: Operational definition as a group of academic services carried out by the heads of departments at the university, represented by following up on study plans and setting study schedules in accordance with the needs of students and the capabilities of faculty members, and developing programs and study plans and following them up in accordance with the changes of the times and development requirements, which can be measured through the research tool (questionnaire).

Method

The study employs a quantitative (descriptive) approach, which involves gathering information by using questionnaire (consists of two parts: the quality of administrative services, while the second measures the quality of academic services) forwarded to faculty members at the Jordanian universities and analyzing it to achieve the research objectives and answer the research questions. This approach is the most appropriate for the study's purposes.

Study Population and Sample

The study population consists of all 762 faculty members at the Hashemite University, according to the human resources department's statistics for 2022. A sample of 215 faculty members, selected using a simple random method, represents 28% of the total population.

Study Instrument

A questionnaire was developed based on previous studies conducted by Al-Hujaili (2010), Al-Sawy (2005), Fadel (2011), Morsi (2011), Al-Masry (2007), and Barakat (2010). The questionnaire was used to collect information from the research sample to evaluate the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at the Hashemite University. The questionnaire consists of two parts: the first measures the quality of administrative services and includes 14 items, while the second measures the quality of academic services and includes 13 items. To measure the quality of administrative and academic services for department heads at the Hashemite University, a five-point Likert scale (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) was adopted to determine the rating according to the arithmetic means for each item as follows:

A rating of 1-1.80 represents a very low rating.

A rating of 1.81-2.60 represents a low rating.

A rating of 2.61-3.40 represents a medium rating.

A rating of 3.41-4.20 represents a high rating.

A rating of 4.21-5.00 represents a very high rating.

Instrument Validity

The instrument's validity was ensured using the Face validity method, which involved presenting the statements of the questionnaire to a committee of fifteen arbitrators who are experts in the principles of education and management, consisting of Jordanian university professors. The arbitrators were asked to determine whether the statement corresponds to the characteristic it measures and provide appropriate documentation.

To confirm the Internal Consistency Validity of the questionnaire's statements and fields, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used by administering the questionnaire to a survey sample of 30 faculty members from both within and outside the study sample at the Hashemite University. The results revealed a correlation coefficient for the statements with the corresponding field at the level ($\alpha = 0.01$). For the field of administrative services, the correlation coefficients ranged between

(0.49 - 0.83), while for the field of academic services, they ranged between (0.53 - 0.86). Table (1) presents these findings.

Table 1. Coefficient of internal consistency between the statements of the fields of administrative and academic services.

Administrative services		Academic services	
No.	correlation coefficient	No.	correlation coefficient
1	** 79.0	1	** 69.0
2	** 77.0	2	** 59.0
3	** 49.0	3	** 72.0
4	** 75.0	4	** 53.0
5	** 80.0	5	** 84.0
6	** 58.0	6	** 86.0
7	** 55.0	7	** 72.0
8	** 68.0	8	** 76.0
9	** 83.0	9	** 66.0
10	** 55.0	10	** 50.0
11	** 65.0	11	** 69.0
12	** 71.0	12	** 73.0
13	** 80.0	13	** 61.0

** = (significance at (0.01)

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to calculate the internal consistency validity of the fields and their correlation with the overall instrument. The results of this calculation are: administrative services= 0.78, academic services=0.80. According to the results, all fields assessing both administrative and academic services demonstrated statistical significance at the ($\alpha = 0.01$) level. The consistency coefficients for each field ranged between 0.78-0.80, indicating that the fields of the instrument are valid and accurately measure the intended characteristics.

Instrument Reliability

In order to assess the reliability of the research tool, a sample of (30) faculty members were surveyed, and the degree of reliability of the study instrument was determined using the coefficient of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha). The results of this analysis were: administrative services = 0.85, academic services=0.80, and total=0.86.

Results

1-What is the faculty members' perception of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?

To address the first research question, which is about the perception of faculty members regarding the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at the **Jordanian univers**ities, the study computed the mean and standard deviation of each statement in the field of administrative services, as well as

for the field, based on the responses of the study sample. The results are presented in Table (2), where the statements are arranged in descending order according to their mean scores.

