

Upward feedback from faculty to the department heads in Saudi universities; reality, affect and challenges

Prepared by

Author: Wasmiah Albasri

Institution: Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU)

College: College of Education

Department: Educational Administration Department

Academic Level: Doctor of Education

Title: Assistant Professor

Major: Educational Leadership in Higher Education

ملخص باللغة العربية:

يستكشف هذا البحث الكمي ممارسة التغذية الراجعة التصاعدية في تقييم رؤساء الأقسام من قبل أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعات الحكومية السعودية، بهدف الكشف عن تطبيقها في العالم الحقيقي وتأثيرها والتحديات التي تواجهها. ومن خلال استخدام دراسة استقصائية تم توزيعها على عينة مختارة استراتيجيًا مكونة من 314 عضوًا في هيئة التدريس من إجمالي 1660 عضوًا، تستخدم الدراسة تحليلات إحصائية شاملة لتفسير البيانات. تكشف النتائج عن انفصال حاسم: يشعر أعضاء هيئة التدريس بالتهميش في عملية تقييم رؤساء أقسامهم، مع الحد الأدنى من المشاركة في صنع القرار أو آليات التغذية الراجعة. وعلى الرغم من ذلك، هناك إجماع على إمكانية تعزيز ردود الفعل التصاعدية للصفات القيادية. وتحدد الدراسة أيضًا العوائق الحاسمة التي تحول دون التنفيذ الفعال للتغذية الراجعة التصاعدية، مثل ندرة التطبيق، وانعدام الشفافية، والمشاركة المحدودة لأعضاء هيئة التدريس.

لا توفر هذه النتائج رؤى قيمة حول الممارسات والتصورات الحالية للتغذية الراجعة التصاعدية في التعليم العالي فحسب، بل تشير أيضًا إلى ضرورة إجراء تحسينات منظمة لتحقيق فوائدها في تنمية المهارات القيادية بشكل كامل. إن معالجة هذه التحديات المحددة يمكن أن يؤدي إلى مجتمع أكاديمي أكثر مشاركة وبيئة ردود فعل بناءة، مما يساهم في نهاية المطاف في فعالية وديناميكية القيادة الجامعية.

Abstract:

This quantitative investigation explores the practice of upward feedback in evaluating department heads by faculty members within Saudi public universities, aiming to uncover its real-world application, impact, and the challenges it faces. Utilizing a survey distributed to a strategically selected sample of 314 faculty members out of a total of 1,660, the study employs comprehensive statistical analyses to interpret the data. Findings reveal a critical disconnect: faculty members feel marginalized in the evaluation process of their department heads, with minimal engagement in decision-making or feedback mechanisms. Despite this, there is a consensus on the potential of upward feedback to enhance leadership qualities. The study also identifies critical barriers to the effective implementation of upward feedback, such as infrequent application, lack of transparency, and limited faculty involvement. These findings not only provide valuable insights into the current practices and perceptions of upward feedback in higher education but also point to the necessity for structured improvements to fully realize its benefits for leadership development. Addressing these identified challenges could lead to a more engaged academic community and a constructive feedback environment, ultimately contributing to the effectiveness and dynamism of university leadership.

Article title: Upward feedback from faculty to the department heads in Saudi universities; reality, affect and challenges

Keywords: Upward feedback; Upward appraisal; Saudi faculty; Saudi university; leadership; performance

Study problem:

There is a research gap in addressing this type of evaluation, which relies on a bottom-up reverse evaluation in which faculty members formally evaluate their supervisors. This study contributes to filling this research gap.

Study delimitations:

Delimitations of the temporal study: The study was applied in the first semester of the year 1445 AH, and its spatial delimits are that it was applied at Shaqra University to faculty members of both sexes, men and women, in all its colleges. Objective delimitations: The topic centers on faculty members' evaluation of their department head, which is a reverse evaluation from the bottom up

Theoretical and practical importance:

This study enriches information and increases light on the subject of reverse evaluation and helps to conduct further theoretical research into it. The importance of applying this study. This study may be cited for applying this type of evaluation, which may have a positive impact on the performance of department heads.

Introduction:

The academic landscape in Saudi Arabia is marked by its 28 public universities which collectively employ near 70,000 faculty members across various disciplines (Ministry of Education, 2024). Leadership within these institutions is hierarchically structured with department heads playing a pivotal role in the management and operational effectiveness of their respective departments. Given the significant impact of leadership quality on academic and administrative outcomes, this study delves into the practice of upward feedback within the university setting, focusing particularly on the evaluation of department heads by their faculty members.

The concept of upward feedback, also known as upward appraisal, has evolved significantly since its initial conception. Hutchison and Carleton (1991) define upward appraisal as a process where employees rate the performance of their bosses, establishing it as a fundamental tool for evaluating managerial performance. This definition is complemented by

Cockfield (1996), who describes upward feedback as a formal system for gathering insights from employees about management quality, and by Atwater et al. (1995), who emphasizes its impact on providing followers' perceptions of leadership to leaders. Stoneman et al. (1995) introduces the idea of an upward feedback system where employees offer feedback on key competencies of their managers. Stein (1995) and Reilly et al., (1996) further define upward appraisal as evaluating managers' performance based on input from their staff, providing a bottom-up perspective on leadership that diverges from traditional top-down evaluation methods. Lastly, Smither et al., (1995) specifically regard upward feedback as subordinates rating the performance of their immediate supervisor, highlighting the direct involvement of subordinates in the appraisal process.

The historical context of upward feedback traces back to the industrial sector, with early implementations aimed at enhancing factory management through worker surveys. The surveys presented insights from factory workers about their perceptions of management. This survey revealed a generally positive outlook among employees towards how their companies were managed. This paradigm shift towards engaging employees in the evaluative process highlighted the potential of feedback in improving managerial practices and fostering a more inclusive organizational culture. The concept of upward feedback, historically rooted in industrial settings as early as 1944, has evolved into a crucial tool for organizational development and leadership improvement (Workers Polled, 1944).

