Extent of Implementing the Total Quality Management Principles by Academic Departments Heads at Najran University from Faculty Members' Perspectives

Hesham Moustafa Kamal Al-Din[*]   Mohamed Mahmoud Abouzid

Deanship of Development and Quality, Najran University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, PO box 1988, Najran city

Abstract

This study aimed to identify the implementing degree of Total Quality Management (TQM) principals by Academic Departmental Heads (ADH) at the Najran University from faculty members' perspectives. It also aimed to determine significant differences between the average estimate of sample section of faculty members about the implementing degree of TQM principles by ADH attributable to the study variables (gender, faculty, and academic rank and experience years). The study sample consists of 200 faculty members. A questionnaire divided into six domains (44 items): (effective leadership, Make decisions based on facts, strategic planning, participation and teamwork, focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary, and the continuous improvement and excellence). The most significant outcome revealed from this study, that the implementing degree of TQM principles was average (68.4%). Results also have shown statistically significant differences at the level (α = 0.05) in the responses of faculty members about assessing the implementing degree of Total Quality Management (TQM) principals by Academic Departmental Heads (ADH) at Najran University according to the study variables (gender, academic rank and experience years). In light of these findings, the study has recommended several recommendations such as Finding a clear functional description for the job of the academic ADH which can explain the tasks and specializations at Najran University.

Keywords: academic departments, academic leaderships, quality of Higher education.

1. Introduction

The Total Quality Management (TQM) in higher education focus on evaluation of educational institution for the purpose of development and improvement, as this is one of the modern methods used in evaluating the institutions generally and the educational institutions particularly. In addition, use the TQM principles and ideas lays the cornerstone of a new philosophical vision of the goals of the university and its mission, raises its staff morale, gives them the opportunity to Self-expression, changing perceptions and attitudes towards their profession, which Giving a productive atmosphere for the educational environment (Al Mosay, 2003).

The academic departments represent the first unit in the organizational structure of the university, where cannot carry out the university's mission and achieve its objectives only through them. It is the real key as seen by (Tuker, 1997) to raise the level of productivity in universities both quantitatively and qualitatively. In addition, through them can control the central university decisions that determine the character of the university. Such as selection of faculty members, identifying the Courses, Setting admission and graduation criteria, assess the relative importance of different activities such as (teaching, scientific research, community service and other). (Rita, W, 1986) confirms that about 80% of the administrative decisions at the university taken at the departmental level. (Martin, 2001) also see that there is no connection between the leadership of the faculty and faculty members only through the academic departments.

Several studies such as (Wu, 2004; Shehaa, 1994; Al Sayed, 2002; Miller, 1999; Mahgoob, 2004) have indicated that, the efficiency of the academic departments and its ability to achieve objectives of the university depends largely on the efficiency of academic and administrative heads. So, the quality and efficiency of the academic department are determined by the capabilities and aptitudes of its head. Generally, he is responsible for the academic department affairs.

On the other hand, many of the studies as (Al Aouda, 2007; Al Zaher, 2005; Lucas, 2006; Oblinger, 1999) confirmed the importance of adopting a policy for developing the abilities of academic departmental heads in the field of management. As many Academic Departmental Heads (ADH) begin their work without prior preparation or management experience. The choice often depends on their skills and years of experience in teaching and research, and it is not enough to manage the academic department administrative affairs. (Noah, 2006; Al Harbe, 2008) confirmed the necessary of providing the organizational environment for departmental heads, which Supports the enhanced continuous process, innovation , and exchange views with the members through discussions and participation in decision making. This is also confirmed by (Lou & Gmelch, 1996) which showed the need to develop the academic departmental head skills like logical thinking, interactive

communication, teamwork, meeting management, and problems' solving.

In light of competition with national and regional universities, Najran University seeks to find a place on the high education map of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In 2012, it signed a contract with the National Commission for Academic Accreditation & Assessment (NCAAA) to start the developmental evaluation project. Which aims to develop the capacity of the university for academic accreditation at the institutional and programmatic levels with regard to quality assurance.