Table 2. The means, arranged in descending order, and the standard deviations of the responses of the study sample to determine the degree of perceptions according to the statements of the field of administrative services.

Number	Order	statement	M	SD	Degree of perception
2	1	Fulfilling the provision of service on time	3.56	1.31	High
13	2	Monitoring the needs of professors in line with the academic programs in the department	3.51	1.25	high
11	3	Provide an effective communication system in the department	3.45	1.25	high
3	4	Solve the problems of various colleagues wisely	3.45	1.18	high
6	5	Adopting the principle of participation in management (planning, organizing, (decision-making)	3.45	1.26	high
4	6	Maintain accurate records and files (information system)	3.43	1.32	high
8	7	Familiarity with colleagues with sufficient information for work and good delivery	3.40	1.32	medium
7	8	Dealing with confidentiality and caution regarding the privacy of colleagues	3.39	1.28	medium
1	9	Regulating the use of classroom	3.38	1.22	medium
12	10	Attention to provide an appropriate learning environment (rooms, equipment)	3.37	1.22	medium
9	11	taking care of and monitoring the professional transactions of colleagues (entertainment, move, transfer).	3.32	1.38	medium
5	12	Immediate response to address department issues	3.29	1.20	medium
10	13	Understand the needs of co-workers and meet them	3.24	1.25	medium
		Total number	3.40	1.19	Medium

Based on Table (2), the perceptions of the study sample regarding the statement estimates of the administrative services field indicate that six statements received a high degree, while seven statements received an average degree. The arithmetic mean, which ranges from 3.24 to 3.56, represents a degree between medium and

high. The overall arithmetic mean for this field, based on the five-year gradient used in the research, is 3.40, which reflects an average score out of five degrees.

Furthermore, based on the responses of the study sample faculty members at the Jordanian universities, the arithmetic means and standard deviations were also extracted to determine the degree of perception for each statement of the academic services field, as well as for the field as a whole. Table (3) illustrates these results.

Table 3. The means, arranged in descending order, and the standard deviations of the responses of the study sample to determine the degree of perceptions according to the items in the field of academic services

Number	order	Statement	M	SD	Degree of perception
13	1	Set the study schedule before the beginning of the study at an appropriate time	3.53	1.30	High
11	2	Balance between theory and practice in academic courses	3.50	1.32	High
12	3	Setting criteria for evaluating students' performance in line with academic programs (Bachelor's, (postgraduate studies	3.46	1.26	High
4	4	Continuously developing course plans and contents	3.45	1.28	High
6	5	Provide colleagues with instructions for scientific research and its changes	3.40	1.25	medium
8	6	Follow-up of students' progress in academic subjects (entrants, graduates)	3.40	1.25	medium
9	7	Provide the opportunity to exchange teaching experiences among colleagues	3.39	1.28	medium
7	8	Provide the opportunity to exchange teaching experiences among colleagues	3.38	1.27	medium
2	9	Presenting lectures at suitable times	3.35	1.31	medium
1	10	Distribution of academic courses according to specializations	3.33	1.20	medium
10	11	Objectively evaluate the teaching performance of colleagues to develop it.	3.31	1.26	medium
3	12	Constantly providing colleagues with changes related to academic subjects	3.28	1.26	medium
5	13	Developing academic programs in the department in accordance with accreditation and development standards at the university	3.27	1.24	medium
		Total number	3.39	1.19	Medium

Based on Table 3, the study sample's evaluations of the statements in the field of academic services revealed four items with high scores, nine with average scores,

and an arithmetic mean ranging from 3.27 to 3.53, representing a combination of the average and high grades. Moreover, the research's five-point scale indicated an overall arithmetic mean of (3.39) for this field, indicating an average score out of (5) degrees. Table 4 presents the descending order of the areas of perceptions of the Jordanian universities department heads' administrative and academic services, along with their corresponding arithmetic means and total percentages.

Table 4. The means and percentages of the study sample's perceptions of the areas of administrative and academic services.