Expanding on the theme of feedback, a pivotal study on staff employees at the University of North Carolina by Hegarty in 1974 brought to the fore the significant impact of providing supervisors with feedback reports sourced from their subordinates. This study illuminated a clear correlation between such feedback mechanisms and an observable enhancement in supervisory performance, as perceived by the subordinates themselves. This finding was in harmony with Hegarty's earlier 1973 research, which posited that supervisors themselves acknowledged an improvement in their supervisory capabilities following the feedback process, thereby underscoring the reciprocal benefits of open and constructive feedback channels within the organizational hierarchy (Hegarty, 1974).

In the academic realm, the grievance service procedures at MIT in the 1980s, serve as a notable example of upward feedback in action. By providing a structured channel for grievances and concerns, MIT demonstrated the effectiveness of upward feedback in promoting changes in policies, procedures, and structures based on employee input.

This system, emblematic of an upward-feedback, mediation model, mirrors the feedback mechanisms adopted by a myriad of universities and corporations over the preceding decade. MIT ensures that every member of its community, from students to non-union employees, including faculty and managers, has access to a suitable platform for voicing concerns, thereby epitomizing the principle of "redundancy" in complaint resolution. The application of upward feedback in educational institutions, as exemplified by the grievance service procedures at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) highlights its potential in facilitating meaningful changes in management practices and policies based on constructive feedback from subordinates (Rowe, 1984).

This research is prompted by the recognition that while upward feedback has been widely discussed and implemented in various sectors, its specific application and outcomes in the context of Saudi public universities remain underexplored. The nuanced dynamics of academic leadership, particularly in cultures with distinct hierarchical norms, necessitate a thorough investigation into how upward feedback from faculty members can influence departmental leadership, contribute to leadership development, and ultimately impact the overall effectiveness of university governance.

By examining the perceptions, experiences, and responses of faculty members to the leadership of their department heads, this study aims to contribute valuable insights into the efficacy of upward feedback mechanisms in higher education. The focus on Saudi public universities offers a unique lens through which to understand the interplay between cultural norms, organizational structures, and feedback processes in the realm of academic leadership.

Upward feedback "has become a trendy activity for today's organization" (Hutchison & Carleton, 1991) and has a "widespread practice to aid in the development of managers" (Johnson & Ferstl, 1999). Despite its growing popularity, research on the effects of upward feedback on managerial performance over time remains limited (Smither et al., 1995).

Research Aims:

The study aims to identify the reality or statue of the upward feedback and discover the impact and the challenges on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among faculty members of the research sample. The literature underscores the potential of upward feedback as a tool for enhancing managerial performance and organizational effectiveness. However, the need for further research, particularly in the context of Saudi public universities, remains evident given the unique cultural and organizational dynamics at play.

Findings:

The evolution of upward appraisal practices, wherein employees are empowered to rate the performance of their superiors, marks a significant shift in organizational culture, as highlighted by Hutchison and Carleton in 1991. This trend, though increasingly popular, was met with a notable gap in research, particularly concerning the long-term effects of upward feedback on managerial performance, as pointed out by Smither et al., in 1995, and echoed in subsequent analyses in 1999.

Pratt's 2000 commentary adds a personal dimension to the discourse, emphasizing the intrinsic need for managers to recognize and balance their strengths and weaknesses. This introspective approach, facilitated by external feedback, is pivotal for effective management, as it encourages a holistic understanding of one's professional capabilities through diverse perspectives.

Building on this foundation, recent research by Johnsson in 2022 calls for a deeper exploration into the role of upward feedback in the realms of organizational leadership and development. This study underscores the relatively untapped potential of upward feedback as a tool for enhancing managerial effectiveness and fostering a culture of continuous improvement and open communication within organizations.

In sum, the collective insights from these varied studies paint a vivid picture of the evolving landscape of feedback mechanisms within organizational settings. They highlight the critical importance of fostering open lines of communication at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, thereby enhancing management practices and creating a more engaged, motivated, and satisfied workforce.

Status Quo:

The current landscape of upward feedback in organizations reveals several critical insights. Firstly, it's common for long-standing employees, who have witnessed the tenure of multiple managers, to understand the profound impact of leadership styles on their work environment and personal job performance. However, these employees often refrain from sharing their insights unless specifically asked, as noted by Pratt in 2000. Furthermore, the significance of subordinate contributions to leadership development and the overarching importance of effective leadership to organizational success are frequently underappreciated. This oversight presents a valuable opportunity to enhance the recognition and development of leadership skills through team member feedback, not only in terms of task execution but also in fostering leadership capabilities, as discussed in the 2013 study on Upward Feedback (Forsyth & Oldcorn, 2013). Lastly, a notable absence of critical upward feedback is often symptomatic of an unhealthy organizational climate, which can lead to reduced employee engagement and, ultimately, impede the achievement of organizational objectives, as highlighted by Popa in 2021.

Impact:

Research underscores a pivotal transformation in managers with initial subordinate ratings indicating low performance, showing marked improvement post the integration of upward feedback mechanisms. This evolution in managerial conduct is a testament to the introspective insights gained from direct reports, fostering a conducive environment for behavioral and strategic enhancements (Reilly et al., 1996; Smither et al., 1995).

Upward feedback is considered a useful tool that is worth applying because it develops leadership skills (Oldcorn & Forsyth, 2015).

Subordinates, owing to their daily interactions and direct observational vantage, provide critical evaluations of managerial practices. These appraisals offer a granular perspective on managerial behaviors, especially those influencing team dynamics, underscoring the validity and utility of subordinate feedback (Bernardin, 1986).

The design and implementation of upward feedback programs aim to create a secure avenue for employees to express managerial performance critiques. This approach not only fosters a culture of transparency but also

accentuates the managerial strengths, promoting a balanced growth trajectory (Thomas et al., 1991).

The evolving business landscape necessitates a shift in managerial and leadership paradigms, with feedback playing a crucial role in enhancing learning and developmental processes. Upward feedback, thus, becomes a catalyst for continuous improvement, urging managers to reflect on and adapt their behaviors and assumptions for organizational betterment (Antonioni, 1993).

Feedback can sometimes directly instigate change, especially in scenarios where managers are unaware of certain behaviors affecting their teams. This immediate corrective potential of upward feedback emphasizes its role in fostering managerial reflexivity and adaptability (Dunoon, 1994).

Organizations like Fiat have leveraged upward feedback to redefine managerial roles, emphasizing leadership skills and human resource development. The Management Style Analysis (MSA) project exemplifies how structured feedback mechanisms can significantly enhance performance and productivity (Auteri, 1994).

