

THE DECENTRALIZED MANAGEMENT STATUS IN THE ASSOCIATE DEANSHIPS AND ITS OBSTACLES FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATORS AT HAIL UNIVERSITY

ALKHAMSAH SALEH SULAIMAN AL-EID

Assistant Professor, Curriculum and teaching methods Department, Faculty of Education at Hail University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study aimed to reveal the Decentralized Management status of the Associate Deanships and its obstacles from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University. The Researcher has used the descriptive analytical approach, as well as the questionnaire study tool was applied on (520) Administrators of the Associate Deanships of Hail University. The study result has showed that the majority of the research sample aged between (30 to 40 years) by more than (44%), the study sample has represented the majority of the Departments Directors. The results have showed that nearly (38%) of the research sample already have Academic Qualifications or equivalent. In contrast, (1.2%) of the study sample are postgraduates, while the majority of the research sample has actual experiences of more than (10 to 20 years), the results has also showed that there is a significant positive correlation between the Decentralized Management and academic Qualification and the job title; this means the higher the academic qualification and the job title, the more there is a decentralization in the Management, however the results did not indicate a statistically significant relationship between the Decentralized Management and both of the age and years of service in the Deanship. The study results has also indicated a tendency of its sample to define the division between the approval and the refusal of the Decentralization of decision-making of the Associate Deanships of Hail University, in regard to the phrases, it is clear that the study sample tendency to the approval of the Deans and the Directors dependence on the research, the study of the views and the proposals submitted by the subordinates, and on their interest in coordination with the other administrative levels to decision-making, as well as on encouraging the Deans and Directors of their subordinates to take the initiative in decision-making, all of these phrases reflect the decentralization of decision- making at the Associate Deanships. In contrast, the study sample was tending to the approval to the other terms that reflect the centralization of decision-making; the phrases include the Deans and the Directors attempts to persuade the subordinates to approve the decision they intend to make, and that the decisions are only issued by the Dean or the Department Director, and that the Dean should be asked before taking any action. The study results have also showed the sample approval of the obstacles to the implementation of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University, where The phrase "the Decentralized Management cause the objective dispersion within the Deanship) was strongly approved, while the phrase (the non-determination of the functional terms) obtained a very poor approval. The most important recommendations concluded by the study are as follows: encouraging the Administrators at universities to contact the Heads directly, leave the matter of the Management to the subordinates, provided that the decisions are to be approved by the Head upon agreement, provide the opportunity for the subordinates to participate in the development of the plans for the Department where they work in, providing an encouraging working environment that contributes to overcoming the obstacles that hinder the Management effectiveness, holding training courses for both sex of Administrators in order to provide them with the Management and decision-making skills that contribute to the development of their confidence, and that decisions are taken from the lower administrative levels may delegate their Authority within the system, and not refer to the Head in the routine administrative works which are not necessary to make a decision, conduct future studies and research on the subject of decentralization and its obstacles in other universities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to reach results that can be circulated.

Keywords: Decentralized Management status, Associate Deanships, Administrators , Hail University.

1. INTRODUCTION

Centralization and decentralization have both a flexible and an interrelated concept at the same time as they are not related to the size of Power but rather to its type, and they are two ways of distributing the administrative activities among the Managing Bodies.

The Centralized Management means the inventory of the duties and the responsibilities, as well as the issuance of the governmental decisions and policies in one point in the institution; this is represented in the regulations, directives and policies issued by the Head. The Centralization Management has two images as follows: (A) the Administration focus: where the Administrative Authority is concentrated in the officials' hands of the institution, where they supervise all the public facilities, whether located in the city or in one of the institution branches in the governorates. (B) Lack of the Administrative focus: here some the institution or branch officials are delegated and not authorized take an action on certain matters without referring to the Head (Al Awaidi, 2002)

While the Decentralized Management means the distribution of duties, responsibilities and functions between the centralized government of the ministry and the Heads of the institutions in the cities and governorates so that those Officials may carry out their duties under the supervision and the control of the centralized government.

The Decentralized Management is based on two components as follows: (A) the independence of the administrative Authorities in the cities and governorates from the Centralized Authorities of the ministry, where it has administrative functions, including the issuance of non-changeable decisions by the Centralized government, (B) the Independence of the decentralized Leaders and staff from the Centralized Government, so that they are appointed in a manner that ensures their independence and not subject to the centralized Management Authority orders (Zahrani, 2001). The process of delegating the Authority to the implementation of the Decentralized Management in the institution means that the Head or the Manager studies the work he performs, thus he keeps the work that he alone can do while distributing the rest of the work to his staff (Farah, 2015).