Field order	Fields	mean in terms of degree	Number of statement s	Mean in terms of the response	percenta ge	Degree of perception
1	Administrative services	44.20	13	3.40	% 0.68	medium
2	Academic services	44.07	13	3.39	67.8 %	medium
	Total	88.27	26	3.40	68.0%	medium

Table (4) presents the descending order of the study sample's perceptions of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by the heads of departments at the Jordanian universities, as determined by their arithmetic means. The results indicate that the field of administrative services ranked first, with an arithmetic mean of 3.40 and a percentage of 68.0%, representing an average degree. The field of academic services ranked second, with an arithmetic mean of 3.39. The overall perception of the study sample towards the combined administrative and academic services provided by the heads of departments was of a medium degree, with an arithmetic mean of 3.40 and a percentage of 68.0%, reflecting an average degree.

2-Are there significant differences in the perceived quality of administrative and academic services among faculty members based on their faculty variable?

To determine if there are any significant differences in the perceived quality of administrative and academic services provided by the heads of departments at Jordanian universities based on the faculty variable, the study calculated the arithmetic means and standard deviations. The results are shown in Table (5).

Table 5. The means and the results of the T-test for the responses of the study sample in the degree of perception according to the faculty variable.

Domains	Faculty variable	Numb er	M	SD	(T) value	significan ce level
Administrative services	humanity	107	3.3774	1.18913	0.374	0.708
	scientific	98	3.4403	1.21560		
Academic services	humanity	107	3.3781	1.18394	0.184	0.854
	scientific	98	3.4089	1.21267		

Both domains (perceptions)	humanity	107	3.3778	1.18319	0.280	0.774
	scientific	98	3.4246	1.20765		

The study sample was asked to provide their perceptions of the quality of these services according to their faculty status. The table also includes the results of the T-test. The analysis shows no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α=0.05).

3-What are the faculty members' expectations regarding the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?

Table (6) presents the degree of expectations for each statement related to administrative services and the field in general, as determined by extracting the arithmetic means and standard deviations from the responses of faculty members at the Jordanian universities. The responses were arranged in descending order according to their arithmetic mean.

Table 6. The means, arranged in descending order, and the standard deviations of the responses of the study sample to determine the degree of expectations according to the statements of the field of administrative services.

Number	order	Statement	M	SD	Degree of perception
9	1	Interested in the follow-up and entertainment of colleagues' professional transactions (entertainment, move, transfer).	4.41	1.01	Very high
2	2	Provides service on time	4.40	1.06	Very high
13	3	Monitors the needs of teachers in line with the academic programs in the department	4.34	1.08	Very high
12	4	Works to provide an appropriate learning environment (rooms, equipment)	4.31	1.12	Very high
10	5	Understands and works to meet the needs of colleagues at work	4.29	1.04	Very high
8	6	Ensures that colleagues are informed of sufficient information for work and improves its delivery	4.29	1.04	Very high
7	7	He deals with confidentiality and caution regarding the privacy of colleagues.	4.28	1.12	Very high
4	8	Maintains accurate records and files (information system)	4.26	1.17	Very high
6	9	Adopts the principle of participation in management (planning, organizing, (decision-making)	4.23	1.11	Very high
5	10	Responds promptly to address department issues	4.20	1.18	high
11	11	Provides an effective communication system in the department	4.15	1.22	high

3	12	wisely solves the problems of various colleagues.	4.15	1.19	high
1	13	Regulate the use of classrooms	4.11	1.16	high
		Total number	4.26	1.06	Very high

Table 6 indicates that the study sample's expectations for the administrative services field were very high in nine statements and high in four statements, with an arithmetic mean ranging from 4.11 to 4.41, indicating a degree between high and very high. The overall arithmetic mean for this field, based on the five-year gradient used in the research, was 4.26, which represents a very high degree on a scale of 5 degrees.

Furthermore, Table (7) presents the degree of expectations for each paragraph related to the academic services field and the field in general, as determined by extracting the arithmetic means and standard deviations from the responses of faculty members at the Jordanian universities. The responses were arranged in descending order according to their arithmetic averages.

Table 7. The means, arranged in descending order, and the standard deviations of the responses of the study sample to determine the degree of expectations according to the items in the field of academic services.