As a result of the above, it became necessary to Najran University in line with the requirements of the academic accreditation project, update its own management methods of implementing the modern systems and typical standards at each administrative level in the university, including of course the management level of the academic departments. Then the researchers found that it is necessary to study the performance management of ADH in Najran University in the light of the extent of implementing the TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members' perspectives.

1.1 Statement of Purpose

The problem of this study is exploring the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members' perspectives. This statement of purpose appears from the researcher's feeling for the need of enhancing the implementation of TQM schools in Saudi universities especially in Najran University.

1.2 Study objectives and Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members' perspectives.

Specifically, the current study seeks to answer the following questions:

- What is the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members' perspectives?
- Are there any statistic-related differences between the Average responses of faculty members to estimate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University depending on the variables related to the independent members of the faculty (gender, academic rank, faculty (scientific, humanity) and Experience)?

1.3 Significance of the study

The importance of this study emerged from its purpose as it seeks to reach several findings benefiting researcher son both practical and scientifically levels. This can be summarized as follows:

1- Scientific importance: The scientific importance of this study is represented from its goal of rooting an important issue regarding TQM related the work of ADH at Najran University.

2- Practical Importance: the practical importance is emerged from the goal of this study which is Exploring the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from the faculty staff points of views.

Study Limitations:

The study is limited to faculty members in Najran University selected randomly in the second semester of the academic year 2014/2015.

1.4 Terminology of the study

- The principles of TQM:

It is a set of management principles that focus on improving quality and if these principles are applied effectively, they inevitably will succeed in achieving an excellent level of quality. The Visions of researchers have varied in determining the principles of TQM, according to (al-Azzawi, 2005) there are seven the principles of TQM is in Strategic Planning, Attribution and support, Participation of workers in operations, Continuous improvement of operations and quality, Practicing and improving, Achieving beneficiary satisfaction and Make decisions based on facts.

And according to viewpoint of (Musleh, 2014) the TQM principles included ten basic principles: Strategic planning, Attribution and support from senior management, Focus on the customer, Continuous improvement of Education and training systems, Teamwork, Make decisions based on facts, The use of statistical techniques in the measurement and development, and Comparison with the best model.

Procedurally the current study agree with the vision of (Maurer, R. 1996) in determining the TQM principles in the six basic principles: effective leadership, decision-making on the basis of facts, strategic planning, participation and teamwork, focus on user satisfaction, and continuous improvement and excellence

The Administrative performance:

According to (Hersey & Blanchard, 1992), administration performance in any organization or association is comprised of several rational functions i.e. planning, organizing, coordinating, evaluating, delegating, controlling and so on. These functions are generally thought identical with leadership and this administrative

leadership is regarded as something to be applied on the association in such a way the organizational goals are more efficiently pursued.

2. Methodology and Procedures
2.1 Methodology:
This section describes the sample of the current study, study tool, validity and reliability procedures. It also presents it the statistic that used in the analysis of data, and extracts the results, this study belongs to a type of descriptive research survey aimed to, analysis, and evaluate of the characteristics of a particular group, or a certain position dominated by the recipe selection.

2.2 Study Sample:
The community of this study consisted of all faculty members at the University of Najran, King Saudi Arabia, the study sample consisted of 200 faculty staff members who were chosen randomly and the following Table 1 represents the number of faculty members by the variables (gender, academic rank, faculty and experience).

2.3 Study Tool:
To achieve the goal of the study, both researchers developed a questionnaire consisted of (44) items in its final form depending on Likert Scale within six domain: (effective leadership, Make decisions based on facts, strategic planning, participation and teamwork, focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary, and the continuous improvement and excellence).

2.4 Instrument Validity:
The questionnaire was verified through being presented to (15) arbitrators with skillful expertise whose directives and suggestions were taken into account.