There is no doubt that the size of the challenges and obstacles facing the type of administration in the Arab universities is increasing from time to time, which has made the universities think about what they will do to meet these challenges and obstacles through the implementation of many scientific researches that are searching for the Management status in the universities and the obstacles to implement one of the Management types in order to reveal one of the comprehensive development requirements (Tiger, 2001).

In fact, the core of the comprehensive development in the universities begins with the search for the extent success of its Management practices; and the disclosure of the implementation of the Decentralized Management; hence, we find out that the university is able to complete its basic features and characteristics through its Management Policy (Junco, 2012).

The larger the size of the organization measured by the number of its staff, the more complex the decision- making process, which requires a longer time for the study and analysis, which increases the burden on the Managers of the senior levels, and then the delegation, becomes necessary and the Decentralized Management becomes an urgent need. Increasing the size of the organization leads to the increase of the necessity and the importance of adopting Decentralization in Management (Al-Otaibi, 1996).

The universities are exerting many continuous efforts in training and qualifying the Administrators in their Deanships, to enable them to acquire the managerial skills that allow them to exercise their Authorization properly (Metcalf, 2009).

Thus, this current Research aspires to reveal the Decentralized Management status and its obstacles of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University.

1.1 The Study Problem Statement and its questions:

Universities aspire to prepare their staff properly, as they are considered a keystone in the development, growth and progress. The Researcher has noted the urgent need to implement the Decentralization Management and its impact on the functioning of the institutions efficiently.

Despite the increasing interest of the universities in preparing their staff and developing their Managerial skills, however this level is less quality and efficiency than should be during the scientific progress and cognitive explosion era; as a result of the obstacles that hinder the Decentralized Management of the institutions and systems.

Therefore, the current study attempts to reveal the Decentralized Management status and its obstacles of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University.

Based on the mentioned above, the problem of the study has been crystallized in the main question as follows:

What is the status of the Decentralized Management and its obstacles in the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University?

The following sub-questions ramified from this question as follows:

- 1) What is the administrative method (Centralization, Decentralization) used in the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University?
- 2) What are the obstacles to implement the Decentralized Management in the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University?
- 3) What is the relationship between the implementation of the Decentralized Management in the Associate Deanships with the personal variables of the Administrators at the Hail University?

1.2 The Objectives and the Importance of the Study:

The objectives of the study are represented in its attempt to identify the followings:

- 1) Determining the actual status of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University.
- 2) Defining the obstacles of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University, in order to find the appropriate methods to meet them.
- 3) Reveal the relationship between the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships and the personal variables of the Administrators at Hail University.

While, the importance of the current study represented by the following:

1. It helps to highlight the status of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University
2. It helps the development of the actual status of the Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University
3. Reveals the obstacles of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University, in order to find the appropriate methods to meet them
4. Helps the Officials, the Teaching Staff and Employees at Hail University in reducing the obstacles and creating a proper Management environment

5. It is considered the unique study - within the limits of the Researcher knowledge - that dealt with the status of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University and its obstacles.

1.3 Research Limits:

The study is defined as:

The Time Limit: The researcher has applied the research tool in the second Semester of the Academic year 1437/1438 AH

The Location Limit: The Associate Deanships of Hail University, which are (5), Deanships as follows: Deanships of Student Affairs, Admission and Registration, Libraries, Quality and Development, Graduate Studies, Community Service and Continuing Education.

The Human Limit: All Administrators of the Associate Deanships of Hail University.

The Objective Limit: The status of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University and its obstacles.

1.4 Research Terminologies:

The Decentralized Management: means the distribution rate of Power at the Deanship levels, the more the delegation of the Power, the more decentralization in the Deanship and vice versa.

The Researcher defines the Decentralized Management procedurally as: The total score obtained by the Administrator in the questionnaire consists of (14) items, while the scores range from (14 to 70).

Obstacles: are the factors that hinder the implementation of the Centralized Management of the Associate Deanships of Hail University.

The Researcher defines the Obstacles procedurally as: The total score obtained by the Administrator in the questionnaire consists (11) item, while the scores range from (11 - 55).

