

The Extent to Which Academic Department Heads Apply Good Governance Requirements and Its Relationship to Faculty Job Satisfaction in Jordanian Universities

Khaledah ALkailanee ¹ , Faleh Abu Eid ^{2*} , Abdulmunem Abutabanjah ³ 

¹ Department of Educational Principles and Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, JORDAN.

² Department of Coaching and Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, JORDAN

³ Department of Coaching and Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, JORDAN.

*Corresponding Author: faleh@hu.edu.jo

Citation: ALkailanee, K., Eid, F. B. and Abutabanjah, A. (2025). The Extent to Which Academic Department Heads Apply Good Governance Requirements and Its Relationship to Faculty Job Satisfaction in Jordanian Universities, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(2), 2729-2739. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1996>

Published: November 17, 2025

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to identify the extent to which academic department heads apply good governance requirements and the faculty job satisfaction as well as the relationship between them among Jordanian university faculty members by using a descriptive correlational method. The study instrument consisted of two parts, the first to measure the level of good governance requirements application in (27) items across five areas, while the second part measured faculty job satisfaction in (20) items. the study was conducted during second semester of the 2024/2025 academic year on a sample of (420) faculty members. The results showed the level of good governance requirements implementation by department heads as perceived by faculty members among Jordanian universities was average across all areas. Similarly, the faculty job satisfaction level was average. A positive, statistically significant correlation was found between all areas of good governance and faculty job satisfaction at Jordanian universities. Based on the results, the study recommends establishing external oversight mechanisms to implement good governance in Jordanian universities, encouraging faculty to do more research, and providing the needed financial support for this, which will reflect on the university's position in global rankings. Finally, adopting transparency standards in university administrative processes.

Keywords: Good Governance, Department head, Job Satisfaction, Faculty Member, University

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most important sectors in society and governments pay special attention to it because it's an investment in people's future. Higher education reflects society's progress and helps to keep pace with rapid changes of our time. It's a key to understanding social, cultural, civilizational, and economic requests of reality. Therefore, we had to address the good governance concept. Today, university governance is an essential pillar to positive change in universities through integrity, transparency, and accountability in light of contemporary global trends. (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Shari'ah, 2023).

The significance of universities has increased in the knowledge society and global universities' competitiveness. Many countries began to view establishing world-class universities as a national goal. They play a key role in

economic and social development, enhancing the creation and dissemination of knowledge and technology, and driving economic growth and global competitiveness. They enhance a country's ability to compete in the global market by acquiring, adapting, and creating advanced knowledge. Therefore, world-class universities have responded to the challenges of globalization by achieving world-class academic excellence, which has resulted in universities making a strong strategic push to meet the global competition, aiming to achieve world-class status (Al-Abbad, 2017).

Governance is a modern term that recently received great attention through its use in achieving quality performance and improving the work results of economic institutions. Then, its concept had been adopted by service institutions as an efficiency tool in management. Lately, the university governance concept has emerged due to their contribution in many countries in preparing frameworks capable of improving society in all aspects (Al-Kassar, 2018).

Educational institutions, particularly universities, are among the state institutions with an increasing need for good governance implementation due to their crucial role in shaping the future and providing other institutions with trained human resources capable of leading the work and advancing the country's capabilities. (Al-Ghamdi, 2022).

Governance is based on the existence of an autonomous system for goals and plans the institution aims to achieve with proper use of financial and human resources and balanced distribution of authority and responsibility between management and staff to ensure ultimate decision-making authority is not limited to a single group. It emphasizes giving equal importance to both short- and long-term performance and all affecting dimensions. Thus, the governance role comes in its interest in regulating performance through administrative leadership, which promotes all that helps and achieves the enabling infrastructure that assists effective work. Through adopting principles such as integrity and transparency, which is reflected in performance development (Ibn Al-Shumailan, 2024)

University governance is the process of establishing regulatory mechanisms for university members' performance through implementing transparency, disclosure policies, performance standards, accountability of officials, and engaging stakeholders in operation, evaluation, and decision-making processes.

The good governance for universities involves the application of transparency, participation, and accountability to all university operations, ensuring their integrity through self-monitoring and monitoring by stakeholders and beneficiaries of their services (Hadeya, 2020).

Governance principles are based on the rule of law, transparency, accountability, participation, integrity, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. These can be evaluated through regulations, organizational structure, leadership, strategy, management of resources and partnerships. Also, service delivery, public services, final outputs, and overall results and impacts (Houriya and Al-Owaidi, 2022).

The key principles suited to universities are ensuring a basis for an effective institutional governance framework that encourages transparency, respects the law, and clearly defines the distribution of responsibilities; protecting stakeholders' and property owners' rights; ensuring fair treatment, including the right to participate in decision-making, whether directly or through chosen representatives; accessing redress when rights are violated; and contributing to wealth creation, employment, and financial sustainability. Leadership should have a clear strategic vision and an integrated system of accountability that applies to everyone, including decision makers, while upholding ethical conduct and social responsibility (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Shari'ah, 2023).