2.5 Instrument Reliability:
The reliability of the study tool was verified by using the (test-retest) method, as well as the internal consistency by Cronbach's alpha for all items and the tool as a whole (Table 1).

Table (1): Frequency of the sample according to gender, academic rank, faculty and experience.

Variable	Level	Frequency
Gender	Male	110
	Female	90
Academic rank	Research Assistant	31
	lecturer	26
	Assistant Professor	89
	Associate Professor	31
	professor	23
Faculty	Hutments & Arts	96
	scientific	104
Experience	From (1-5) years	79
	From (6-10) years	68
	More than 10 years	53

3.6 Study Variables and statistical Procedures
Data was processed through SPSS software by coding the variables in a clear way as well as recording each variable and its symbol as in the list. Then data were processed in the computer according to the following method: the maximum is 5 alternative for each item: 1 = ¾ levels (high, average, low) = 1.33 and therefore the minimum limit is 1+1.3 = 2.33, the average is 2.34+1.33= 3.67, the highest level = 3.68 +. Therefore, the scale of the items is: (3.68- 5.00 high degrees, 2.34- 3.67 averages, 1.00- 2.33 low).

4. Study Findings & Discussion:
The first question: What is the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members' perspectives?

To answer this question means and standard deviations were calculated to estimate the implementing degree.

Table (2) presents the means and standard deviations for the implementing degree of TQM principals arranged in a Descending order.

Table (2): means and standard deviations for the implementing degree of TQM principals arranged in a Descending order

Rank	no	Domain	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	Level
1	5	focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	3.63	0.54	%72.6	Average
2	6	the continuous improvement and excellence	3.54	0.82	%70.8	Average
3	4	participation and teamwork	3.41	0.45	%69.4	Average
4	1	effective leadership	3.22	0.65	%70	Average
5	3	strategic planning	3.21	0.58	%66.8	Average
6	2	Make decisions based on facts	3.01	0.86	%56.8	Average
		The tool as a whole	3.42	0.512	%68.4	Average

Table (2) showed that the means of the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members perspectives ranged between (3.63 – 3.01). That result indicated to average implementing degree, focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary domain came first with the highest means of (3.63) with an average application degree followed by the continuous improvement and excellence domain with a mean of (3.54) an average application degree. Meanwhile, Make decisions based on facts came in the last rank with a mean of (3.01) and an average application degree.

However, the implementing degree is still in its average level and this can be attributed to the new trends towards applying TQM at Najran university as this concept had appeared only since the last decades and it still needs time to be applied and understood highly by the Najran university leadership.

The Second Question: - Are there any statistic-related differences between the Average responses of faculty members to estimate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University depending on the variables related to the independent members of the faculty (gender, academic rank, faculty (scientific, humanity) and Experience)?

First- gender

Table (3): Means, Standard deviations and t-test for the Average responses of faculty members to estimate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH according to gender.

Domain	Male N=111		Female N=89		T	Sig.
	%	Std. Deviation	%	Std. Deviation		
effective leadership	%46.0	0.873	%32.3	0.339	5.354	.000 *
Make decisions based on facts	%48.3	0.876	%37.1	0.489	3.492	.002 *
strategic planning	%46.0	0.933	%34.7	0.528	3.266	.003 *
participation and teamwork	%45.9	0.956	%34.9	0.489	3.339	.003 *
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	%50.7	0.805	%33.2	0.270	8.036	.000 *
the continuous improvement and excellence	%50.6	0.869	%34.0	0.319	6.716	.000 *
The tool as a whole	%48.0	0.801	%34.2	0.319	5.799	.000 *

Table (3) show statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in responses of faculty members toward the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University due to the gender in favor of male in all areas and in the tool as a whole. The estimates of male were higher than the estimates of the female. This may be due to the nature of this study and privacy in Saudi Arabia where coeducation do not allowed. On the light of that, quality activities at Najran University are effectively implementing by male faculty members compared with female faculty members. Accordingly, the male faculty members more able to evaluate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at university more than female faculty members.