2. THE PREVIOUS STUDIES:

The Researcher has dealt with several researches, essays and articles on "the Administrative Decentralization" through analysis, classification and theorizing, which are very useful, and it is also indispensable for any Researcher on the subject of its ideals, however the Researcher has dealt with the obstacles to implement the Decentralized Management of a specific status in the study environment, as well as an applied sector that differs from the environment of those studies, There is no doubt that the whole scientific researches complements each other.

Some of these studies as follows:

Ali's study on (2017) entitled "Development of the Academic Management System in the Sudanese Higher Education Institutions within the Decentralized System: Case Study of the Academy of Health Sciences in Sudan, PhD thesis, Omdurman University, Sudan. The study aimed at the formation of an integrated technical system, including decision support system at the Academy of Health Sciences, where the Researcher relied on the extrapolation of the reality and analysis of the inputs and outputs based on the obstacles to complete the transformation of the electronic registration system, and he examined the opportunities and the available possibilities to move to the E-government. The results showed that the E-government softened the pressure on the Registration Offices, Data Management and the vision comprehensiveness at the central, the Senior and Middle Leadership level. The

Researcher recommended the trend towards the decentralized services and training the manpower on the technical skills.

Atiqa's Study on (2011), entitled "the Administrative Decentralization in the Maghreb Countries, a Comparative Analytical Study, Master's Degree in Political Science," under the supervision of Dr. Ban Hanieh, in which the Researcher focused her efforts on the administrative decentralization in the Maghreb countries (Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco) and she compared between these applications. Where she found that: The local administrative systems in the Maghreb embody the administrative decentralization in its theoretical aspect, on the contrary in the implementation level, where many of the challenges are known, and that the more the countries tend towards the Democracy, the greater the tendency towards the administrative decentralization and vice versa. The Researcher recommended achieving the balance between local Bodies and Authorities, giving more freedom to the Local Councils in the exercise of their competences.

Tebaishat Study on (2010): entitled "Rate of Implementing the Decentralization in the Jordanian Universities and Proposals for their Development, PhD Thesis, Yarmouk University, Supervisor (Prof. Saleh Olimat). The study aimed at determining the rate of decentralization implementation at the Jordanian public and private universities from the point of view of Leaders and Academics. The Researcher used a questionnaire consisting of (30) sections that are distributed to the study sample which consisted of (745) Academic and Administrative Leaders. The study concluded that the Decentralization implementation rate at the Jordanian universities from the point of view of the Academic and Administrative Leaders was very high, where the statistical significance differences were attributed to the variables of the job title and gender, as well as the differences were in favor of males, and the absence of the statistical significance differences were attributed to the university variable. The Researcher recommended implementing a training program for the Academic and Administrative Leaders to exercise the decision-making processes, as well as to form a Central Committee that contain the best prominent leaders to lead the supervision of the decentralization of the university.

Ozler and King study on (2005), entitled "What are the benefits of Decentralization to education?" This study aimed at revealing what could result from the implementation of the decentralization in the public schools on both sides of achievement and climate development in Nicaragua, where the study sample consisted of (50) Managers who participated in a special course held on the School Management Development Program for the country. The study concluded by applying a questionnaire that the schools which implement the Decentralization aspects of tests and incentives were more successful than the schools that did not implement the experiment.

Anely and Mackenzie, 2005, entitled "the School Management", a Research on the Administrative and Educational Issues". In this survey study, the two Researchers reviewed the various definitions or experiences of the Decentralization in a number of tax countries and Australia in the area of the educational Authorities decentralization, where they pointed out the decentralization dimensions and its areas of implementation, as well as the decentralization effect on education outputs. The results that they found are that the educational outputs were not improved on implementing the Decentralization in Australia.

Al-Mandel study on (2003), entitled "the Centralization and Decentralization in Decision Making and its Relation to Job Performance", A Field Study on the Reform Institutions in Riyadh, Research on a Master Degree from Prince Nayef Academy, supervision by Prof.

Khalid bin Mohammed Al-Aiban. The research environment was limited to the security aspect of Riyadh penitentiaries. The study aimed to identify the administrative method (Centralization / Decentralization) used in the Penitentiaries Institutions in Riyadh. The study sample consisted of (170) Employees in the Penitentiaries Institutions. The study concluded that there is no statistically significant correlation between decentralization in decision making and the job performance level among the Employees in the Penitentiaries Institutions, as well as there are statistically significant differences in respondents' attitudes towards the Decentralization in decision making according to the type of the job occupied by the respondents. The study recommended encouraging the Employees to contact their Heads directly; also providing a trust environment, in addition to developing the Management styles and understand the subordinates' needs.

