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**Abstract**

* Purpose

exploresadministrative, financial, and academic Saudi university a facultyperspective and to identify whether views vary based on positionye

* Design/methodology/approach

The study uses the descriptive-analytical approach and a questionnaire.

* Findings

On average, faculty consider administrative constraints on autonomy as the most restrictive, followed by constraints.However, faculty with over tens’ consider financial constraints as greater obstacles to autonomy.

* Originality
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Universities’ roles have changed significantly in recent decades. In addition to their traditional missions—education, research, and service—new functions have been adopted in response to economic, social, and cultural advances. These dynamics are complex and intertwined because of higher education’s role in social and economic development and international competitiveness (Michavila and Martinez, 2018). Universities are higher education institutions (HEIs) with open systems that are affected by constant changes in the internal and external environments. Globalization and internationalization have significantly influenced universities’ visions and plans; increasingly, they are autonomous institutions seeking to create knowledge, innovate, and achieve teaching excellence at national and international levels (Suriansyah *et al.*, 2019).

Recent issues surrounding governance, trust, and interdependence between HEIs and the state are additional challenges that may pose obstacles to progress. In response, some universities have moved toward greater institutional autonomy to respond to the changing social and economic needs (Nurgaliyeva ***et al****.,* 2018).

Autonomy is crucial for universities, enabling them to control their activities and granting them freedom to establish their own regulations (Stern, 2018). Universities recognize the importance of a structured approach to autonomy. The components of autonomy mutually influence one another; for example, financial autonomy allows institutions to make decisions regarding employees and wages associated with employee autonomy, i.e., employment and job opportunities. This, in turn, helps attract highly skilled faculty, which encourages advanced scientific development and programs (Vorobyova, 2019).

Obstacles to university autonomy include traditional values, outdated academic cultures, political and administrative dominance, and the growing corporatist trend of efficiency and competitiveness (Murawska, 2018). These developments challenge HEI autonomy, thereby inviting interference from the government and other institutions.

The launch of Saudi Vision 2030 led to increasing scientific competition, especially among universities, to provide the best academic services to students and top facilities for scientific research. Thus, universities are seeking autonomy to provide greater academic freedom at the personal, institutional, and professional levels, but are thwarted by various constraints that this study seeks to identify.

**Research Problem**

University autonomy involves governance relations between external stakeholders and universities. More generally, university autonomy is an integral dimension of bureaucratic autonomy, or the ability to translate preferences into reliable actions without external constraints, and, in the case of HEIs, grants discretion in matters deemed important (Maassen et al., 2017).

Despite the autonomy granted to King Saud, King Abdulaziz, and Imam Abdulrahman Faisal Universities, Saudi universities face continuing obstacles to independence. The new system focuses on reducing dependence on state support, including for academic structures and administrative systems. These three HEIs and others are embarking on developing new identities involving establishing creative environments at the academic, financial, administrative, and investment-related levels (Alnaem, 2020).

Universities must give their academic communities more academic, administrative, and financial freedom. For universities to guarantee academic freedom, they require autonomy in their internal affairs without interference from society or the government.

This study poses this research question:: What are the obstacles to Saudi university autonomy from the faculty’s point of view? Do the perceived constraints on HEI autonomy vary by job title and years of experience?

There are a number of reasons why studying the autonomy of universities is important:

- Autonomy allows universities to develop policies and manage resources properly, a key element in higher education quality.

- Autonomy includes the right to determine organizational and administrative structures, priorities, budgets, staff appointments, and student admissions.

- Academic autonomy is not a privilege, but a necessary condition for HEIs to perform their public function of educating and disseminating knowledge.

**Terminology**

*Autonomy*

Autonomy refers to unrestricted decision-making by managers, authorities, and organizations. In a higher education context, the separation of the state from academic institutions improves HEI performance (Agasisti and Shibanova, 2020). Autonomous HEIs freely decide on their internal organization through executive leadership, decision-making bodies, legal entities, and administrative and financial structures, without external interference.

*Administrative Independence*

This is the ability of public institutions to determine their preferences and translate them into actions in their relationship with external actors, i.e., public officials (Bach, 2016). Administrative independence enables HEIs to choose their administrative structures and procedures, develop strategic plans and formulate regulations.

*Financial Stability*

This is the university’s freedom to oversee its financial affairs in pursuing its strategic objectives (EUA, 2021). Financially independent universities establish their own financial rules and regulations and manage their funds independently in alignment with strategic objectives.

*Academic Independence*

This is the ability to decide on academic issues, including student admissions, academic content, quality assurance, degree programs, and language of instruction (EUA, 2021). It gives HEIs the ability to conduct comprehensive academic planning on developing schools, structuring academic disciplines and programs, and ensuring student freedom of expression.