Governance has dimensions and components, each performing tasks and characteristics that complement each other to achieve the main goal for different institutions and companies that apply it. The supervisory dimension strengthens and activates the supervisory role of the board of directors over the performance of executive management, faculty, and stakeholders (Al-Haddabi, 2019). The regulatory dimension strengthens and activates regulations, whether internally or externally. Internally, it enhances internal controls and risk management systems, while also addressing regulations and rules governing the institution's work externally (Zaher and Ahmed, 2019). The ethical dimension creates and improves the regulatory environment, including ethical rules, integrity, honesty, and spreading governance culture across departments (Al-Dahdar, 2017). The strategic dimension formulates business, strategic thinking, and looking-forward strategies based on thorough study and information about its performance, as well as studying external and internal factors and their impacts based on comprehensive information and the extent of mutual influence between them (Al-Zamel, 2018). Accountability discloses activities and performance and presents them to shareholders and others who are legally entitled to hold the company or institution accountable (Asiri, 2017).

Good governance practices impact job satisfaction, as they clarify procedures and fairness in dealings, leading to a balanced and motivating work environment.

Job satisfaction refers to the psychological, physiological, and environmental conditions surrounding the employee's relationship with colleagues and supervisors and aligns with their personality. It is also linked to happiness, which leads to high productivity. In contrast, dissatisfaction results in poor adaptation, emotional

imbalance, boredom, discontent, frustration, and resignation. It is highly important to management as it indicates individuals' feelings and attitudes towards their work, which identifies weaknesses and attempts to avoid them, as well as understanding the employee's concerns in order to find progressive and productive solutions to provide quality services. (Ali, Al-Sayed and Al-Zayadi, 2022).

Thus, job satisfaction is a multidimensional phenomenon affecting performance and productivity. It results from the interaction between personal factors, job characteristics, and the work environment. (Labib, Bakr, and Farag, 2023).

The factors influencing job satisfaction can vary. Firstly, personal factors, such as age, experience, education, ambition, and integration with coworkers, lead to adaptation at work (Al-Jassasi, 2020, p. 451). Secondly, work-related factors that are intrinsic and related to the nature of work, such as job information availability, the degree of difficulty, job tasks that align with the employee's abilities and inclinations, and stability, are represented in individual skills, learning opportunities, creativity, duty variety, workload, responsibility, performance pressure, and autonomy. Thirdly, secondary work environment-related factors, such as salary, pay fairness, promotions, working conditions, supervision, appreciation, a sense of the importance of the work done, and company policy (Al-Marri, 2022, 127). Finally, organizational factors related to the institution, such as supervision methods, work procedures, and working hours and breaks. Also, work conditions, nature, and policies through providing health care, a safe work environment, and assistance. (Al-Mubarak and Al-Sheikh, 2022).

Job satisfaction has many positive impacts, and the most important of these are impacts on performance, loyalty, and physical and mental health. Performance refers to the activities and tasks that comprise work, quantitatively and qualitatively. The relationship between satisfaction and performance has been a subject of research and debate, considering that these two are among the most important and effective organizational variables (Al-Harathi, 2019, 387). It also leads to high performance because the more satisfied the employee is, the more productive he is, and vice versa. Thus, performance is a natural and logical result of satisfaction.

There are three accepted dimensions of job satisfaction. First, it is an emotional response to work conditions and cannot be observed but can only be inferred. (Al-Batashi et al., 2023, 486). Second, it's often defined by whether outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For example, employees who feel they work harder than others but receive less compensation may have a negative attitude toward their work, boss, and coworkers and will be dissatisfied. Third, satisfaction represents interrelated attitudes on key aspects of the job, such as the work nature, salary, promotions, supervision, and coworkers (Atiyah, 2022).

Job satisfaction consists of key elements focusing on the mental and physical state of employees. They play a pivotal role in influencing educational policies and incentives provided by the leadership (Abu Arar, 2023). These components encompass several aspects that influence job satisfaction.

One of the most important components of satisfaction is the comfort and acceptance resulting from fulfilling needs provided by the work environment. The more the institution fulfills employees' needs, physical or emotional, the greater their sense of belonging, which improves performance and motivates them to stay in their positions. It also includes the positive feedback resulting from the extent of achieving individuals' goals, which makes them more committed and integrated into the work environment (Al-Omari, 2021). It's a personal judgment of work circumstances, which means that it's possible to improve it through policies and environment (Al-Otaibi, 2020).

Finally, satisfaction level affects performance, productivity, and professional stability, which reflects in the quality of services. Enhancing the quality of work life increases satisfaction, which improves the work environment and the institution. (Al-Azmi, 2022).