Al-Zahrani study on (2001), entitled "Decision-Making in the Security Services, Methods and Constraints, Unpublished MA, The Arab Center for the Security Studies, Riyadh". The Researcher dealt with the Administrative Decentralization as a method of decision-making. He mentioned its obstacles briefly, since "the Administrative Decentralization" is one of the branches of the methods which the Researcher dealt with. the most important results that the study concluded are: The attention to follow the theoretical methods more than the practical methods by the sample of the police in Riyadh, the limited participation in the security decision- making between the Heads and the subordinates. One of the main obstacles that hinder the subordinates' participation in decision-making respectively is as follows: the Organizational, Social and Self-obstacles. Among the most important recommendations of the study are: the development of the organizational culture of the Heads and subordinates in the Management area, processing to find an effective system of job stability for the Employees, and consider about the subordinates psychological and social needs.

Al- Shammari and Al-Anzi study on (2002), entitled "The Effects of Regional Administrative Decentralization in the Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights", published in Babel magazine, edition 2 of Volume 5, 2002. The study dealt with the problem that the Local Councils in Iraq have become involved in the Centralized Government in some issues of the national character; however, there are many obstacles to the establishment of a legislative organization that takes into account the regional administrative decentralization elements, which in turn serves the democratization requirements and respect the human rights.

3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Study Community: The study community has been consisted of all the Administrators of the Associate Deanships in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia universities for the academic year 1437/1438 AH.

The Study Sample: the study sample consisted of all the Administrators of the (5) Associate Deanships at Hail University, while the Administrators were 520 person for the academic year 1437/1438 AH.

The Study Tools: The Researcher has stated the two research tools, which were represented in two questionnaires to collect the data based on the following:

- 1- Review the theoretical literature related to the study subject.
- 2- Making use of the arbitrators' views.
- 3 - Take advantage of some relevant previous studies.

Based on that, the Researcher has concluded to two questionnaires, one relating to the implementation of the Decentralized Management items in the Deanship, consisting of two sections. The first section has dealt with the general preliminary data of the research sample (age, job title, qualification, and years of service in the Deanship).

The second Section of the questionnaire has dealt with the items related to the extent of implementing the Decentralized Management at the Deanship to which the Employee belongs, where this section contained (14) items. The five-dimensional Likert scale has been used, (Strongly Disagree = 1 Disagree = 2 Not Sure = 3 Agree = 4 strongly Agree = 5) to answer the terms of this Section. The second questionnaire has dealt with the obstacles hindering the implementation of the Decentralized Management from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University, which consisted of (11) obstacles. The five-dimensional Likert scale has been used to measure the approval score of the obstacle (very little = 1 little = 2 Medium = 3 High = 4 very high = 5) to answer the terms of this questionnaire.

The Study Tool credibility:

The tool veracity: The two research tools have been presented to 10 Faculty Members Arbitrators to judge their accuracy within a set scale, as well as their language formulation integrity. Some modifications have been made to the two questionnaires by deletion or addition of some new terms in the light of the arbitrators' opinions and finalization.

The Study Tool Stability: To verify the stability of the two research tools, Alpha - Cronbach's stability coefficient for questionnaire sections was found. The stability coefficient was 0.7775 which is a high value, that is reassuring that the two questionnaires have a high score of stability.

Statistical Processing Methods: The Statistical Data collected through the questionnaires using the statistical packages (SPSS) have been processed to answer the study question. The frequency and percentages distribution, arithmetic average, standard deviation and Alpha Cronbach's coefficient have been used to verify the two questionnaires stability. Besides, Pearson Correlation coefficient was also used to verify the veracity the questionnaire internal consistency and to measure the relationship between the variables.

Methodology of the Study: The Researcher has used the analytical descriptive approach in revealing the Decentralized Management status of the Associate Deanships and its obstacles from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University.

4. RESULTS AND ITS DISCUSSION:

This section includes a presentation of the study results and its discussion by answering the research questions as follows:

The Descriptive Analysis of the Study Data:

The descriptive analysis of the study data will be presented through the preliminary data description as follows:

1. The Preliminary data for the study items: the frequency and the Percentage distribution of the sample data have been calculated as follows:

Table No. (1)

Distribution of the study sample according to the age:

No.	Age	Frequency	Percentage
1	30 years or Less	54	32.3 %
2	More than 30 - 40 years	74	44.3 %
3	More than 40 years	39	23.4 %
Total		167	100

The above table shows that the age of the study sample ranged from (20 - 35) years old, the arithmetic average was about 35 years and with a standard deviation of approximately (7) years, this is confirmed by the results of Table (1), where it has indicated that the vast majority of the study sample are aged between (30 to 40 years) by over (44%), while the percentage of those who were older (23.4%) and those aged 30 years or less (32.3%).