Number	order	statement	M	SD	Degree of perception
11	1	Balance between theory and practice in academic courses.	4.38	1.13	Very high
13	2	Sets the study schedule before the beginning of the study at an appropriate time	4.37	1.11	Very high
7	3	Organize exams schedule accurately	4.36	1.05	Very high
1	4	distributes courses according to specializations	4.35	1.04	Very high
8	5	Follows up the progress of students in academic subjects (entrants, graduates)	4.33	1.05	Very high
9	6	Provides the opportunity to exchange teaching experiences among colleagues.	4.32	1.10	Very high
5	7	Develops academic programs in the department in accordance with accreditation and development standards at the university	4.31	1.12	Very high
3	8	Provides colleagues with changes related to academic subjects constantly	4.30	1.11	Very high

4	9	continuously develops study plans and contents	4.28	1.19	Very high
6	10	Provides colleagues with instructions for scientific research and its changes	4.27	1.07	Very high
10	11	Evaluates the teaching performance of colleagues objectively with the aim of developing it.	4.26	1.07	Very high
2	12	ensures that a schedule of lectures is presented at the proper times.	4.21	1.11	Very high
12	13	Sets standards for evaluating students' performance that are compatible with academic programs (Bachelor's, postgraduate studies)	4.20	1.18	Very high
		Total number	4.30	1.05	Very high

Table (7) reveals that all statements related to the field of academic services, except one, were rated as very high by the study sample, with an arithmetic mean ranging from 4.20 to 4.38, indicating a degree between high and very high. The overall arithmetic mean for this field, based on the five-year gradient used in the research, was 4.30, which is considered a very high degree on a scale of 5 degrees.

Additionally, Table (8) displays the arithmetic means and total percentages of the study sample's expectations for the administrative and academic services provided by the heads of departments at the Jordanian universities. The table is arranged in descending order based on the calculations.

Table 8. The arithmetic means and percentages of the degree of expectations of the study sample in the fields of administrative and academic services.

Domain order	domains	means in terms of degree	Number of statements	Means in terms of response	percentage	Degree of expectations
1	Academic services	55.90	13	4.30	% 0.86	Very high
2	Administrative services	55.38	13	4.26	%85.2	Very high
Both domains		111.28	26	4.28	85.6%	Very high

Based on the responses of the study sample, the field of academic services ranked first with an arithmetic mean of 4.30 and a percentage of 86.0%, indicating a very high score. On the other hand, the field of administrative services ranked second with an arithmetic mean of 4.26 and a percentage of 85.2%, which is also considered a very high degree. The expectations for both fields were displayed in descending

order in Table (8), based on the study sample's heads of departments at the Jordanian universities.

4-Are there significant differences in the expected quality of administrative and academic services among faculty members based on their faculty variable?

To examine this, a T-test was conducted on the arithmetic means and standard deviations, and the results are presented in Table (9).

Table 9. The arithmetic means and T-test results of the responses of the study sample, the degree of expectations according to the faculty variable

Fields	Faculty variable	number	M	SD	(T) value	Level of significance
Administrative services	humanity	107	4.2825	99411.		0.854
	scientific	98	4.2551	1.13826	0.184	
Academic services	humanity	107	4.3178	98838.	0.116	0.908
	scientific	98	4.3006	1.12865		
Both fields (Perceptions)	humanity	107	4.3001	99009.	0.150	0.881
	scientific	98	4.2779	1.13260		

Table 9 presents the responses of the study sample regarding their expectations for the quality of administrative and academic services provided by the heads of departments at the Jordanian universities. The table also includes the arithmetic means and the results of the T-test, which indicate that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

5-Is there a significant gap between the faculty members' perceptions and expectations regarding the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads at Jordanian universities?

To answer this question, a paired samples test was conducted, and the results are shown in Table (10).

Table 10. Results of the "T" test for pared samples to determine the gap between faculty members' perceptions and their expectations of the quality of the administrative and academic services of department heads.

Fields	Perceptions		expectations		Gap "difference between means"	T value	Level of significance
	M	SD	M	SD			
Administrative services	3.40	1.19	4.26	1.06	0.86-	10.26-	000.
Academic services	3.39	1.19	4.30	1.05	0.91-	11.15-	000.
Total	3.40	1.19	4.28	1.05	0.88-	10.75-	000.