A number of researchers have addressed good governance in their studies, including (Asiri, 2017), who found that the governance level (participation, disclosure, and transparency) at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in light of 2030 Vision, as perceived by leadership, was average. Additionally, there are obstacles the university faces in applying governance standards.

(Al-Dahdar, 2017) revealed a weakness in the support of the Ministry of Higher Education in universities in the Gaza Strip and a lack of standards for university governance, and that the implementation of governance principles was average.

(Al-Hamidi's, 2017) concluded that the reality of implementing good governance at Taif University, as perceived by faculty members, was average, while the overall degree of its obstacles was large.

(Al-Zamil, 2018) concluded that the reality of the administrative performance of Saudi university departments based on the governance principles and 2030 vision, as perceived by administrative leaders, was high. (Shatat, 2018) found that the level of practicing governance among heads of departments in Jordanian universities was average. (Al-Kasr, 2018) revealed that implementing governance in Riyadh private universities was high and that there is a relationship between applying programmatic quality standards and activating administrative governance.

(Al-Khatib, 2018) aimed to estimate the degree of good governance standards application in Jordanian universities. It found that legislation, laws, regulations, and instructions ranked first, and decision-making ranked

last. (Al-Haddabi's, 2019) results indicated that the application of governance principles at Sana'a University was low, and it was high at the University of Science and Technology.

(Al-Qahtani's, 2019) concluded that the implementation of governance decisions at Imam Bin Muhammad Islamic University in light of 2030 Vision was high. (Al-Ghamdi's, 2020) showed that implementing governance at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University was average. There are many obstacles related to implementing governance at the university.

(Hadiya, 2020) aimed to propose a vision to improve the impacts of good governance application on Saudi universities' performance. The results showed that the sample completely agreed to the positive impact of it, with accountability being the highest, as perceived by them, as well as a positive impact on research quality. Transparency has the highest impact, as perceived by them, and found a positive impact of community service quality.

(Abu-Lebda, 2021) concluded that academic leaders in Jordanian universities practice a level of good governance that is high, as perceived by faculty members. (Farajallah and Hammadi, 2021) found that Algerian universities lack the necessary activation and supervision to implement governance principles and a weak environment for their implementation. Therefore, the participation in decision-making concept must be activated, leadership must be elected, transparency of transactions, periodic evaluations of administrations, and publishing their results. Also appointing an independent committee to evaluate university governance and measure it periodically, spreading governance culture among faculty and staff, and benefiting from other universities' experiences in the field.

(Houria and Al-Awidi, 2022) showed the application level of governance principles in Jordanian universities was average. Among the assessed areas, regulations, instructions, and independence showed a high level, while accountability, clarity, transparency, and participation were average.

(Al-Ghamdi, 2022) aimed to determine good governance motivations in education faculties at Saudi universities, as perceived by faculty members, determining the level of achievement of good governance principles, quality performance, and the relationship between the two. It showed a positive, statistically significant correlation between the arithmetic means of both. (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Sharia 2023) aimed to identify the level of good governance standards application at Al-Quds University, as perceived by staff, and showed that it was average.

Job satisfaction was of interest to researchers, including (Abu Shaisha, 2020), who found a positive relationship between all work environment elements and job satisfaction among academics. Research has also found that employer-employee relationships are the most important work environment element in Pakistani private business universities. While (Abdel Wahab ,2021) aimed to study the relationship between satisfaction and organizational commitment among professors at the faculty of science in the University of Tlemcen by determining the levels of satisfaction and organizational commitment. It also explored the dimensions of satisfaction and its relationship to overall organizational commitment.

(Al-Otaibi, 2021) showed that the sample members somewhat agreed that there is interest in organizing incentives at the Arab Open University and an interest in human development through training. It was also found that the sample members of workers at the Arab Open University have an average level of satisfaction.

(Al-Mubarik and Al-Sheikh, 2022) showed an increase in satisfaction level among female administrative staff at King Saud State University and Prince Sultan National University. (Attia, 2022) showed that although some dimensions of organizational justice affect satisfaction, they differ in the order of their impact. The most influential is distributive justice, followed by interactional justice, and lastly, procedural justice.

(Misbah, Nasr, and Arhouma, 2022) found a positive correlation and impact between satisfaction elements and organizational citizenship across all dimensions, the highest being material aspects.

(Ali, Al-Sayyid, and Al-Ziyadi, 2022) aimed to assess the satisfaction levels among teaching staff, identify dissatisfaction and resentment causes, and activate the fundamental components of both external and internal job satisfaction, including salary, incentives, personal advancement and self-development opportunities, and working conditions.

(Labib, Bakr, and Faraj, 2023) revealed statistically significant differences between public and private universities in favor of public universities in terms of job security and work relationships. On the other hand, and in favor of privates, there was financial satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, work conditions and procedures, the physical environment, the president and the leadership style, and methods of evaluation.

Research Problem

Department heads represent the most important human elements in the university environment, and they are socially distinguished. They directly contact students and university environment members. Therefore, they must be fully aware of good governance requirements and practice them.