Upward feedback systems aim to identify and bolster key managerial competencies, aligning them with organizational objectives. This strategic focus on competency development underscores the integral role of feedback in managerial and organizational growth (Stoneman et al., 1995).

Studies, such as the one conducted within the Dayton-Montgomery County (Ohio) Public Library, reveal that subordinates provided valuable information through their evaluation of their supervisors, highlighting the most important supervisory values from their point of view. Subordinates highly value supervisors who act as role models, respect their opinions, and encourage a respectful treatment, highlighting the importance of procedural fairness and relational dynamics in supervisory roles (Rubin, 1995).

Institutions like Carnegie Mellon University Libraries have adopted upward appraisal programs for managers to tackle issues related to managerial communication and accountability and delegating of authority. Such initiatives demonstrate the efficacy of structured feedback in enhancing managerial performance and fostering a culture of accountability. Such initiatives demonstrate the efficacy of structured feedback in enhancing managerial performance and fostering a culture of accountability (Stein, 1995).

The growing adoption of upward performance appraisals by service firms to augment communication, development, and productivity reflects a broader organizational shift towards inclusive feedback mechanisms, emphasizing their transformative potential across sectors (Wooten & Brown, 1998).

Upward appraisal is recognized as a vital tool in the arsenal of managerial development, capable of inducing positive change by leveraging a previously underutilized source of valuable information. This tool's potential to facilitate organizational evolution and leadership enhancement is increasingly acknowledged (Stein, 1995).

Upward feedback's influence extends beyond mere performance enhancement, touching upon areas like self-awareness and subordinate commitment. This broader impact highlights the multifaceted benefits of feedback processes in fostering individual and organizational growth (Atwater et al., 2000).

A significant finding reveals that managers exhibit greater performance improvement when upward feedback is employed for administrative purposes rather than solely for developmental aims. This shift underscores the strategic value of feedback in administrative contexts, enhancing its impact on managerial efficacy (Jhun et al., 2012).

Upward negative feedback, while delicate, plays a critical role in illuminating organizational health and aiding decision-making processes. Its effective utilization, free from aggression and conflict, can significantly enhance organizational performance, highlighting the importance of divergent perspectives in organizational dynamics (Popa, 2021).

The integration of upward feedback within organizational frameworks has emerged as a pivotal strategy for enhancing leadership, fostering open communication, and promoting continuous improvement. The insights derived from subordinate evaluations offer a rich tapestry of perspectives that, when constructively harnessed, can lead to significant enhancements in managerial performance and overall organizational health. The multifaceted impact of upward feedback, spanning immediate behavioral adjustments to strategic competency development, underscores its indispensable role in the contemporary organizational paradigm.

“Performance evaluation makes the organization's senior management able to monitor and evaluate the efforts of superiors and their

supervisory and directive abilities and determine the nature of superiors' treatment of subordinates".(Alnasor, 2015)

Challenges:

One of the primary challenges is ensuring that the feedback program leads to sustained change, a process that requires continual administration and commitment to ongoing evaluation and adaptation to maintain effectiveness. This persistence embeds a culture of feedback deeply within the organizational fabric, ensuring that improvements are enduring and not merely temporary (Reilly et al., 1996).

Managers may perceive upward feedback as a threat to their authority and existing power dynamics, stemming from a fear of vulnerability or reluctance to be evaluated by subordinates (Dunoon, 1994). Overcoming this resistance involves encouraging managers to view feedback as an opportunity for growth rather than a critique of competence, fostering a creative risk-taking approach to utilizing subordinates as an untapped source of valuable information (Antonioni, 1993).

Ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of feedback is paramount, allowing subordinates to provide honest appraisals without fear of retaliation. This is crucial as managers wield more power in the working relationship, making any potential reprisal costly for subordinates (Antonioni, 1994).

Merely providing feedback does not guarantee change; the challenge lies in motivating leaders to act upon the feedback, especially when it is unfavorable. This requires finding ways to encourage managers to embrace feedback and commit to behavioral changes (Smither et al., 1995).

The Human Resources department is essential in ensuring that managers and their supervisors establish specific improvement goals and action plans based on feedback. Regular audits and consultations can keep the process on track and ensure that feedback leads to actionable outcomes (Antonioni, 1995).

The research underscores the importance of Human Resource Management (HRM) professionals meticulously executing upward feedback mechanisms to significantly influence managerial development (Executive, 2007).

Resistance from organizations and skepticism from employees, coupled with perceived administrative burdens, can impede the implementation of upward appraisals. Addressing these challenges involves changing traditional mindsets and tackling logistical hurdles (Wooten & Brown, 1998).

Data gathered through self-reports from 153 university staff members revealed that the inclination to offer upward feedback was inversely associated with the fear of retaliation and directly correlated with factors such as the suitability of one's role, the perceived value of feedback, the confidence of the evaluator in providing feedback, the quality of leader-member relationships, awareness about the upward feedback process, support from top management and peers, and the tendency to seek feedback (Kudisch et al., 2006).

Numerous executives in the nonprofit sector are hesitant to incorporate staff assessments into their board evaluations, concerned that it may provide an opportunity for disgruntled employees to harshly criticize the administrator (Executive, 2007).

The primary obstacle in the effective execution of an upward feedback system lies in guaranteeing that evaluators provide sincere assessments of their superiors (Smith & Fortunato, 2008).

Adopting best practices, such as defining the program's purpose, ensuring confidentiality, developing thoughtful questionnaires, and providing timely feedback, can help overcome these challenges. These practices address concerns from both managers and subordinates, facilitating a more effective feedback process (Stein, 1995).

Becoming open to feedback, whether it's positive or negative, requires practice and is often a difficult endeavor. It is also underscored that the foundations of trustful relationships, faith in leadership abilities, and open communication play critical roles in enhancing a manager's openness to upward feedback, making these elements key in leveraging feedback beneficially. It is concluded that managers who are self-assured and have established trusting connections with their staff are better positioned to use upward feedback for leadership development, cultivating a positive work atmosphere, and promoting a learning-oriented workplace (Johnsson, 2022). A Saudi study showed the importance of developing the performance of heads of educational departments “in the field of scientific

and research tasks and teamwork through professional and administrative courses and programs specialized. Also, the importance of heads of educational departments practicing transparency and clarity in their management of departments and their dealings with faculty members". (Althobaiti, 2019)

Research questions:

Main question: What is the reality or statue of the upward feedback of department heads among faculty members of the research sample?