*Obstacles to Autonomy*

These are internal and external processes restricting the university’s ability to achieve administrative, academic, or financial independence.

**Theoretical Framework and Literature Review**

The literature on university autonomy has two main strands: 1) the legal and regulatory tools and practices between the state and HEIs and the related power trade-offs; and 2) the characteristics of higher education governance systems embedded in their social and cultural context.

An important recent development in the first body of literature was the “self-scorecard” by Estermann et al. (2011), which measures and compares European HEIs’ autonomy in four areas—organizational, financial, staffing, and academics—using 24 indicators that measure the relative authority of HEIs vis-à-vis the state to make regulatory decisions and be autonomous.

The second category of literature classifies university autonomy by procedural or substantive autonomy, which is the extent to which the university exercises authority over its administration or must meet the state’s administrative and reporting requirements. This approach assumes a continuum of authority, with state authority and university independence at opposite poles, with authority issues between the government and HEIs becoming a zero-sum game (St. George, 2019).

A study by the Asian Development Bank (2012) found a trade-off between institutional independence and state power. The study posited that independence entails the freedom that HEIs receive from the government and those freedoms the government wishes to grant. This was also highlighted by Salmi (2007) in a paper on independence from the state versus responding to market demands; he concluded that HEIs that escape state control are better able to control their own destinies and benefit from market forces. Studies on the benefits of autonomy for HEI outcomes is echoed in Aghion et al*.* (2010), which found that, all else being equal, U.S. HEIs with greater autonomy, competitiveness, and funding generated more output in terms of patents and publications. The premise of these studies is that HEIs and the state are separate, competing entities, and there are benefits to reducing state interference in higher education (St. George, 2019).

Autonomy has two important components: policy and management. Policy autonomy means independent discretion in policy implementation; management autonomy is the delegation of management functions to facilitate independent decision-making and enable effective behavior (Waluyo, 2018). Any restrictions on HEIs’ independence must be based on educational or legal grounds, such as accreditation requirements or nondiscrimination laws, not on political grounds (Karran, 2020).

University management comprises four styles: 1) self-organization within a framework of social accountability featured in the United States, Canada, England, Australia, the Netherlands, and New Zealand; 2) the transition to self-regulation featured in Finland, Sweden, Singapore, the Philippines, and Nigeria; 3) organizations facing difficulties, including Eastern European and Latin American countries; and 4) sharp centralization and full government regulation, including France, Italy, and Germany in Europe; China and India in Asia; and some African and Arab countries (Al Khatib, 2015).

The Saudi higher education system relies on the government for most of its funding and infrastructure. Recently, however, Saudi Arabia’s business sector has contributed significant money and resources to support research in public universities, including full funding for major *waqf* projects and the appointment of research chairs. Because universities now must generate a significant portion of their research funding, there are increasing demands by universities to make their own decisions regarding funding allocations. To this end, university governance mechanisms must be modified and universities given the opportunity to achieve autonomy (Al-Eisa and Smith, 2013).

King Abdulaziz University was established as the first private HEI in Saudi Arabia in 1967, although it was subsequently converted into a government institution. The true beginning of private higher education was in 1999 with the establishment of Prince Sultan University, followed by eight private universities and 18 private colleges (Al-Eisa and Smith, 2013). The introduction of private universities was a driving force for Saudi higher education reform, as they required autonomy or at least shared governance, although private HEIs have still not achieved autonomy

Saudi Arabian public universities are fully funded and operated by the government, according to the ten-year National Development Plan; thus, the government exercises significant control over them. Students pay no tuition fees, which has given rise to a culture of entitlement.

There are two recent major higher education reforms in Saudi Arabia: the establishment of universities independent of the Ministry of Higher Education and amendments to the new university system. Nonetheless, the transformation of academic and administrative structures has been slow, as university staff remains unchanged since the reform. Respecting employee rights has become an impediment to the new system and to projecting a new identity of independent universities. It creates obstacles and challenges, as the concept of “change” at the core of the drive for independence has come under serious investigation (Alnaem, 2020). There are still many obstacles that prevent Saudi universities from achieving autonomy; this affects their management, and, ultimately, the academic process.

Agasisti and Shibanova (2020) examined the relationship between the institutional autonomy of universities (formal and informal) and their performance and efficiency, using the multiple experimental stages methodology. The researchers first measured the “independence in action” index, then analyzed the data to assess institutional efficiency. Finally, they used a steady impact regression and an effective variable approach to provide strong evidence of the relationship between institutional autonomy, performance, and efficiency. The study showed that formal autonomy does not directly affect university performance efficiency and revealed that informal autonomy is positively correlated with degrees of competence. Moreover, advanced autonomy practices in personnel management can contribute to increased publishing activity and overall institutional efficiency.