Job satisfaction is an important behavioral phenomenon in institutions, as it is a key aspect of organizational behavior. It deals with the individual's feelings about their job and the work environment. Satisfying the individual's needs aims to achieve a high satisfaction level, which affects work-related behaviors, including productivity.

Faculty members' satisfaction is of high importance, given that professors are required to demonstrate high competence, effectiveness, creativity, and achievement. It has become a primary concern of many universities, and enhancing it is extremely important because it's the key to educational success at the present time, given the ranking competition, whether institutional, academic, or international. Therefore, universities try to gain a competitive advantage through their human element. They must provide various satisfaction means for staff, ensuring their loyalty, competence, and distinguished performance to achieve efficiency.

Through the researcher's review of previous studies addressing good governance and job satisfaction, she recommended conducting a study related to the two variables, such as (Assaf, 2018), (Al-Haddabi, 2019), (Al-Qahtani, 2021), (Al-Ghamdi, 2022), (Houria and Al-Awaidi's, 2022), and (Ibrahim, 2022). She reached the study problem, which revolves around the following questions:

First: To what degree do department heads apply good governance requirements, as perceived by faculty members in Jordanian universities?

Second: What is the job satisfaction level of faculty members in Jordanian public universities?

Third: Is there a correlation between good governance application and the job satisfaction level of faculty members in Jordanian public universities?

Study Significance

The importance of this study comes from its topic and theoretical significance. It enriches academic libraries, supports researchers, and benefits decision-makers. It aims to identify the significance of good governance and its relationship to satisfaction. Practically, it's expected that department heads and faculty will benefit from it to advance departments and colleges in universities.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to a sample of faculty members in Jordanian universities. It was conducted during the second semester of academic year 2023/2024. Results are determined by the seriousness of the sample's answers to the instrument items.

METHODOLOGY

The descriptive correlational method was used as it's the appropriate one to achieve the objectives.

Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all faculty members in Jordanian universities, numbering 4430, representing three universities. One university was chosen from each region of Jordan (Yarmouk University from the Northern Region, the Hashemite University from the Central Region, and Mu'tah University from the Southern Region), according to statistics from the Ministry of Higher Education in the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024. It consisted of 420 members, constituting 10% of the original community.

Study Instrument

The researcher developed a questionnaire composed of two parts: the first measured the degree to which department heads applied good governance requirements based on (Al-Hamidi, 2017), (Al-Qahtani, 2019), (Abu-Lebda, 2021), and (Al-Ghamdi, 2022). The second measured the satisfaction level among faculty based on (Al-Otaibi, 2021), (Ibrahim, 2021), (Labib, Bakr, and Faraj, 2023). The researcher based the development of this tool on the theoretical literature related to the study topic and on measurement tools adopted in previous studies.

The researcher adopted the five-point Likert scale (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) to measure the application degree of good governance requirements and satisfaction level. The rating scale was determined based on the arithmetic mean for each item by subtracting the minimum value from the maximum value, which equals 4, then dividing the difference by 3, so the class width was 1.33. Accordingly, the means were categorized as follows: (1–2.33) low, (2.34–3.67) average, and (3.68–5.00) high.

Instrument Validity

To ensure the instrument's validity, face validity (judgment by experts) and internal consistency methods were adopted. The questionnaire was presented to a group of 10 expert reviewers experienced and specializing in principles of education and educational administration at Jordanian universities. They were asked to assess each item's relevance to its intended construct. They suggested appropriate modifications, which were considered, such

as grammatical adjustments and rephrasing of some items. Consequently, 27 items were reached to assess good governance requirements, distributed over five domains, and 20 items to assess satisfaction levels.

The researcher used Cronbach's alpha coefficient to determine the instrument stability. It was revealed that the value for good governance requirements was 0.97, the transparency and oversight area was 0.90, the participation area was 0.92, continuous improvement was 0.90, the accountability area was 0.91, and the measurement and feedback area was 0.88. For job satisfaction items, the value 0.96 was revealed.

Data was collected after the researcher contacted department heads and faculty members at the selected universities. The sample was informed of the study purpose and data confidentiality, that it is used for research purposes only, and that participation was voluntary. The questionnaire was collected after a two-week application period, followed by statistical analysis using SPSS version 21.

RESULTS

Results of the First Question

The arithmetic means and standard deviations for the application degree of good governance requirements were calculated, as perceived by the study sample for each domain individually and for the domains together.