Several questions emerge from this question:

- 1: What is the reality or statue of the upward feedback of department heads among faculty members of the research sample?
- 2: What is the impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among faculty members of the research sample?
- 3: What are the challenges facing upward feedback of department heads among faculty members of research sample?
- 4: Do the sample members' viewpoints differ regarding the upward feedback of department heads and its impact on leadership effectiveness from the viewpoint of the faculty members at Shaqra University according to the variables of gender, academic degree, years of experience, and the college to which the faculty member belongs?

Materials and Methods

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher relied on both the descriptive and analytical approaches in conducting her study. Due to its suitability to the questions and objectives of the study, which relate to describing and interpreting a contemporary phenomenon in terms of its nature and degree of existence, by indirectly interrogating a large sample of the study population through an electronic questionnaire, which was built to identify the upward feedback of department heads and its impact on leadership effectiveness from the point of view Faculty members at Shaqra

University. Statistical Package of (SPSS v.29) were used to describe the basic features of the data in the study, through frequencies, percentages. Where T-test is a type of inferential statistics which is used widely to demonstrate the difference in the mean of the two groups (Graeme, 2006), and ANOVA test applied to test the difference between the three independent groups (Jeremy et.al, 2019). T-independent sample test and ANOVA test were used to find the differences in mean score of upward feedback according to socio-demographic variables.

P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Study population and sample

The research population consisted of all faculty members at Shaqra University the second semester of 1444/1445 AH. The total number of faculty members is 1660 according to the statistic from the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia (Ministry of Education, 2024).

Krejcie & Morgan (1970) developed the following formula for determining sample size for a given population:

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 N p (1-p)}{d^2 (N-1) + \chi^2 p (1-p)}$$

where:

n = sample size, N= population size

χ^2 = Chi-square of degree of freedom 1 and confidence 95%=3.841

d = expected sampling error

p = population proportion (assumed to be .50)

Our population is 1660 faculty, then to be 95% confident that sample is within 5% of the true population value, we need sample size of 310 at least. comprehensive inventory of the study population, the electronic After a questionnaire was published to all teaching staff at Shaqra University in the .city of Shaqra314 completed responded, representing 18.91% of the study population, which is sufficient.

Reliability and Validity

Measuring the internal consistency of survey instruments using multi-item scales is vital, and a key method is the Cronbach's alpha test (Churchill, 1979). This test, also known as the coefficient alpha, assesses the reliability of a dataset by evaluating whether all items within a scale reliably measure the same underlying construct (De Vellis, 1991). In essence, reliability refers to the degree to which a test consistently measures what it intends to (De Vellis, 1991). Therefore, for researchers using multi-item scales, employing Cronbach's alpha is an essential step to ensure the instrument's data holds up to scrutiny. Assessing data reliability for research, Cronbach's alpha helps gauge internal consistency. Typically, values between 0.70 and 0.95 suggest reliable data. Lower values (as Tavakol & Dennick, 2011, explain) could indicate a lack of questions, weak item connections, or mixed underlying concepts.

Hence, in this study, this test was used to determine whether the scales used are reliable. The next table shows the values of the Cronbach's Alpha test was 0.941 for the overall questionnaire, ranges between 0.876 and 0.938 for its dimensions suggests a good internal consistency (Pallant, 2007). Indeed, Nunnally (1978) established that an alpha (α) of 0.70 or above provides evidence for the internal consistency and reliability of a scale's items, (*See Table 1*).

Table 1: Reliability Result

Dimensions	N of items	Cronbach's Alpha
The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	8	0.922
The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.	10	0.876
The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	9	0.938
Overall	27	0.941

A validity coefficient is a gauge of how strong (or weak) that “usefulness” factor is, it provides the strength of that relationship between test results and criterion variables (Nunnally, 1978).

In general, the possible range of the validity coefficient is the same as other correlation coefficients (0 to 1) and so, in general, validity coefficients tend not to be that strong, where 0 is a weak validity and 0.50 is moderate validity. The tendency towards consistency found in repeated measurements of the same phenomenon is referred to as reliability (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Thus, the researcher may be sure of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Table (2) shows the inter-construct correlation validity for the questionnaire; from which we found that all correlation coefficient was significant with p-value < 0.01, ranged between (0.445) and (0.919), (*See. Table 2*).

Table 2: Correlation validity for the items of the questionnaire

The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample. (R =0.819**)			The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample. (R =0.681**)			The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample. (R =0.808**)		
ITEMS	R	P-VALUE	ITEMS	R	P-VALUE	ITEMS	R	P-VALUE
1	0.707	**0.000	1	0.526	**0.003	1	0.673	**0.000
2	0.919	**0.000	2	0.445	*0.014	2	0.667	**0.000
3	0.758	**0.000	3	0.770	* *0.000	3	0.870	**0.000
4	0.797	**0.000	4	0.737	**0.000	4	0.856	**0.000
5	0.814	**0.000	5	0.764	**0.004	5	0.892	**0.000
6	0.891	**0.000	6	0.680	**0.000	6	0.851	**0.000
7	0.867	**0.001	7	0.782	**0.000	7	0.819	**0.000
8	0.798	**0.000	8	0.718	**0.000	8	0.793	**0.000
			9	0.792	**0.000	9	0.855	**0.000
			10	0.597	**0.000			

** : Statistically significant at 0.01

Results:**Demographic Characteristics**

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of a sample of 314 faculty members. Males make up the majority of the sample (53.20%) compared to females (46.80%). For Academic Degree, Assistant professors form the largest group (38.90%), followed by associate professors (26.80%) and professors (14.60%), while lecturers and teaching assistants represent a smaller portion (16.50% and 3.20%, respectively). The majority of faculty members have 10 or more years of experience (74.20%) while less than 5 years of experience is the least common category (8.90%). Regards to college affiliation, the college of human studies has the highest number of faculty members (40.40%) and college of engineering has the fewest faculty members (2.50%), (See Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of sample according to demographic characteristics (n=314)