Table (2)

The Distribution of the study sample according to the job title in the Deanship:

No.	Job Title	Frequency	Percentage
1	Department Director	20	17.1 %
2	Secretary	9	5.3 %
3	Typist	25	14.7 %
4	Data Entry Clerk	29	11.8 %
5	Registrar	19	11.2 %
6	Security Clerk	3	1.8 %
7	Writer	6	3.5 %
8	Messenger	9	5.3 %
9	Public Relation Officer (PRO)	24	14.1 %
10	Administrative Communication Officer	13	7.6 %
11	Maintenance Officer	10	5.9 %
12	Head of Department	2	1.2 %
13	Assistant Director	1	0.6 %

The above table shows that approximately 17.1% of the research items are from the Department Directors category and the Security Clerk category is (1.8%). The above table shows the majority of Department Directors representing the research sample; this is a positive indicator that will reflect on the study results.

Table (3)

The Distribution of the study sample as per the Qualification:

No.	Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
1	Lower than Secondary School	49	29.7 %
2	Secondary School or Equivalent	52	31.5 %
3	Academic Qualification or Equivalent	62	37.6 %
4	Postgraduate	2	1.2 %
Total		165	100

The above table shows that approximately (38%) of the study sample have an Academic Qualification or Equivalent, and in contrast, 1.2% of the study sample has a postgraduate Degree.

Table (4)

The Distribution of the study sample as per the years of Experience at the Deanship:

No.	Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1	10 years or less	57	33.5 %
2	More than 10 – 20 years	77	45.3 %

3	More than 20 years	36	21.2
Total		170	100

It is clear from the above table that the majority of the study sample is between more than (10 to 20 years). **The results related to the first question: What is the administrative method (Centralization, Decentralization) used in the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University?**

To answer this question, the frequency and percentages distribution, arithmetic average, standard deviation of all items of the questionnaire were calculated and the results were as follows:

Table (6)
The arithmetic average, standard deviation, frequency distribution of the sample research towards the Decentralized Management

Terms	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Not Sure (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Arithmetic Average	standard deviation
Decisions issued by the Dean of the Deanship only *	10 60%	37 22.3 %	10 60%	69 41.6%	40 24.1%	3.554	1.243
Deans encourage their subordinates to Decision-making initiative	9 5.4 %	19 11.4 %	26 15.6 %	70 41.9 %	43 25.7 %	3.713	1.131
The Dean discusses his subordinates before decision-making	12 7.3 %	24 14.6 %	27 16.5 %	55 33.5 %	64 28.0 %	3.604	1.242
Decision-making in simple matters requires the approval of the Dean	24 14.3 %	59 35.1 %	12 7.1%	48 28.6%	25 14.9	2.946	1.346
Discourage the person wishing to decision-making in this Deanship quickly *	20 12.5 %	46 28.8 %	41 25.6 %	34 21.3 %	19 11.9 %	2.913	1.215
I should ask the Dean before I do any work *	9 5.4 %	38 22.9 %	7 4.2%	77 46.4 %	35 21.1 %	3.548	1.209
I make the decision on my own and then I inform the subordinates *	17 10.5 %	80 49.4 %	12 7.4%	40 24.7 %	13 8.0%	2.704	1.184
I am interested in coordination with other administrative levels of decision-making	6 3.7 %	10 6.1 %	6 3.7%	101 61.6 %	41 25.0 %	3.982	0.930
When I make a decision, I try to persuade the subordinates to approve the decision I intend to take *	9 5.4 %	28 16.7 %	11 6.5%	94 56.0 %	26 15.5 %	3.595	1.101
When I make a decision, I try to make sense for the subordinates that they participated in the decision by providing them with the solutions and then I try to get their approval of the expected decision *	6 3.6 %	51 30.2 %	20 11.8 %	61 36.1 %	31 18.3	3.335	1.192
I leave the decision-making to subordinates and I appreciate the decision they agreed upon	37 22.0 %	38 22.6 %	14 8.3 %	55 32.7 %	24 14.3 %	2.946	1.420
Before the decision-making, I submit it to the subordinates. If they appreciate it, I implement it, and if not, I modify it.	20 12.0 %	42	6 3.6 %	69 41.3 %	30 18.0 %	3.281	1.339
I rely on the search and study the views and proposals submitted to me by my colleagues and Advisors	1 0.6 %	8 4.8 %	14 8.3 %	81 48.9 %	64 38.1 %	4.185	0.824
I do not have the opportunity to participate in developing the plans of the Deanship and the	25 14.8 %	52 30.8 %	22 13.0 %	30 17.8 %	40 23.8 %	3.047	1.426