St. George (2019) analyzed the relationship between autonomy and quality in universities in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, which relies heavily on the bi-branched neoliberal framework of higher education. The study showed that efforts to achieve autonomy to improve quality should be more precise, and consider the internal dynamics of a unified state structure, the possibilities arising from regional participation, and the lessons learned from neighboring countries on a similar path.

Aithal and Aithal (2019)’s study analyzed the challenges and opportunities universities face and how these challenges can be addressed through autonomy to achieve excellence. It examined general strategies used by universities, especially autonomy, based on a review of private universities’ performance and their rankings. The study also discussed the nature of independence and its implementation in universities for academic, research, and technological innovations, and for cooperation and expansion. It showed that universities’ autonomy contributes to quality improvements of educational services, finances, and scientific research capacities.

Shabani et al. (2019) sought to determine the scope of autonomy in pursuit of transformation and innovation at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, using the mixed exploratory approach. The research strategies included a descriptive survey of ten faculty members selected by target sampling. The study also involved 434 other faculty members, 204 of whom were selected using stratified random sampling.

The data were collected using a questionnaire containing 75 questions. The results showed that academic independence has two dimensions: structural (i.e., organizational, financial, policy-making, and national/regional); and content (i.e., academic/educational, scientific, and technological). The results also stressed the need to support autonomy in universities because of its role in maintaining scientific quality.

Ayan (2018) discussed administrative processes in employment and independence in Turkey’s higher education institutions, using a narrative-descriptive approach to review the educational process’s history and evolution from the late Ottoman Empire to today. The results showed that Turkish universities did not have autonomy in faculty appointments, student enrollment, or administrative decision-making, despite some improvements in the 1960s. Many new universities have been established, but faculty recruitment processes have not been transparent, and university infrastructure has not been considered. The study found that because of university departments’ limited autonomy, these universities did not meet the needs of either faculty or prospective students. Decisions regarding recruitment and enrollment were managed solely by the Higher Education Council, in accordance with governmental decisions.

A study by Maassen et al*.* (2017) examined recent university reforms aimed at supporting the independence of universities. It highlighted the various tensions in fundamental reform ideologies, focusing on the traditional interpretation of university independence in reform logics. The study also provided an analytical framework for studying how autonomy is interpreted and used within universities, showing that universities need to go beyond formal arrangements and analyze practices that help achieve full autonomy.

**Methodology**

This study uses the descriptive-analytical approach, which describes the reality of the object of study, analyzes the results, and reaches conclusions.

The universe of the present study consists of all 3,365 faculty members at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz, Bisha, and Hafr Al Batin Universities.

The sample was collected via a simple random sample method, with 336 faculty members in the second semester of the 2021 academic year. Key variables of the sample are presented in the following tables.

**Table I**

Table I shows that 268 of the study sample participants, 79.8%, are faculty members; 34, 10.1%, have the title Vice Dean; 21, 6.3%, have the job title Department Head, and 13, 3.9%, are Deans.

**Table II**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table II shows that 38.1% of the study sample members have 5–10 years of experience, 38.1% have more than 10 years of experience, and 23.8% have less than 5 years of experience.

*Study Tool*

The researcher used a survey as a tool for collecting data, which was designed considering the relevant literature and based on the study’s objectives. The final version had three parts: 1) an introduction to the study objectives and type of data to be collected, with a guarantee of confidentiality to the participants; 2) preliminary data about job title and years of experience of the research participants; and 3) 41 statements, distributed on one basic axis and three fields.

Table III shows the number and distribution of the survey statements.

**Table III**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

The Likert pentatonic scale was used to obtain the responses of the participants (see Table IV).

**Table IV**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*Study Tool Validity*

 was used to confirm the study tool’s validity.

A preliminary version of the questionnaire was presented to six qualified arbitrators. They assessed the quality of the questionnaire and its suitability for the study objectives. Based on their feedback, the necessary amendments were made, and the final version was produced.

Internal consistency was assessed using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, calculated to determine the degree of correlation between each survey statement and the axis.

**Table V**

|  |
| --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table V shows that the values of the coefficient of correlation of each statement to its axis are positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level and below, indicating internal consistency between the statements and their appropriateness to conduct measurements.

*Study Tool Reliability*

The reliability of the study tool was confirmed using Cronbach’s alpha. Table VI shows the values of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each axis of the survey.

**Table VI**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Tables III–VI show that the general reliability coefficient is high, reaching 0.972.

After confirming the survey validity, reliability, and applicability, 336 surveys were distributed electronically. To achieve the study objectives and analyze the collected data, several statistical methods were employed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The following statistical measures were then calculated: weighted mean, mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, and the Scheffe test.

**Results**

To answer the main research question about obstacles to Saudi university autonomy, the average of each axis was calculated.