*at a significance level less than 0.001

Table 10 displays that there exists a statistically significant gap between the expectations and perceptions of the quality of academic and administrative services provided by department heads at the Jordanian universities. This gap is significant at a level of significance less than 0.001, and it favors expectations. The overall value of "t" was 10.75, which is significant at a level of significance less than 0.001, and the gap between perceived and expected averages is statistically significant. Additionally, the results indicate that the gap in the academic services field is greater than the gap in the administrative services field. Furthermore, the study sample's responses demonstrate that there is a noticeable gap between their perceptions and expectations of the quality of services provided.

Discussion of Findings

The results indicate that there is a greater gap between perceptions and expectations in the field of academic services compared to administrative services. This gap is also evident in the study sample's perceptions of service quality. The possible reasons for this include the numerous roles and responsibilities assigned to department heads, which may affect their administrative performance, and the frequent changes in university policies and regulations that could hinder their ability to perform at a high level. This result of study that revealed a greater gap between perceptions and expectations in the field of academic services compared to administrative services, is unique compared to results of literatures like (Weaver et al., 2019.

Furthermore, the study found that there were no significant differences in perceptions of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads among the various faculties in the university. The findings showed that there were high expectations for the quality of services provided by the heads of departments in terms of administrative and academic services, and every department head is aware of the impact of their support on faculty members' performance. The study also revealed a significant gap between perceptions and expectations of the quality of administrative and academic services provided by department heads.

Conclusions, Recommendations

It is recommended that department heads stay up-to-date with administrative and leadership theory to develop their academic management strategies.

Based on the study's significant findings, it is suggested that department heads improve their academic and administrative support for faculty members. This quality is reflected in the university's systems and policies, and it educates everyone who collaborates with them in any department or administrative unit. It may also be necessary to grant department heads a level of authority that matches their responsibilities.

The study recommends that the university administration establish a regular evaluation process for department heads to ensure they meet the expectations of faculty members in terms of administrative and academic services. It is also suggested that the university provide professional development opportunities and training programs for department heads to improve their leadership and administrative skills. In addition, the study suggests that the university administration create a more collaborative work environment among faculty members and department heads. Such collaboration can help build trust and enhance communication, which in turn can contribute to the improvement of service quality. Furthermore, it is recommended that the university provide adequate resources and support for department heads to enhance their ability to provide high-quality services to faculty members. Overall, the study highlights the importance of effective academic and administrative management for the success of faculty members and the university as a whole. It provides valuable insights into the perceptions and expectations of faculty members regarding the quality of services provided by department heads and emphasizes the need for continuous improvement in this area. By implementing the recommendations of the study, the university can improve the quality of its administrative and academic services, which can ultimately contribute to the success of faculty members and the university as a whole.

1. References

1. Albashiry, N. M., Voogt, J. M., & Pieters, J. M. (2015). Curriculum leadership in action: A tale of four community college heads of department leading a curriculum development project. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *40*(5), 401–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1065775

2. Al-Hujaili, Nasr (2010) Views of heads of academic departments at Dhamar University towards their administrative and academic tasks. Damascus University Journal, 2010, 26.

3. Al-Masry, Marwan. (20٠٧). Developing the administrative performance of heads of academic departments in Palestinian universities in light of the principles of total quality management. Unpublished master's thesis, the Islamic University, Gaza.

4. Al-Sawy, Mohamed (2005). Towards standards for the performance of the head of the academic department from the point of view of university professors. The third annual conference of the Egyptian Society for Comparative Education and Educational Administration, 1, 210-227.

5. Al-Sisi, Jamal. (2012). The performance of responsibilities by heads of academic departments at Al-Azhar University and its relationship to the scientific productivity of faculty members. *Contemporary Education Journal*, 68.

6. Armstrong, D. E., & Woloshyn, V. E. (2017). Exploring the tensions and ambiguities of university department chairs. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 47(1), 97-113.

7. Barakat, Muhammad (2010) The gap between perceptions and expectations to measure the quality of services provided by Al-Quds Open University from the point of view of its students. The Palestinian Journal of Distance Education, 2.