Department I work in.							
Total						** 3.1444	0.404

* The Centralization Terms.

** The total arithmetic average was calculated after reversing the Centralization Terms.

The above table shows that the total arithmetic average value of (3.144) and the standard deviation of (0.404) indicate the study sample tendency to the division between the approval and non-approval of the decision-making decentralization of the Associate Deanships at Hail University. Regarding to the terms, it is clear that the sample study tendency to the approval of the Deans and Directors dependence on the research and study of the views and proposals submitted to them by the subordinates, as well as their interest in coordination with the other administrative levels of decision-making, as well as on the Deans and Directors encourage of their subordinates to take the initiative in decision-making. All The value of its arithmetic average terms ranged between (3.604) and (4.185), which all reflect the decentralized decision-making of the Associate Deanships. This may be due to the desire of both sexes Administrators to the democratization of the administrative work itself, in addition to their conviction that if the decision-maker Director is experiencing the problem, will be better than the director who does not know the details, as well as their desire to reduce the risks of the distributed weak decisions, as it effects on one Department or one Section rather than affecting the whole organization or some Departments.

On the other hand, the research sample tends to the approval of other phrases that reflect the Decision- making Centralization (this explains the divisions mentioned earlier). The phrases include the Deans and Directors attempts to persuade their subordinates to approve the decision they intend to make, and that decisions are only issued by the Dean or the Department Director, as well as the Dean should be asked before taking any action. The arithmetic averages of these phrases ranged between (3,548) and (3,595), This may be due to the tendency towards the dependency and dependence on the lower administrative levels members, so that they do not act in any position awaiting the decision of the senior Management, and also due to the many complications faced by those dealing with the administration, which attributes them to the tendency towards centralization.

The results related to the second question: What are the obstacles to implement the Decentralized Management in the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University? To answer this question, the arithmetical averages, the standard deviations and ranking scores of the sample approval were calculated on the obstacles to the implementation of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University. The results were as follows:

Table (7)

The arithmetical averages, the standard deviations and ranking scores of the sample approval on the obstacles to the implementation of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University

No.	Phrase	Arithmetical Averages	Standard Deviations	Approval Score	Ranking
1	The Decentralized Management causes an objective dispersion within the Deanship	4.23	1.300	Very high	1
2	Monitoring Difficulty	2.98	1.405	Medium	3
3	The partial view danger	2.95	1.161	Medium	4

4	Non-Determination of functional terms	2.86	1.064	Medium	
5	Job instability	2.47	1.357	Less	9
6	Contradictions or inconsistencies of the decisions taken	2.95	1.322	Medium	5
7	Services duplication required by Deanships	2.76	1.220	Medium	7
8	Intense centralization (thirst for power)	2.58	1.332	Less	8
9	Working methods and procedures instability	1.79	1.204	Very less	10
10	Costs increase	2.88	1.327	Medium	6
11	Lack of the Administrators expertise of the Associate Deanships	3.05	1.182	Medium	2

Table (5) shows the arithmetical averages, standard deviations of the sample approval scores on the obstacles to the implementation of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University in descending order, where the arithmetic averages value ranged between (1.79 - 4.23), and the term(1) (The Decentralized Management causes an objective dispersion within the Deanship) has obtained the highest arithmetic average (4.23) and a very high score of approval; This may be attributed to the increasing burdens placed on the Administrators within the Deanship of the University as a result of the constant and continuous preoccupation with the urgent routine work; the corresponding need of the Decentralized Management for the employee's competence and high skills, which increases the burdens assigned to him, as well as the increase of the Deanship size as measured by the number of the Administrators of both sexes will increase the decision-making process complexity which is consistent with the Deanship's objective under the university vision and mission, This will be more complicated due to the lack of prior involvement of the Administrators of both sexes in developing the Deanship objectives, vision and mission. While the phrases (2, 3, 6, 10, 7, and 8) obtained medium approval scores, the phrases (5, 9) obtained a few approval scores and the phrase (4) (Non-Determination of the functional terms) obtained the lowest arithmetic average of (1.79), as well as it obtained a very less approval score, this is my be due to the pre-determination of functional terms, which weakens the interaction process in the functional activities and terms, the very low score of approval obtained by this phrase corresponds to the very high score of approval obtained by the phrase (1) (the decentralized Management causes the objective distraction within the Deanship), both of them, despite their opposition to the approval score, point to one inevitable outcome which is the great positive role of the communication between the two parties in facilitating the obstacles and overcoming the obstacles faced by the Administrators of the Deanship.