Second - academic rank.

To indicate the statistical significance of differences between the Average responses of faculty members according to academic rank, it was used the test "ANOVA" analysis of variance and the tables 4 illustrate this.

Table (4): Means, Std. Deviation and (ANOVA) due to academic rank variable

Domain	One-Way Anova					
	within group		Between group		F	Sig.
	df	Mean Square	Df	Mean Square		
effective leadership	68	0.337	4	0.470	1.395	.245
Make decisions based on facts	68	0.306	4	1.123	3.671	.009*
strategic planning	68	0.366	4	1.105	3.018	.024*
participation and teamwork	68	0.483	4	1.416	2.931	.027*
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	68	0.523	4	1.325	2.532	.048*
the continuous improvement and excellence	68	0.536	4	2.112	3.943	.006*
The tool as a whole	68	0.291	4	1.127	3.874	.007*

* α = 0.05 (significant)

It is clear from Table 4, there are statistically significant differences at the level (α = 0.05) in responses of faculty members toward the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University. This result attributed to the academic rank in all areas and in the tool as a whole, except the area of "effective leadership". In addition, to indicate the statistically marital differences between the means, it was used LSD test as shown in Table 5.

Table (5): LSD test for the statistically marital differences between the means due to academic rank variable.

Domain	Academic Degree	Mean	Research Assistant	lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	professor
effective leadership	Research Assistant	3.327		0.243	0.164	0.002 *	0.015 *
	lecturer	3.539	0.243		0.879	0.013 *	0.063
	Assistant Professor	3.564	0.164	0.879		0.014 *	0.069
	Associate Professor	4.244	0.002 *	0.013 *	0.014 *		0.884
	professor	4.185	0.015 *	0.063	0.069	0.884	
Make decisions based on facts	Research Assistant	3.033		0.386	0.060	0.006 *	0.031 *
	lecturer	3.205	0.386		0.316	0.025 *	0.082
	Assistant Professor	3.385	0.060	0.316		0.085	0.195
	Associate Professor	3.900	0.006 *	0.025 *	0.085		0.940
	professor	3.867	0.031 *	0.082	0.195	0.940	
strategic planning	Research Assistant	2.806		0.283	0.077	0.095	0.002 *
	lecturer	3.050	0.283		0.512	0.317	0.012 *
	Assistant Professor	3.185	0.077	0.512		0.528	0.023 *
	Associate Professor	3.400	0.095	0.317	0.528		0.136
	professor	4.167	0.002 *	0.012 *	0.023 *	0.136	
participation and teamwork	Research Assistant	2.870		0.059	* 0.008	0.003 *	0.010 *
	lecturer	3.328	0.059		0.479	0.062	0.104
	Assistant Professor	3.481	0.008 *	0.479		0.134	0.188
	Associate Professor	4.022	0.003 *	0.062	0.134		0.923
	professor	4.074	0.010 *	0.104	0.188	0.923	
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	Research Assistant	3.056		0.107	0.092	0.040 *	0.010 *
	lecturer	3.439	0.107		0.975	0.293	0.071
	Assistant Professor	3.432	0.092	0.975		0.272	0.065
	Associate Professor	3.822	0.040 *	0.293	0.272		0.411
	professor	4.259	0.010 *	0.071	0.065	0.411	
the continuous improvement and excellence	Research Assistant	2.972		0.415	0.054	0.020 *	0.013 *
	lecturer	3.144	0.415		0.267	0.064	0.035 *
	Assistant Professor	3.356	0.054	0.267		0.214	0.105
	Associate Professor	3.750	0.020 *	0.064	0.214		0.597
	professor	4.000	0.013 *	0.035 *	0.105	0.597	
The tool as a whole	Research Assistant	3.064		0.143	0.026 *	0.006 *	0.003 *
	lecturer	3.324	0.143		0.477	0.056	0.023 *
	Assistant Professor	3.438	0.026 *	0.477		0.140	0.057
	Associate Professor	3.829	0.006 *	0.065	0.140		0.494
	professor	4.100	0.003 *	0.023 *	0.057	0.494	

It is clear from Table 5 the following:
• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between Research Assistant and professor in favor of professor in the tool as a whole.
• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between Research Assistant and Associate Professor in favor of Associate Professor in the tool as a whole with the exception of the area of "strategic planning".
• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between lecturer and professor and the differences were

in favor of professor in the field of "strategic planning".

• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between lecturer and Associate Professor and the differences were in favor of Associate Professor in the field of "effective leadership".

• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between Research Assistant and Assistant Professor and the differences were in favor of Assistant Professor in the field of "participation and teamwork".

Finally, the result showed statistically significant differences among all levels of academic ranks in favor of the highest academic ranks. This result due to the degree of wide awareness at the side of professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors more than Research Assistants and lecturers about the importance of TQM on quality issues in higher education.

Moreover, they participated in several training courses more than Research Assistants and lecturers in the light of this they are more able to assess the ADH when applying TQM principles in the administrative performance.

Third- Faculty (Scientific, Humanity):

Table (6): Means, Standard deviations and t-test for the Average responses of faculty members to estimate the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH according to faculty (Scientific, Humanity)

Domain	scientific N=94		Hutments & Arts N=106		T	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
effective leadership	3.84	0.59	3.91	0.34	-0.31	0.75
Make decisions based on facts	3.37	0.76	3.31	0.62	0.22	0.82
strategic planning	3.82	0.53	3.87	0.58	-0.34	0.73
participation and teamwork	3.54	0.66	3.56	0.73	-0.14	0.88
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	3.0	0.74	3.09	0.89	-0.38	0.70
the continuous improvement and excellence	3.33	0.68	3.38	0.79	-0.28	0.77
The tool as a whole	3.42	0.61	3.48	0.70	-0.31	0.75

Table 6 shows there are no statistically significant differences at the level (α = 0.05) in responses of faculty members toward the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University according to the faculty in all areas and in the tool as a whole. This result due to that the Regulations and internal policies at Najran University are not vary towards both scientific and humanities faculties. Therefore, there are similarities in the level of the administrative performance of ADH at Najran University from viewpoint of the faculty members.

Fourth - experience

To indicate the statistical significance of differences between the Average responses of faculty members according to experience, it was used the test "ANOVA" analysis of variance and the tables 7 illustrate this.

Table (7): Means, Std. Deviation and (ANOVA) analysis of variance according to the experience variable.

Domain	source	mean	Std. Deviation	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
effective leadership	From (1-5) years	2.93	0.93	Between group	71.623	2	35.812	55.989	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.95	0.72	Within group	120.887	198	0.640		
	More than 10 years	4.35	0.68	Total	192.510	200			
Make decisions based on facts	From (1-5) years	3.11	1.03	Between group	46.223	2	23.111	36.111	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.68	0.65	Within group	119.426	198	0.632		
	More than 10 years	4.01	0.52	Total	165.648	200			
strategic planning	From (1-5) years	3.18	0.93	Between group	27.279	2	13.640	14.867	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.92	0.55	Within group	173.394	198	0.917		
	More than 10 years	4.01	0.52	Total	200.673	200			
participation and teamwork	From (1-5) years	3.18	0.93	Between group	29.278	2	14.639	22.310	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.92	0.55	Within group	124.013	198	0.656		
	More than 10 years	3.98	0.67	Total	153.291	200			
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	From (1-5) years	2.48	0.76	Between group	16.834	2	80417	2.844	0.062
	From (6-10) years	3.47	1.01	Within group	254.777	198	1.384		
	More than 10 years	3.39	0.96	Total	271.611	200			
the continuous improvement and excellence	From (1-5) years	3.01	0.86	Between group	42.254	2	21.127	20.139	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.47	1.01	Within group	198.276	198	1.049		
	More than 10 years	3.39	0.86	Total	240.530	200			
The tool as a whole	From (1-5) years	3.05	0.73	Between group	37.514	2	18.757	36.997	.000*
	From (6-10) years	3.71	0.75	Within group	95.821	198	0.507		
	More than 10 years	3.80	0.67	Total	133.335	200			