Variable	Groups	n	%
Type	Male	167	%53.20
	Female	147	%46.80
Degree	Professor	46	%14.60
	Associate Professor	84	%26.80
	Assistant Professor	122	%38.90
	lecturer	52	%16.50
	Teaching Assistant	10	%03.20
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	28	%08.90
	less than 10 years From 5 years to	53	%16.90
	years and more 10	223	%74.20
The college to which the faculty member belongs	Human studies	127	%40.40
	Sciences	82	%26.10
	Business Management	52	%16.60
	Computer Sciences	16	%05.10
	Health colleges	18	%05.70
	Engineering	8	%02.50
	Applied College	11	%03.50

Descriptive Statistics

All items of the study factors had 5- point Likert scale, as 1 for (It never happens/ Strongly Disagree) up to 5 for (It happens all the time/ I totally agree). According to (Pimentel, 2010) the mean interval has equal length ($4/5= 0.80$), very low level of agreements represented by mean score from (1 to less than 1.80), low (1.80 to less than 2.60), medium level from (2.60 to less than 3.40) and high level of agreements by mean score (3.40 to less than 4.20) and very high level for mean score (4.20 to 5.00).

Answer to the first research question:

What is the reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample?

Table 4 shows that the overall mean score of the reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample is 1.886 with a standard deviation of 0.940 and rate percentage of (37.72%), indicating a low level of agreement with the statements regarding upward feedback practices.

Item 7, "The department head accepts comments submitted by faculty members," received the highest mean score (2.790 ± 1.382), indicating a medium level of agreement with rate percentage of (55.80%), this suggests faculty members perceive the department head as somewhat receptive to their feedback. Items 4 and 8 received low mean scores (between 1.80 and 2.60), indicating limited presence of clear mechanisms for upward feedback and a lukewarm level of encouragement for such feedback from the department head. Items 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 all received very low mean scores (below 1.80), suggesting faculty members perceive a lack of involvement in selecting, evaluating, and influencing the department head's position or decisions. Item 3, "All department faculty members evaluate the department head's performance" received the lowest mean score (1.490 ± 1.024) with rate percentage of (29.80%), indicating a very low level of agreement among faculty members regarding their involvement in

evaluating the department head's performance. This suggests that faculty members feel largely excluded from this process, (See. Table 4).

Table 4. Diagnosing the reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample

No	Items	Mean	SD	% rate	rank	Degree of approval
1	Faculty members participate in selecting the department head.	1.704	1.149	%34.08	5	very low
2	There is an evaluation of the department head by the faculty members in the department.	1.557	1.051	%31.14	6	very low
3	All department faculty members evaluate the department head's performance.	1.490	1.024	%29.80	8	very low
4	There is a clear, announced mechanism that helps members provide feedback on the decisions of the department head.	1.914	1.252	%38.28	3	Low
5	Department faculty members participate in recommending the renewal of the department head's appointment.	1.541	1.113	%30.82	7	very low
6	The results of the department head's performance evaluation are considered.	1.789	1.239	%35.78	4	very low
7	The department head accepts comments submitted by faculty members.	2.790	1.382	%55.80	1	Medium
8	The department head encourages and supports upward feedback from faculty members.	2.303	1.466	%46.06	2	Low
Overall		1.886	0.940	%37.72	Low	

Answer to the second research question:

What is the impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample?

Table 5, summarizes the key takeaways from the data on the perceived effects of upward feedback. Mean score: 4.210, indicating a very high level of agreement with the positive impacts of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness. Standard deviation (SD): 0.603, suggesting a relatively low level of variability in responses, signifying a strong consensus among participants. Rate %: 84.20%, referring to the percentage of respondents who scored items above the "somewhat agree" level (3 on the Likert scale), further emphasizing the prevalence of positive perceptions regarding upward feedback.

All items have mean scores above 4.0, indicating a very high level of agreement with statements about the benefits of upward feedback.

Item 10 ("The upward feedback provides a model for future department heads") has the highest mean score (4.360 ± 0.835), suggesting strong agreement with the beneficial impact on aspiring future department heads.

Items with the lowest mean scores (around 4.0) are related to establishing a healthy relationship (item #6), providing non-embarrassing feedback (item #7), and transparent evaluation (item #8). While these items still show high levels of agreement, they may warrant further investigation to understand if there are areas for improvement in these aspects of the upward feedback process.

These findings suggest that implementing and fostering a robust upward feedback system could be a valuable strategy for enhancing the department's leadership effectiveness and overall faculty engagement, (See. Table 5).

Table 5. The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample

No	Items	Mean	SD	% rate	rank	Degree of approval
1	Upward feedback increases department heads' concern about the quality of their decisions and develops their performance.	4.204	0.954	%84.08	6	Very high
2	Upward feedback has a positive impact on evaluating the department head's performance.	4.185	0.938	%83.70	7	High
3	Upward feedback raises members' morale in making the leadership process in the department successful through their contribution to the evaluation.	4.223	0.891	%84.46	5	very high
4	Upward feedback increases the likelihood that a successful leader will be selected to run for the department.	4.341	0.895	%86.82	2	Very high
5	Upward feedback contributes to excluding the unsuccessful leader from running for the department.	4.293	0.920	%85.86	3	Very high
6	Upward feedback creates a healthy relationship between the department head and faculty members.	4.092	0.956	%81.84	8	High
7	Upward feedback allows faculty members to provide feedback in a way that is not embarrassing for them.	4.064	0.937	%81.28	10	High
8	Upward feedback allows the department head to receive feedback transparently when evaluating responses.	4.070	0.933	%81.40	9	High
9	Continuous and regular feedback evaluation contributes to increasing the effectiveness of the evaluation.	4.271	0.861	%85.42	4	Very high
10	The upward feedback provides a model that highlights the elements that must be taken into consideration by faculty members if they run for the head of the department in the future.	4.360	0.835	%87.20	1	Very high
Overall		4.210	0.603	%84.20	Very high	

Answer to the third research question:

What are the The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.?

The data in Table 6 highlights the challenges perceived by the study sample regarding the upward feedback of department heads. Overall Mean score: 3.794 suggests a high level of agreement with statements about the challenges faced in the current system. Standard deviation (SD): 0.841 indicates moderate variability in responses, suggesting that while there is a shared perception of challenges, individual experiences may differ slightly. Degree of approval: "High" reflects the significant concerns about the current upward feedback process.