The table also shows that the total of the terms obtained an arithmetical average of (2.86) and a medium approval score, this indicates that these terms, except for (5, 9 and 4), represent the obstacles to the implementation of the Decentralized Management of the Associate Deanships from the point of view of the Administrators at Hail University.

The results related to the third question: What is the relationship between the implementation of the Decentralized Management in the Associate Deanships with the personal variables of the Administrators at the Hail University?

To answer this question: Pearson correlation coefficient between the Decentralized Management and the personal variables was calculated. The results were as follows:

Table (5)

Pearson correlation coefficient between the Decentralized Management and the preliminary data

The Preliminary Data		The Decentralization
Age	correlation coefficient	0.150
	Significance Level	0.052
Job Title	correlation coefficient	** 0.353
	Significance Level	0.000
Years of service at the Deanship	correlation coefficient	0.121
	Significance Level	0.115

** At a significant level less than 0.001

It is clear from the above table that there is a significant positive correlation between the Decentralized Management, the Academic qualification and the job title (the significance level is less than 0.01); the higher the academic Qualification and the job title, the more the Decentralized Management is. While the results did not indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the Decentralized Management, the age and the years of service at the Deanship (where the values of the significance levels were higher than (0.05))

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the study and analysis of the study results, the following recommendations can be concluded as follows:

- Encouraging the universities Administrators to contact the Heads directly; this is done by providing an environment of confidence between the Heads and subordinates and paying attention to their proposals and to adopt the distinguished ones who contribute to the development within the system.
- To leave the Management matter to the subordinates provided that the decisions are approved by the Head upon agreement.
- Provide the opportunity for subordinates to participate to develop the plans of the department in which they work.
- Provision an encouraging work environment that helps to overcome the obstacles that prevent effective management.
- Conduct training courses for both sexes of Administrators to impart Management and decision-making skills that contribute to instilling confidence in them.
- Decisions should be taken from the lower administrative levels authorize them to act within the system.
- The Head should not be consulted in routine administrative works which are not necessary to make a decision.
- Conduct further studies and research on the subject of decentralization and its obstacles in other universities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to reach results that can be circulated.

References

1. Abdul Rahman, Kayed (1996), the Scientific Research, its Concept, Tools & Methods, Dar Osama, Riyadh.
2. Abdul Wahab, Ali Mohamed (1982), Introduction to the Administration, Institute, Riyadh.
3. Abdul-Latif Abdul Aziz (1992) Decision-making, King Saud University
4. Ahmed, Jafar Abu Al-Qasim (1992) the Organizational Behavior & Performance, Translated on 1992, the Administration Institute, Riyadh, Andro Mark J. Wallace
5. Ahmed, Mohamed and others, (1982), the Administrative Regulation, Al-Madani Press, Cairo
6. Ainely, J. and Mackenzie, P (2005). School Governance: Educational and management Issues, International Educational Journal, 1(3)-139-151, retrived on 22/11/2009 from :www. Sturt. Flinders. Edu.au.