Table 1. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations Descending Arranged

Number	Rank	Field	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	1	Transparency and Oversight	3.53	0.97	Average
2	2	Participation	3.46	0.97	Average
3	3	Continuous Improvement	3.44	0.97	Average
4	4	Accountability	3.43	0.00	Average
5	5	Measurement and Feedback	3.41	0.97	Average
Overall Mean			3.45	0.95	Average

The above results show the degree to which department heads applied good governance requirements across all domains was average. The overall mean was 3.45 with a standard deviation of 0.95. Transparency and oversight came in first place with a mean of 3.53 and an average degree. Secondly, participation with a 3.46 mean and an average degree. Then, continuous improvement with a mean of 3.44 and an average degree, followed by accountability with a mean of 3.43. Lastly, measurement and feedback, with a mean of 3.41 and an average degree.

That can be explained that the degree to which department heads implement governance was rated as average, which reflects faculty members' perception that all requirements are met and administration is following them, indicating their awareness of its importance in achieving their objectives.

This result is similar to (Asiri 2017), (Al-Ghamdi 2020), (Hour and Al-Awaidi 2022), and (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Shari'ah, 2023), which indicated that the degree of application of good governance in their universities is average. However, they contradict the results of (Al-Hamidi 2017), (Al-Kasr 2018), (Al-Khatib 2018), (Al-Qahtani 2019), and (Abu-Lebda 2021), which indicated a high degree of applying good governance. Also (Al-Hadar 2017), (Al-Haddabi 2019), and (Faraj-Allah and Hammadi 2021), which stated a low degree.

The researcher extracted the means and standard deviations for each item within the domains of good governance requirements.

Transparency and Oversight

Table 2. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations Descending Arranged

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
5	1	Department head applies a precise and clear working mechanism.	3.60	1.07	Average
3	2	Department head informs all faculty with regulations.	3.56	1.05	Average
1	3	Department head instills transparency culture in dealing with all groups and levels.	3.54	1.00	Average
2	3	Department head monitors faculty compliance with laws and regulations.	3.54	1.04	Average
4	5	Department head employs various oversight methods.	3.46	1.07	Average
Overall Mean			3.53	0.97	Average

The above results show that the overall level of transparency and oversight among department heads was average, as perceived by the study sample, with an arithmetic mean of 3.53 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Item

(5), stating, "The department head applies a precise and clear working mechanism," ranked first with an arithmetic mean of 3.60 and an average score, while item (4), stating, "Department head employs various oversight methods," ranked last with an arithmetic average of 3.46 and an average score.

This result can be interpreted to mean that faculty sense that department heads are applying transparency and oversight in an average manner and that they aspire for more. Transparency is also applied precisely and clearly, and the department head follows up on various oversight methods. The results are similar to (Al-Ghamdi 2020), (Hour and Al-Awaidi, 2022), and (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Sharia, 2023).

Participation

Table 3. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations Descendingly Arranged

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
2	1	Department head encourages collaboration to develop the department.	3.56	1.05	Average
1	2	Department head respects opinions in decision-making.	3.48	1.04	Average
4	3	Department head encourages all faculty to participate in decision-making.	3.47	1.02	Average
3	4	Department head develops techniques and tools to facilitate participation.	3.45	1.08	Average
6	5	Department head involves faculty in developing improvement plans.	3.44	1.03	Average
5	6	Department head encourages faculty to express their opinions regarding the department.	3.40	1.06	Average
Overall Mean			3.46	0.970	Average

The above results show the overall level for the participation domain was average as perceived by the study sample, with a mean of 3.46 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Item (2) stating, "department head encourages collaboration to develop the department," ranked first with a mean of 3.56 and an average level. While item (5) stating, "department head encourages faculty to express their opinions regarding the department," ranked last with a mean of 3.40 and an average score.

This result can be interpreted to mean that faculty participation in decision-making didn't meet the required level due to exclusivity in decision-making by department heads to an average level. Results are similar to (Asiri, 2017), (Al-Ghamdi, 2020), and (Hour and Al-Awaidi, 2022).

Continuous Improvement

Table 4. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations Descendingly Arranged

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	1	Department head works on continuous improvement for department work as part of quality requirements.	3.62	1.06	Average
2	2	Department head relies on quality control programs to improve internal quality audit.	3.43	1.03	Average
5	3	Department head provides an information exchange system among quality control programs in the department.	3.42	1.05	Average
4	3	Department head works on continuous improvement to reduce errors in the learning process.	3.42	1.05	Average
3	5	Department head uses quality control programs to accurately detect learning errors.	3.33	1.06	Average
Overall Mean			3.44	0.97	Average

The above results show that the overall level of continuous improvement among department heads was average, as perceived by the study sample, with a mean of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Item (1), stating, "Department head works on continuous improvement for department work as part of quality requirements," ranked first with a mean of 3.62 and an average score, while item (3), stating, "Department head uses quality control programs to accurately detect learning errors," ranked last with a mean of 3.33 and an average score.

These results are similar to (Al-Ghamdi 2020), (Hour and Al-Awidi 2022), and (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Sharia 2023).