It is clear from Table 7 there are statistically significant differences at the level (α = 0.05) in responses of faculty members toward the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University according to experience in all areas and in the tool as a whole, except the areas of "the continuous improvement and excellence". Moreover, to indicate the statistical significance of differences between the means, it was used the Scheffe's posteriori test (multiple comparisons) as shown in Table 8.

Table (8): Scheffe's posteriori test (multiple comparisons).

Domain	Experience (I)		Experience (j)		Mean Difference (I-J)
	Source	Mean	Source	Mean	
effective leadership	From (1-5) years	2.93	From (6-10) years	3.95	-1.02 *
			More than 10 years	4.35	-1.42 *
	From (6-10) years	3.95	More than 10 years	4.35	- 0.4 *
Make decisions based on facts	From (1-5) years	3.11	From (6-10) years	3.68	- 0.57 *
			More than 10 years	4.01	- 0.9 *
	From (6-10) years	3.68	More than 10 years	4.01	- 0.328 *
strategic planning	From (1-5) years	3.18	From (6-10) years	3.92	- 0.74 *
			More than 10 years	4.01	- 0.80 *
	From (6-10) years	3.92	More than 10 years	4.01	-0.06 *
participation and teamwork	From (1-5) years	3.18	From (6-10) years	3.92	- 0.96 *
			More than 10 years	3.98	- 0.80 *
	From (6-10) years	3.92	More than 10 years	3.98	- 0.11 *
focus on the satisfaction of the beneficiary	From (1-5) years	2.48	From (6-10) years	3.47	- 0.99 *
			More than 10 years	3.39	- 0.91 *
	From (6-10) years	3.47	More than 10 years	3.39	0.08
the continuous improvement and excellence	From (1-5) years	3.01	From (6-10) years	3.47	-1.01 *
			More than 10 years	3.39	- 0.91 *
	From (6-10) years	3.47	More than 10 years	3.39	0.08
The tool as a whole	From (1-5) years	3.05	From (6-10) years	3.71	- 0.65 *
			More than 10 years	3.80	- 0.752 *
	From (6-10) years	3.71	More than 10 years	3.80	- 0.09*

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It is clear from Table 8 the following:

• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between (1-5) years and (6-10) years in favor of (6-10) years in the tool as a whole.

• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between (1-5) years and more than 10 years and differences went in favor of more than 10 years in the tool as a whole.

• There are statistically significant differences (α = 0.05) between (6-10) years and more than 10 years and the differences were in favor of more than 10 years in the areas of: effective leadership, Make decisions based on facts, strategic planning, participation and teamwork and the tool as a whole.

• Finally, Table (8) Shows The estimates of faculty members with long experience were higher than the estimates of faculty members with short experience. Researchers due this result to the faculty members with long experience have more aware about the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH. Especially that Najran University began implementing of quality activities since 2006 and Implement its own quality system in 2012, which gave faculty members with long experience extensive knowledge about quality system at university compared with faculty members who participated in the quality activities at university through a short period.

5. Conclusion

- The implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University from faculty members perspectives ranged between (3.63 – 3.01) showing an average implementing degree.
- There are statistically significant differences at the level (α = 0.05) in responses of faculty members toward the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University attributed to the gender in favor of male.
- There are statistically significant differences among all levels of academic ranks in favor of the highest academic ranks.
- There are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) of faculty members responses about the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University according to the faculty (scientific, humanity).
- There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) of faculty members responses about the implementing degree of TQM principals by ADH at Najran University according to experience in favor of the faculty members with long experience.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the researcher recommended:

- Finding a clear functional description for the job of the ADH which can explain the tasks and specializations.
- Assign an administrative assistant to the academic department head.