8. Beikzad, J., Ranjbarian, R., & Esgandari, K. (2012). *The Relationship between Department Heads' Duties and the Performance of the Academic Staff Members*. http://www.eurojournals.com/ajsr.htm

9. Brinkley-Etzkorn, K. E., & Lane, I. (2017). From the ground up: building a system-wide professional development and support program for academic department chairs. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1389877*, *44*(3), 571–583. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1389877

10. Butler, T. N. (2019). *Leading from the middle: Understanding the leadership role*
    a. ed.gov/? id=ED598796

11. Cerri, Shpëtim. (2012). Assessing the quality of higher education services using

12. a modified servqual scale. Annales.

13. Cipriano, R.E., & Riccardi, R.L. (2016). The Department Chair: A Nine-Year Study. The Department Chair, 27, 16-18.

14. Edet, A. O., & Ekpoh, U. I. (2017). Administrative Challenges of Academic Heads of Department in Tertiary Institutions in Cross River State. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 8(2), 129–135.

https://doi.org/10.5901/MJSS.2017.V8N2P129

15. Fadel, Maha (2011) Management of academic departments in the light of total quality standards and accreditation at Um Al-Qura and King Abdulaziz Universities, unpublished master's thesis, Um Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.

16. Freeman, S., Karkouti, I. M., & Ward, K. (2020). Thriving in the midst of liminality: perspectives from department chairs in the USA. Higher Education, 80(5), 895–911. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00521-6

17. Gardner, S. K., & Ward, K. (2018). Investing in Department Chairs. Change, 50(2), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1483181

18. Gemlech, W.; & Miskin, V. (2011). Department chair leadership skills; Atwood, Madison, WI.

19. Gerashchenko, D. (2022). Academic leadership and university performance: do Russian universities improve when they are led by top researchers? *Higher Education*, *83*(5), 1103–1123. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10734-021-00732-5/METRICS

20. Gmelch, W. H., & Buller, J. L. (2016). Skill Development for Academic Leaders. The Department Chair, 26(4), 25–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/DCH.30082

21. Hendrickson, R., Lane, J., Harris, J., Dorman, R. (2013). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education*; Stylus, Sterling, VA.

22. Kassim, N. M., Bogari, N., Zain, M. (2013). Service Quality of a Public University in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of e-Learning and Higher Education*, Article ID 954273.

23. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, (2018) Jordanian Universities Law - Regulations and Instructions - No. (18) of 2018.

24. Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J. S. (2015). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37(2), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1019125

25. Morsi, Omar and Mustafa, Mohamed (2011). A proposed vision to improve the administrative performance of the heads of scientific departments in the light of the principles of total quality at Assyut University, Journal of Culture and Technology, Academy of Scientific Research, No. 49.

26. Nguyen, Thi Lan Huong (2012). Identifying the Training Needs of Heads of Department in a Newly Established University in Vietnam, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, v34 N 3, p. 309.

27. Paape, J. E., Miller, M. T., Grover, K. S., & Morris, A. A. (٢٠٢١). *Department Chair Training: Priorities, Needs, and Preferences*.

28. Rehbock, S. K. (2020). Academic leadership: Challenges and opportunities for leaders and leadership development in higher education. *Modern Day Challenges in Academia: Time for a Change*, 252–264. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788119191.00025

29. Riley, T., & Russell, C. (2013). Leadership in higher education examining

professional development needs for department chairs. Review of Higher Education and Self- Learning, 6, (21), 38-57.

30. Sharma, S., & Al Sinawi, S. (2021). Organizational Performance Influenced by Academic Service Quality: An Investigation in Public Universities in Malaysia. *Education*

31. *Research International*, *2021*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8408174.

32. Shoenthal, D. (2020). The Dynamics of Communication: Department Chair Responsibilities., PRIMUS,*30*(6), 711–719. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970.2020.1737604

33. Weaver, L. D., Ely, K., Dickson, L., & Dellantonio, J. (2019). The Changing Role of the Department Chair in the Shifting Landscape of Higher Education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *8*(4). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n4p175.

34. White-Lewis, D. K. (2022). White-Lewis / Leadership Role in Faculty Diversity the Role of Administrative and Academic Leadership in Advancing Faculty Diversity. *The Review of Higher Education*, *45*(3), 337–364.