Accountability

Table 5. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations Descendingly Arranged

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
3	1	Accountability encourages motivation in work.	3.45	1.07	Average
2	2	Accountability verify commitment levels in the department.	3.44	1.07	Average
1	3	Objective accountability is taken into account in performance.	3.43	1.04	Average
4	4	Accountability helps identify department needs.	3.42	1.07	Average
5	4	Department representatives participate in setting accountability rules at the university level.	3.42	1.08	Average
Overall Mean			3.43	1.00	Average

The above results show the overall level of accountability among department heads was average, as perceived by the study sample, with an overall mean of 3.43 and a standard deviation of 1.00. Item (3), stating, "Accountability encourages motivation in work," ranked first with a mean of 3.45, and the average score for items (4) and (5), stating, "Accountability helps identify department needs" and "Department representatives participate in setting accountability rules at the university level," respectively, ranked last in this field. With a mean of (3.42) and an average score.

This result can be interpreted to mean that faculty have a sense of justice in dealing with each other, which reflects in their commitment to the department and participation in setting accountability rules. This is similar to (Al-Ghamdi 2020), (Houry and Al-Awidi 2022), and (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Sharia 2023).

Measurement and Feedback

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
1	1	Department head measures faculty performance.	3.44	1.03	Average
2	1	Accountability contributes the improvement of educational outcomes.	3.44	1.03	Average
3	3	The adopted measurement methods contribute to improving overall performance.	3.43	1.02	Average
4	3	Department head relies on standardized educational indicators to evaluate performance.	3.43	1.04	Average
5	5	Department head relies on aggregate methods to analyze performance levels.	3.41	1.02	Average
6	6	Department head relies on approved and varied standards to audit performance.	3.34	1.09	Average
Overall Mean			3.41	0.97	Average

The overall results show that the overall level of measurement and feedback was average, as perceived by the study sample, with a mean of 3.41 and a standard deviation of 0.97. Items (1) and (2) stating, "Department head measures faculty performance" and "Accountability contributes the improvement of educational outcomes," respectively, ranked first with an arithmetic average of 3.44 and an average score, while item (6), stating, "Department head relies on approved and varied standards to audit performance," ranked last with a mean of 3.34 and an average score.

This result can be explained by the availability of performance measurement tools, especially electronic evaluation in universities, contributing to improving educational outcomes because the department head relies on aggregate methods to analyze performance and approved and diverse standards in auditing faculty performance. The results of this study are similar to (Houry and Al-Awidi, 2022) and (Harfoush, Shuaibat, and Sharia, 2023).

Results of the Second Question

To answer this question, the arithmetic mean, relative importance, standard deviation, and level of agreement were used for each item under the dimension of job satisfaction, as well as for the overall dimension, according to the sample responses, as shown in Table (7):

Table 7. Descendingly Ranked Arithmetic Means, Standard Deviations, and Degree of Agreement

Number	Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
4	1	The relationship with my colleagues is characterized by mutual respect	3.32	1.08	Average
5	2	Doing my job gives me a sense of achievement and experience.	3.30	1.10	Average

2	3	I am keen to exchange experiences and knowledge with my colleagues.	3.29	1.07	Average
11	4	I feel happy and satisfied while doing my job.	3.28	1.11	Average
18	5	I will be asked before I participate in committees	3.26	1.08	Average
1	6	The credit hours total I teach is appropriate.	3.23	1.07	Average
12	6	The work environment is adequately furnished for the nature of work.	3.23	1.08	Average
6	8	I participate with my colleagues in completing assigned tasks.	3.20	1.06	Average
3	8	I adhere to the office hours announced to students.	3.20	1.09	Average
8	8	There is cooperation among faculty members.	3.20	1.06	Average
13	11	There is respect from superiors for your professional suggestions and opinions.	3.19	1.07	Average
15	11	Department head adopts a discussion-based approach.	3.19	1.09	Average
7	13	Promotion opportunities have clear criteria.	3.18	1.10	Average
9	13	There is fairness in promotions.	3.18	1.12	Average
16	13	Promotions in my job are available and accessible.	3.18	1.08	Average
19	13	My efforts are appreciated by superiors.	3.18	1.09	Average
17	17	There is an information exchange between supervisors and faculty.	3.17	1.10	Average
20	18	My university facilitates attending seminars and conferences.	3.13	1.12	Average
14	19	Superiors' relationship with subordinates is characterized by trust and mutual respect	3.09	1.11	Average
10	20	I receive the necessary financial support for research and studies.	3.03	1.13	Average
Overall Mean			3.20	0.99	Average

The above results show that the job satisfaction level of faculty members in Jordanian universities was average, as perceived by them, with an overall mean of 3.20 and a standard deviation of 0.99. Item (4), stating, "The relationship with my colleagues is characterized by mutual respect," ranked first with a mean of 3.32 and an average score, while item (10), stating, "I receive the necessary financial support for research and studies," ranked last with a mean of 3.03 and an average score.