Specific Challenges:

Non-continuous and irregular feedback: This was ranked as the highest challenge (mean score: 4.102), suggesting a perceived need for a more consistent and systematic approach to upward feedback.

Lack of participation: This was ranked seventh (mean score: 3.729), indicating concerns about inclusivity in the evaluation process.

Weak follow-up, feasibility, and effectiveness: These items received high mean scores (around 3.6 - 3.7), suggesting concerns about the implementation and impact of the current process.

Limited transparency and accountability: Items related to lack of clear evidence (rank 2), limited result sharing (rank 3), and weak assurance of objectivity (ranks 4 & 5) received high mean scores (around 3.8 - 3.9), highlighting concerns about transparency and accountability in the system.

Table 6. The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the study sample

No	Items	Mean	SD	% rate	rank	Degree of approval
1	Lack of participation in evaluating the department head's performance from all faculty members.	3.729	1.215	%74.58	7	High
2	Non-continuous and irregular upward feedback reduces the effectiveness of the evaluation.	4.102	0.990	%82.04	1	High
3	Weak follow-up by the department head to evaluate their performance.	3.659	1.189	%73.18	8	High
4	Weak feasibility of evaluating the department head's performance by feedback.	3.576	1.184	%71.52	9	High
5	Weak effectiveness of the highest authority responsible for evaluation.	3.768	1.139	%75.36	6	High
6	Lack of clear evidence for upward feedback.	3.949	1.101	%78.98	2	High
7	Limiting the delivery of the results of the upward feedback to the head of the department only, without referring it to a body specialized in evaluation.	3.815	1.163	%76.30	3	High
8	Lack of objectivity by some faculty members in the evaluation process.	3.777	1.178	%75.54	4	High
9	Weak assurance of objectivity in the evaluation results by the competent authority.	3.771	1.098	%75.42	5	High
Overall		3.794	0.841	%75.88	High	

Answer to the fourth research question:

Do the sample members' viewpoints differ regarding the upward feedback of department heads and its impact on leadership effectiveness from the viewpoint of the faculty members at Shaqra University according to the variables of gender, academic degree, years of experience, and the college to which the faculty member belongs?

Gender

Based on T-test result, there is a statistically significant difference in the viewpoints of male and female faculty members regarding one of the three research areas related to the upward feedback of department heads:

Challenges facing the upward feedback:

Male faculty (mean: 3.676, SD: 0.831) reported a lower level of agreement with statements about challenges compared to female faculty (mean: 3.928, SD: 0.834). The t-statistic (-2.679) and p-value (0.008) are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, indicating that this difference is unlikely due to chance and suggests a real difference between male and female perceptions.

No statistically significant differences were found between male and female faculty members regarding their perceptions of the reality of the upward feedback ($t = 1.748$, $p = 0.081$) or its impact on leadership effectiveness ($t = 0.702$, $p = 0.483$). Therefore, while both genders share similar perceptions of the potential benefits of upward feedback, female faculty members appear to perceive more challenges in the current implementation of the upward feedback process compared to male faculty members.

Table 7. Independent Samples T-Test Result for Gender Comparisons

	Male (n=167)		Female (n=147)		t	p-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	1.973	0.924	1.787	0.952	1.748	0.081
The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.	4.233	0.543	4.184	0.666	0.702	0.483
The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	3.676	0.831	3.928	0.834	2.679-	0.008**

*: Statistically significant at 0.05

** : Statistically significant at 0.01

Academic degree:

Based on the ANOVA test results in Table 8, there are **no statistically significant differences** in the viewpoints of faculty members regarding the upward feedback of department heads and its impact on leadership effectiveness, **across the four academic degree categories.**

The reality of the upward feedback:

The F-statistic (1.112) and p-value (0.134) suggest **no significant difference** between groups based on academic degree.

The effect of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness:

The F-statistic (1.596) and p-value (0.175) also indicate **no significant difference** in viewpoints across academic degree groups.

The challenges facing the upward feedback :

Similarly, the F-statistic (1.590) and p-value (0.173) **do not show statistically significant differences** based on academic degree.

Therefore, the data suggests that faculty members with different academic degrees (e.g., Bachelor's, Master's, PhD) **hold similar views** on the reality of the upward feedback , its potential impact on leadership effectiveness, and the perceived challenges within the current system.

Table 8. ANOVA test result for comparisons between groups according to Academic Degree

	Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-ANOVA	p-value
The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	4	3.857	2.214	1.112	0.134
	Within groups	309	267.885	0.867		
	Total	313	270.742			
The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	4	2.307	0.577	1.596	0.175
	Within groups	309	111.660	0.361		
	Total	313	113.967			
The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	4	4.377	1.084	1.590	0.173
	Within groups	309	210.823	0.682		
	Total	313	215.200			

Similar to the results for academic degree, the ANOVA test in Table 9 suggests no statistically significant differences in faculty members' viewpoints across the three experience categories regarding:

- The reality of the upward feedback ($F = 0.829$, $p = 0.437$)
- The effect of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness ($F = 0.195$, $p = 0.823$)
- The challenges facing the upward feedback ($F = 0.327$, $p = 0.721$)

Therefore, based on the data, faculty members with varying levels of experience (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, and more than 10 years) appear to hold similar views on these aspects of the upward feedback process.

Table 9. ANOVA test result for comparisons between groups according to Experience

	Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-ANOVA	p-value
The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	2	1.468	0.734	0.829	0.437
	Within groups	311	275.274	0.885		
	Total	313	276.742			
The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	2	0.143	0.071	0.195	0.823
	Within groups	311	113.824	0.366		
	Total	313	113.967			
The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	2	0.464	0.232	0.327	0.721
	Within groups	311	220.737	0.710		
	Total	313	221.201			

An analysis of faculty member perspectives on the department head evaluation process (Tables 10) reveals interesting insights regarding the influence of college affiliation. While faculty across colleges generally agree on the current state of the evaluation system, their views on its effectiveness and the challenges it presents differ.