**Table VII**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table VII shows that the study participants strongly agreed with the impediments to Saudi university autonomy on average (3.51 out of 5), indicating that the most significant obstacles were administrative (3.58), followed by academic (3.53), and financial (3.43). The faculty identified administrative independence as a fundamental pillar of autonomy.

The current study affirms the findings of Ayan (2018) that universities do not have autonomy regarding student enrollment, faculty recruitment, or administrative decisions, despite positive improvements in the 1960s. Although many new universities were established in Saudi Arabia, the recruitment process of faculty was not transparent, limiting the autonomy of university departments. The current study also agrees with Maassen et al. (2017), who found that universities must go beyond formal arrangements to include practices that help achieve full autonomy.

Regarding the subquestions about , the averages and standard deviations of the responses are presented in Table VIII.

**Table VIII**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table VIII shows that the participants strongly agree regarding administrative impediments to autonomy in Saudi universities, with an average of 3.58 out of 5.00. The most prominent administrative impediments are found in statements 9 (4.12), 7 (3.82), and 6 (3.80), suggesting that ’sTurkish ies overseenthat follows government .

The three lowest-ranking statements regarded restricting university authority refer to determining a university’s identity (research/teaching/technical(, establishing partnerships with local communities, and appointing faculty. Limiting a university’s authority to determine its own identity is related to issues of university diversity in the region where it is located, as well as the government being entitled to make decisions because it provides full funding.

In answer to the second subquestions on financial constraints, the averages and standard deviations of the responses are presented in Table IX below.

**Table IX**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table IX shows that the participants agree significantly, regarding the constraints on financial autonomy, with an average of 3.43 out of 5.00.The most prominent financial constraints are found in statements 10 (3.77), 2 (3.61), and 13 (3.56).

Faculty members are aware of the importance of university financial independence. Universities receive generous funding from the government, which impacts university administration. It is the gateway to interference in university affairs and decision-making. As a result, it is necessary to grant limited licenses. The government should provide supervision and require accountability.

The results of the current study are consistent with those of Aithal and Aithal (2019). Financial independence is a challenge for public universities, while private universities have better chances of improving their financial position and potential for innovation, excellence, and academic quality. Agasisti and Shibanova (2020) also noted the heterogeneity of the criteria by which universities are selected, whereby financial autonomy privileges are granted as envisaged by the Board of Directors. Thus, the key element of informal autonomy is not associated with higher performance or efficiency. Such a link may arise from two points: whether universities are formally independent or not and whether they are accountable for how resources acquired from the private sector are redistributed.

In response to the third subquestions about academic obstacles, the averages and standard deviations of the responses were calculated, with the results presented in Table X.

**Table X**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table X shows that the research participants strongly agree that there are academic constraints on Saudi university autonomy, with an average of 3.53 out of 5.00.

The most prominent academic obstacles are found in statements 3 (4.00), 1 (3.80), and 4 (3.77), all indicating the obstacles to academic independence that prevent achieving academic goals. The results concur with St. George (2019), that efforts to achieve academic autonomy to improve higher education quality should be more precise, taking into account the internal dynamics of the state.

In response to the fourth subquestions regarding whether constraints vary by job title or years of experience, Tables XI and XII present relevant data.

The one-way ANOVA was used to analyze the significance of differences in the responses according to both job title and years of experience variables.

**Table XI**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table XI shows no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level and below in the views of the study participants based on position in the university.

**Table XII**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table XII shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level of significance and below in the study participants’ views ’on administrative and academic constraints based on years of experience. However, there are statistically significant differences at the 0.01 level and below on impediments to financial independence based on years of experience.

To determine the differences between the categories in the years of experience variable, the Scheffe test was used. Table XIII shows0.01 and below participants who had less withover’ experiencebarriers to , those with over’ experience. This is attributable faculty with over’ experience are more familiar are less-experienced faculty

**Table XIII**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Recommendations**

In view of these findings, the following recommendations are made:

\* Amend the university system and its regulations by the Ministry of Education and relevant bodies to support self-regulation and social accountability to enhance autonomy.

\* Delegate university decision-making.

\* Appoint university leaders through free elections.

\* Issue instructions to university leaders to limit centralization and delegate authority.

\* Reduce the high fees of graduate programs; Develop rules for regulating and determining program fees.

\* Increase university powers to benefit from the annual budget surplus allocated by the state.

\* Grant universities freedom to invest in buildings and resources to achieve investment partnerships, including unrestricted signing of contracts with companies.

\* Work on establishing associations involving faculty interests.

\* Work to increase the financial resources allocated to expand graduate programs.

\* Advocate for transparency and clarity in university performance reports and grant access to the reports by the relevant parties.
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