This result can be explained by the vital role job satisfaction plays in achieving high performance among faculty members. Satisfaction is considered an important behavioral phenomenon in universities, as it addresses feelings about the job and the work environment. Fulfilling individuals' needs achieves a high level of satisfaction among faculty members, which affects many job behaviors, such as productivity, attendance, and overall attitude toward the job and department. This achieves belonging, loyalty, and keenness to contribute towards continuity and achieving desired goals, which are reflected in quality.

This result is similar to (Al-Otaibi, 2021) (Abu Shisha, 2020), (Abdul-Wahhab, 2021), and (Labib, Bakr, and Farah, 2023), while it differed from (Assas, 2021), (Al-Mubarak and Al-Sheikh, 2022), (Attiya, 2022), and (Misbah, Nasr, and Arhouma, 2022).

Results of the Third Question

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to analyze the responses in order to determine the relationship between the implementation level of good governance requirements by department heads and job satisfaction among faculty members in Jordanian public universities. Table (8) presents the results:

Dimension	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
Transparency and Oversight	0.660	0.00
Participation	0.662	0.00
Continuous Improvement	0.659	0.00
Accountability	0.681	0.00
Measurement and Feedback	0.677	0.00
Combined Dimensions	0.688	0.00

The above results indicate a statistically significant positive correlation, as the value of the correlation coefficient reached (R) 0.688.

A statistically significant direct correlation was found between all sub-dimensions and satisfaction level of faculty members in Jordanian universities. All correlation coefficients were close, with the strongest correlation between accountability and satisfaction and the weakest correlation between the participation field and the crisis management.

This result can be explained that the higher the degree of applying good governance requirements, the more this is reflected in the job satisfaction of faculty members. The department head's commitment to involving faculty in transparency and participation in the department's operations reflects satisfaction. Similarly, the more department heads involve faculty in continuous improvement and adhere to accountability, measurement, and feedback, the more faculty members are satisfied.

Based on the study results, the researcher recommends establishing appropriate monitoring mechanisms to implement good governance in Jordanian universities. Also, encouraging faculty members to conduct more research and providing the necessary financial support. This will restore the university's position in global rankings. As well as adopting transparency standards in administrative dealings within the university and spreading good governance culture in universities. Additionally, encouraging competition and creativity among faculty members, allowing the skilled and competent to advance, and actively participating in setting strategic plans for the department, which supports a sense of satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- A. Ibrahim, Job satisfaction in Saudi universities among non-Saudi faculty members: An applied study at Business faculty, Northern Border University, Arab Journal of Administration, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 113–130, 2022.
- A. Ibn Al-Shamailan, "The relationship between good governance and the quality of performance: A field study on the Health Directorate in Hail City, Saudi Arabia," Arab Journal of Administrative Sciences, Kuwait University, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 210–229, 2024.
- A. Abu-Shaisha, "Work environment impact on academic job satisfaction: A case study of private universities in Saudi Arabia," Journal of Contemporary Commercial Research, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 66–88, 2020.
- A. Abu-Arar, "Transcendent leadership and its impact on teachers' job satisfaction from their perspective in the Negev educational area," Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Specific Education – Menoufia University, no. 10, pp. 129–152, 2023.
- S. Abu-Labda, The extent to which academic leaders at Jordanian universities practice the requirements of good governance from the perspective of faculty, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan, 2021.
- M. Al-Batashi, I. Hamza, M. Ibrahim, and A. Othman, "Transformational leadership practiced by school principals' impact on teachers' job satisfaction in Oman," Arab Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, vol. 7, pp. 481–508, 2023.
- B. Al-Jassasi, "Leadership styles of post-basic education school principals in Oman according to the path-goal theory and their relation to teachers' job satisfaction," Arab Studies in Education and Psychology, no. 127, pp. 451–471, 2020.
- A. Al-Harithi, "The degree of implementation of administrative accountability in the schools of Turbah Governorate and its relationship to teachers' job satisfaction," Assiut University Journal of the Faculty of Education, vol. 35, pp. 382–416, 2019.
- D. Al-Hadabi, "The Implementation Level of Governance Principles in Yemeni Universities: A Comparative Study Between Private and Public Universities", Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 31–62, 2019.
- Y. Harfoush, M. Shuibat, and M. Sharia, "The Degree of Applying Good Governance Standards at Al-Quds University from Employees Perspective", Journal of Educational Studies and Research, vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 102–124, 2023.
- A. Houria and H. Al-Oweidi, "Governance Principles Application Level in Jordanian Universities from the Faculty Perspective", Journal of the Association of Arab Universities for Research in Higher Education, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 163–188, 2022.
- A. Al-Khatib, "Good Governance Standards Application Degree Assessment in Jordanian Universities", Journal of the Association of Arab Universities for Research in Higher Education, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 93–118, 2018.
- M. Al-Dahdar, "The Reality of Governance in Palestinian Universities", Islamic University Journal for Economic and Administrative Studies, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 62–88, 2017.
- M. Al-Zamil, "The Reality of Administrative Performance in Academic and Administrative Departments in Saudi Universities based on 2030 Vision", Islamic University Journal for Educational and Psychological Studies, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 223–247, 2018.