- **Shared Perception of the Current System:** There were no statistically significant differences between colleges in terms of how faculty members perceive the current evaluation process itself. This suggests a general consensus among faculty regardless of their college affiliation.
- **Differing Views on Effectiveness and Challenges:** The data shows statistically significant differences (p -value = 0.001 and 0.042, respectively) in faculty viewpoints on the impact of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness and the difficulties associated with the current evaluation process. Further analysis (refer to Table 11 and 12 for details) is needed to understand the specific variations between colleges.

Table 10. ANOVA test result for comparisons between groups according to College

	Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-ANOVA	p-value
The reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	6	4.401	0.733	0.827	0.550
	Within groups	307	272.341	0.887		
	Total	313	276.742			
The impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	6	8.068	1.345	3.898	0.001**
	Within groups	307	105.899	0.345		
	Total	313	113.967			
The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.	Between groups	6	9.158	1.526	2.209	0.042*
	Within groups	307	212.045	0.691		
	Total	313	221.201			

*: Statistically significant at 0.05

** : Statistically significant at 0.01

Scheffe's post-hoc test (Table 11) reveals that:

- Faculty in Applied College hold the most positive views on the impact of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness, with a mean score exceeding 4.691. This score is statistically significantly higher compared to faculty members from Human Studies, Science, Business Management, and Computer Science ($p < 0.05$).
- Health Colleges also hold a relatively positive view, with the highest mean score (4.550) among all colleges. However, this is only statistically significant compared to Business Management and Computer Science ($p < 0.05$).

- No statistically significant differences were found between the remaining college groups ($p > 0.05$).

Table 11. Scheffe Test result for post-hoc comparisons on the effect of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads by college

Groups/colleges	n	Mean	Human studies	Science	Business Management	Computer Science	Health Colleges	Engineering	Applied College
Human studies	127	4.215	-	0.019-	0.201	0.290	0.335-	0.098-	*0.476-
Science	82	4.234		-	0.220	0.309	0.336-	0.079-	*0.557-
Business Management	52	4.014			-	0.089	*0.536-	0.299-	*0.677-
Computer Science	16	3.925				-	*0.625-	0.388-	*0.766-
Health colleges	18	4.550					-	0.237	0.141-
Engineering	8	4.313						-	0.378-
Applied College	11	4.691							-

Scheffe's post-hoc test (Table 12) reveals that:

- Faculty members from Business Management (mean score: 3.528) hold significantly fewer challenges with (p -value < 0.05) than Faculty members from the Applied College (mean score: 4.273) and Health colleges (mean score: 3.994)
- No significant differences were found between other colleges ($p > 0.05$).

Table 12. Scheffe Test result for post-hoc comparisons on the challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among sample members by college

Groups/colleges	n	Mean	Human studies	Science	Business Management	Computer Science	Health Colleges	Engineering	Applied College
Human studies	127	3.891	-	0.019-	0.201	0.290	0.335-	0.098-	0.382-
Science	82	3.699		-	0.171	0.037-	0.295-	0.273-	0.274-
Business Management	52	3.528			-	0.218-	*0.466-	0.444-	*0.745-
Computer Science	16	3.736				-	0.258-	0.236-	0.237-
Health colleges	18	3.994					-	0.022	0.379-
Engineering	8	3.972						-	0.301-
Applied College	11	4.273							-

The study found that faculty members from Business Management reported **fewer challenges** with the current upward feedback system compared to faculty members from the Applied College and Health colleges. This difference could be attributed to several possible reasons:

1. Familiarity with Performance Management: Business schools often have a stronger emphasis on **performance management** compared to other academic disciplines. This could lead Business Management faculty to be **more accustomed** to providing and receiving feedback, making them feel more comfortable navigating the upward feedback system.

2. Specific Needs and Expectations: The **types of challenges** faced by different colleges might differ. For example, Applied College and Health colleges might deal with **more complex or nuanced** leadership issues compared to Business Management, requiring a more robust and adaptable feedback system. The current system might not adequately address the specific needs and expectations of these colleges, leading to their faculty reporting more challenges.

3. College Culture and Communication: The **prevailing culture and communication practices** within each college could also play a role. Business Management faculty might have a **more open and direct communication style** with their department head, allowing for more frequent and informal feedback exchanges. This could contribute to their perception of fewer challenges with the formal upward feedback system.

Discussion

The study examined the upward feedback of department heads and its impact on leadership effectiveness from the viewpoint of faculty members. Faculty members generally felt left out of the evaluation process. They reported low levels of agreement with statements about their involvement in selecting, evaluating, and influencing the department head. Similar to the current study, all the referenced studies (Hutchison & Carleton, 1991; Atwater et al., 1995; Stoneman et al., 1995; Stein, 1995; Reilly et al., 1996) highlight the potential benefits of upward feedback for leadership effectiveness. These benefits include improved decision-making, stronger relationships with subordinates, and enhanced overall performance. Despite the lack of involvement, faculty members overwhelmingly agreed that providing feedback to department heads (upward feedback) has positive effects on leadership. They felt it would improve the department head's decision-making and overall performance. While faculty members identified several problems with the current system. The biggest issue was the lack of regular and consistent feedback. Additionally, concerns were raised about transparency and fairness in the evaluation process. While the current study uses the term "upward feedback," some previous studies utilize different terms like "upward appraisal" (Hutchison & Carleton, 1991; Stein, 1995) or