7. Al- Awaidhi, Abdul Rahman Mohammed (2002), The Role of the Participation in Rationalizing the Security Decision, unpublished Master thesis, the Arab Center for Security Studies, Riyadh.
8. Al-Anzi, Alaa Abdul-Hassan Karim, Al-Shamri, Amer Ibrahim Ahmed (2002), The Effects of Regional Administrative Decentralization in the Promotion of Democracy & the Human Rights, Dr. Alaa Abdul-Karim Al-Enezi, Babylon University.
9. Ali, Marwan Ali Issa (2017) Development of the Academic Management System in the Sudanese Higher Education Institutions in the decentralized system: case study of the Health Sciences Academy in Sudan, PhD thesis, Omdurman University, Sudan.
10. Al-Mandil, Khalid Fihan (2004), centralization & Decentralization in Decision-Making & its Relationship to Job Performance, a Field Study on Penitentiary Institutions in Riyadh, Master's Thesis from Prince Nayef Academy, Riyadh.
11. Al-Nimr, Saud (2001), Public Management, Foundations & Functions, 5th edition, Dar Al-Farzadak, Riyadh.
12. Al-Otaibi, Ayayad Saadoun (1996), Position of the Administrative Leaders from Delegation of the Authority, Master Thesis, Faculty of Economics, Abdulaziz University, Jeddah.
13. Al-Sabab, Ahmed Abdullah (1997), Principles of the Modern Management, Al-Bilad Bookstore, Jeddah.
14. Al-Taweel, Mohamed (1995), Public Management in Saudi Arabia, published by the Administration Institute, Riyadh.
15. Al-Zahrani, Jamaan Awadah (2001) Decision-Making in the Security Services, Methods & Constraints, Unpublished Master, Arab Center for Security Studies, Riyadh.
16. Amer, Yassen (1986), the Administrative Communication & its Behavioral Approach, Dar Al-Marikh, Riyadh Aqeeli, Abdul Amir Abdul Azim (1992) Principles of the Public Management, Environmental & Political Approach, Open University, Libya
17. Ashour, Ahmed (1979) the Public Management, the Comparative Environmental Approach, Arab Renaissance House, Beirut
18. Attika, Quashy (2011), the Administrative Decentralization in the Maghreb countries, comparative analytical study, MA thesis in the political sciences, Morocco.
19. Ayoub, Nadia, (1994) Organizations Management, Police trend, University of Damascus
20. Bauman , K. E,(1980). Research Methods for Community Health and Welfare: An Introdyction. Oxford University Press,New York and oxford.
21. Bazra'a, Mohamed Sadiq (1996) Marketing Research for Planning, Control, & Marketing Decision Making, Obeikan Bookstore, Riyadh
22. Coleman, L.and P. March(1976). "Differential Communication Among Farmars" Human Reltions ,Vol.(29). Darwish, Abdel-Karim (1980), the Principles of the Public Management, the Anglo Bookstore, Cairo.
23. Fadl Allah Ali (1997), Development Department: A New Perspective of Modernization Concept, 3rd edition, Prince Nayef Academy for the Security Sciences, Riyadh.
24. Farah, Farah Yassein (2015), The Implementation of the Decentralized Administrative & Financial works at Gedaref University, a pivotal working paper.
25. Freund, J.E(1981). Statistics: Afirst Course, New jersy: Prentice Hall Inc. Hall,R.(1972). Organization: Structure and Process, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
26. Hilal, Mohamed (1996), Skillsof Managing the Department, Printed by the Management Development, Cairo.
27. Junco,R.(2012): Too much face not enough books: the relationship between multiple indices of face book use and academic performance. Computers in Human Behavior.
28. Khashoggi, Abdul Rahman (1993) Administrative Regulation in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Dar Al-Khuraiji, Riyadh.

29. Leavitt, H.(1962) Managerial Psychology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Lee,M &W. Zwerman(1975). Home Wood: Irwin.
30. Mansour, Ahmed (1973), the Public Principles at the Manpower Department, 1973, the Publications Agency, Kuwait.
31. Metcalfe A,Scott (2009): Knowledge for Whose Society? Knowledge Production . Higher Education . and Federal Policy in Canada Higher Education (2009)57:DOI10.1007.
32. Mohamed, Ahmed Ali (1982), the Administrative Regulation, Al-Madani Press, Cairo.
33. Omasikaran, (1998): Methods of Research in Management: Introduction to Building Research Skills, translated by Ismail Basiouni & Abdullah Sulaiman Al-Azaz, King Saud University Press, Riyadh
34. Ozler, B and King, E. (2005). What is Decentralization got to do with learning? School Autonomy and students performance the case of Nicaragua, Discussion paper to the World Bank, conference, 2005,Kyoto University.
35. Sharif, Ali (1996) the Management Principles, University House, Alexandria
36. Tabishat, Wafa Ali Khalaf (2010), Class of the Decentralization in the Jordanian Universities & proposals for their development, PhD thesis, Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University.
37. Taleb, Hassan (1998), Crime, Punishment & the Penitentiary Institutions, Dar Al-Zahraa Riyadh