- K. Shatat, "The Degree to Which Heads of Academic Departments in Jordanian Universities in Amman Practice Governance from the Faculty Perspective", *Zarqa Journal for Research and Human Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 245–260, 2018.
- N. Shawki, "The Importance of Organizational Development and Its Impact on Achieving Job Satisfaction: A Field Study on Damascus University Employees", *Damascus University Journal for Economic and Political Sciences*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 122–146, 2024.
- H. Al-Azmi, "The Reality of Digital Leadership Implementation in Kuwaiti Secondary Schools and Its Relationship with Satisfaction", *Mansoura University Journal*, no. 120, pp. 579–628, 2022.
- A. Al-Abbad, "A Proposed Model to Enhance the Competitive Capacity of King Saud University Based on Global University Ranking Standards", *International Specialized Educational Journal*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1–22, 2017.
- W. Abdelwahab, "Satisfaction and Its Relationship with Organizational Commitment Among University Professors: A Field Study at Tlemcen University", *Journal of Studies in Human and Social Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 116–139, 2021.
- F. Al-Otaibi, "The Role of Incentives and Training Programs on Satisfaction: An Applied Study on Arab Open University Employees in Saudi Arabia", *Journal of Economic, Administrative, and Legal Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 23, pp. 175–198, 2021.
- K. Asiri, "The Reality of Governance at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University Based on 2030 Vision from the Administrative and Academic Leaders Perspective", unpublished Master's thesis, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia, 2017.
- H. Atiya, "The Role of Organizational Justice in Satisfaction: An Applied Study on Tanta University Administration Employees", unpublished Master's thesis, Tanta University, Egypt, 2022.
- T. Ali, M. El-Sayed, and A. El-Zeyadi, "The Impact of Satisfaction on Faculty Performance: A Field Study in Public and Private Universities", *Scientific Journal of Economics and Commerce*, Ain Shams University, no. 3, pp. 102–127, 2022.
- N. Al-Omari, "Job Satisfaction and Its Relationship with Psychological Loneliness Among Secondary School Female Teachers", *Risalat Al-Khaleej Al-Arabi Journal*, no. 4, pp. 83–104, 2021.
- A. Al-Ghamdi, "The Reality of Implementing Good Governance in Education Faculties in Saudi Universities and Its Relationship with Performance Quality from the Faculty Perspective", *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, Assiut University, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 246–268, 2022.
- A. Al-Ghamdi, "Governance Implementation in the Education Faculty at Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University from the Faculty Perspective", *Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 1–41, 2020.
- A. Faragallah and M. Hammadi, "The Reality of Applying Good Governance in Algerian Universities According to the World Bank's University Governance Checklist", *International Conference 2021 on Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions*, Algeria, pp. 242–249, 2021.
- R. Al-Qahtani, "A Governance Framework for Saudi Universities to Achieve Competitive Advantage in Decision-Making Based on 2030 Vision", *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 15, pp. 51–79, 2019.
- Sh. Al-Kassar, "The Role of Applying Total Quality Standards in Achieving Administrative Governance in Universities: An Applied Study on Private Universities in Riyadh", *Journal of the College of Basic Education for Educational and Human Sciences*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 417–430, 2018.
- L. Labib, M. Bakr, and Y. Farag, "Measuring Job Satisfaction Among Employees in Sports Activity Departments in Both Public and Private Universities", *Journal of Theories and Applications of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, Sadat City University, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 74–98, 2023.
- M. Al-Mubireek and N. Al-Sheikh, "Job Satisfaction Among Female Employees and Its Relationship to Some Demographic and Professional Variables: A Study on Administrative Staff at King Saud University and Prince Sultan University", *Rimah Journal for Research and Studies*, no. 63, pp. 44–68, 2022.
- S. Al-Mari, "The Degree to Which Principals of Basic Education Second-Cycle Schools Practice Strategic Management Skills and Their Relationship to Teachers' Job Satisfaction from Their Perspective", *Educational Sciences Series*, no. 44, pp. 117–130, 2022.
- A. Misbah, A. Nasr, and K. Arhouma, "Job Satisfaction and Its Relationship to Organizational Citizenship Behavior at Al-Zaytouna University", *Al-Zaytouna University Journal*, no. 41, pp. 119–192, 2022.
- A. Mostafa and F. El-Lamie, "A Proposed Strategy for Activating Good Governance Standards in Egyptian Universities: Tanta University as a Model, *The Educational Journal*", Sohag University, no. 95, pp. 162–190, 2022.
- S. Hadiyah, "The Impact of Good Governance on the Quality of Performance in Saudi Universities: A Proposed Vision", *King Khalid University Journal for Educational Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 242–268, 2020.