- Training all ADH at Najran University especially new ones on applying TQM in their Administrative Performance.

References

- Al Aouda, Ibrahim Suleiman Aouda. (2007). Professional development of heads of academic departments in Saudi universities. An unpublished PhD thesis, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al-Azzawi, Mohamed Abd Elatef. (2005). Total Quality Management. Amman: El Yazzawi publishing.
- Al Harbe, Mohamed bin Mohamed. (2008). Creative Management in Higher Education Institutions in Saudi Arabia. An unpublished MA Thesis, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Al Mosay, Naaman. (2003). The development of a tool to measure the overall quality of higher education institutions in management. Educational Magazine, (67), 89.
- Al Sayed, Huda & Mostafa, Omaima. (2002). The training needs of Academic Department Heads at Egyptian universities. Education journal, 5(7), 204-205.
- Al Zaher , Naser Ali. (2005). the development of Academic Department Heads leadership practices in higher education institutions. An unpublished MA Thesis, King Khaled University, Saudi Arabia.
- Hersey & Balanchand. (1992). the management of Organizational Behavior. Academic Leadership, (2).
- Lou Higgerson, Mary & Gmelch, Walter H. (1996). Communication Skills for Department Chairs. Bolton: Anker Publishing Company.
- Lucas, Ann F. (2006). Leading academic change : essential roles for department chairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maerten, N. (2001). The Roles and Responsibilities of Academic Department Heads and Chairpersons in Schools of Education as Perceived by Deans. Journal of Education, 12(2),168.
- Mahgoob, Basman Faysel. (2004). The leading role of the heads of departments in Arab universities. Cairo: Arab Organization for Administrative Development.
- Maurer, R. (1996). Using resistance to build support for change, The Journal of Quality and Participation, 19(3).
- Miller, M. (1999). The Department Chair as Speaker of the House: Shared Authority in the Community College Department. Journal of Research and Practice, (23), 739.
- Musleh, Abd Elateef. (2014). Application of Total Quality Management in the Yemeni Higher Education. Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 7(16),3-49.
- Noah, Houzan Mohamed. (2006). Obstacles to change management with department heads and faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University. An unpublished MA Thesis, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.
- Oblinger, Diana, G & Katz, Richard ,N. (1999). Renewing administration : preparing colleges and universities for the 21st century. Bolton: Anker Pub. Co.
- Rita, W. (1986). College Administrator's Handbook. , Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 30.
- Shehaa, Abdelmeged Abdeltouab. (1994). The efficiency of the academic department head: Study of the views of the teaching staff at Qatar University. Journal of College of Education, (11),17-44.
- Tuker, Allan. (1997). Roles, Powers, and Responsibilities of Chairperson at Florida State Universities, In, Chairing the Academic Department, American Council on Education, , New York: McMillan Publishing Co.
- Wergin, Jon F.& , Bensimon, Estela Mara. (2003). Departments that Work: Building and Sustaining Cultures of Excellence in Academic Programs, Bolton: Anker Publishing Company.
- Wu, X. (2004). How to be an Effective Leader: on Department Chair's Guiding Principles. Academic Leader, 21(2), 168.

First A. Author Dr. Hesham Mostafa Kamal Al-Din, Egypt, Date of Birth 02/10/1969, Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Skills Development Unit in the deanship of development & quality at Najran University-Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, PhD in Arts from Mansoura University - Egypt in 2006. Address: Najran university-Najran city - Kingdome of Saudi Arabia, PO (1988), Postal Code (11001)

Second A. Author Mr. Mohamed Mahmoud Abouzid , Egypt, Birth 10/10/1978 , lecture in the Deanship of Development and Quality at Najran University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Master's degree in Physical Education from Alexandria University-Egypt in 2004 ,Address: Najran university- Najran city - Kingdome of Saudi Arabia