"formal system for obtaining information from employees" (Cockfield, 1996) to describe the same concept. Challenges with the implementation: Several previous studies (Stoneman et al., 1995; Stein, 1995; Cockfield, 1996) also align with the current study in identifying challenges associated with implementing upward feedback systems. These challenges include concerns about: Transparency and fairness: Ensuring the process is perceived as objective and free from bias. Regularity and consistency: Implementing a system that gathers feedback frequently and consistently. Employee involvement: Addressing concerns about employee voice and whether their feedback is truly utilized. While, the current study delves deeper into specific challenges faced by different faculty groups (e.g., gender, college affiliation). This level of detail is not explicitly present in all the mentioned past studies. Differences in Viewpoints were found. Interestingly, female faculty reported experiencing more challenges with the current system compared to their male colleagues. The study's findings in 2019 reveal that Saudi women encounter significant barriers to reaching senior leadership roles within Saudi universities, epitomized by a "glass ceiling." This term describes the invisible yet formidable obstacles that hinder Saudi female faculty members from ascending to high-ranking positions. Predominantly, such prestigious roles including university president, deanship dean, college dean, and department head are reserved for men, effectively sidelining women from these opportunities. Furthermore, the study highlights the systematic exclusion of Saudi women from crucial aspects of university governance, such as decision-making, strategic planning, and the recruitment process. Additionally, it underscores the disparity in authority, power, and privileges between male and female leaders, with women facing considerable limitations in exercising their leadership effectively (Albasri, 2019). There were no significant differences in opinions based on academic degree or experience. However, faculty members from different colleges within the university expressed varying views on the effectiveness and challenges of the system. Faculty in the Applied College saw the most benefit from upward feedback, while those in Business Management reported fewer benefits and challenges.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this examination of upward feedback within the university setting reveals both its potential and the challenges hindering its effectiveness. While faculty recognize the value of providing feedback to department heads, the existing system suffers from irregularity, lack of transparency, and limited inclusivity. Addressing these issues through a more structured, transparent, and inclusive approach could foster greater faculty engagement and unlock the full potential of upward feedback in enhancing departmental leadership effectiveness. Additionally, focusing on the specific concerns of diverse faculty groups, such as female faculty, could further refine the evaluation process and ensure it equitably captures valuable insights from all stakeholders. By implementing these improvements, the university can cultivate a more collaborative and effective leadership environment where faculty voices are heard and valued.

To enhance upward feedback at the university, several recommendations have been proposed, including: Establish a formal process to collect faculty feedback consistently throughout the year, create online surveys or anonymous paper forms to promote engagement and address concerns about retaliation. Increase transparency, clearly defining evaluation criteria and how feedback will be used to guide departmental leadership decisions, sharing a summary report with faculty outlining key findings and suggested actions based on feedback, and holding focus groups or workshops to understand the specific concerns of female faculty. and other diverse groups regarding upward feedback. Develop strategies that ensure all faculty voices are valued and heard in the evaluation process. Involve faculty members in designing and implementing an upward feedback system. Communicate regular updates on how feedback is being used to improve departmental leadership. Providing workshops or training courses for department heads on receiving upward feedback and using it effectively to achieve personal and administrative growth. Develop resources to guide faculty on providing constructive, actionable feedback. By implementing these recommendations, the university can create a more organized, transparent, and comprehensive upward feedback system. This will ultimately lead to increased faculty engagement, improved

departmental leadership, and a more collaborative learning environment for all.

Funding Information: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to the anonymization of all personally identifiable information of study participants and the absence of sensitive data.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data are unavailable due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

Appendix A

Survey questions:

Section 1: Demographic data

1. Gender: Male, Female
2. Academic degree: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Teaching Assistant
3. Years of experience: less than 5 years, 5–10 years, more than 10 years
4. The college:
 - Health colleges: (Medicine, Dentistry, Medical Sciences, Nursing, Pharmacy, etc.)

- Faculty of Science (mathematics, chemistry, physics, biology, food, etc.)
- College of Business Administration (accounting, marketing, finance, economics, etc.)
- College of Computer and Information Technology
- College of Engineering, Architecture
- College of Human Studies: (Politics, Law, Language and Literature, Education, Religious Studies, History, Geography, Sociology, Media, Philosophy, Tourism, Theater, etc.)
- Applied College

Section 2: Research focuses

The first focus: Diagnosing the reality of the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.

1. Faculty members participate in selecting the department head.
2. Always happens - often happens - sometimes happens - rarely happens - never happens.
3. There is an evaluation of the department head by the faculty members in the department.
4. All department faculty members evaluate the department head's performance.
5. There is a clear, announced mechanism that helps members provide feedback on the decisions of the department head.
6. Department faculty members participate in recommending the renewal of the department head's appointment.
7. The results of the department head's performance evaluation are considered.
8. The department head accepts comments submitted by faculty members.
9. The department head encourages and supports upward feedback from faculty members.

Do you suggest adding another element other than what was mentioned in the reality of upward feedback?

The second focus: Determining the impact of upward feedback on the leadership effectiveness of department heads among members of the research sample.

1. Upward feedback increases department heads' concern about the quality of their decisions and develops their performance.
2. Strongly agree - Agree - Slightly agree - Disagree - Strongly disagree
3. Upward feedback has a positive impact on evaluating the department head's performance.
4. Upward feedback raises members' morale in making the leadership process in the department successful through their contribution to the evaluation.
5. Upward feedback increases the likelihood that a successful leader will be selected to run for the department.
6. Upward feedback contributes to excluding the unsuccessful leader from running for the department.
7. Upward feedback creates a healthy relationship between the department head and faculty members.
8. Upward feedback allows faculty members to provide feedback in a way that is not embarrassing for them.
9. Upward feedback allows the department head to receive feedback transparently when evaluating responses.
10. Continuous and regular feedback evaluation contributes to increasing the effectiveness of the evaluation.
11. The upward feedback provides a model that highlights the elements that must be taken into consideration by faculty members if they run for the head of the department in the future.

Do you suggest adding another element other than previously mentioned in the effect of upward feedback on leadership effectiveness?

The third focus: The challenges facing the upward feedback of department heads among members of the research sample.

1. Lack of participation in evaluating the department head's performance from all faculty members.

2. Strongly agree - Agree - Slightly agree - Disagree - Strongly disagree
3. Non-continuous and irregular upward feedback reduces the effectiveness of the evaluation.
4. Weak follow-up by the department head to evaluate their performance.
5. Weak feasibility of evaluating the department head's performance by feedback.
6. Weak effectiveness of the highest authority responsible for evaluation.
7. Lack of clear evidence for upward feedback.
8. Limiting the delivery of the results of the upward feedback to the head of the department only, without referring it to a body specialized in evaluation.
9. Lack of objectivity by some faculty members in the evaluation process.
10. Weak assurance of objectivity in the evaluation results by the competent authority.

Do you suggest adding another challenge other than what was previously mentioned in the challenges facing upward feedback?

References

1. Albasri, W. (2019). Saudi women in universities' leadership positions A study of the "Glass ceiling" phenomenon (Order No. 22589899). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2307163445). Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/saudi-women-universities-leadership-positions/docview/2307163445/se-2>
2. Antonioni, D. (1993). Upward appraisals for managers. *Industrial Management*, 35(6), 20. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/upward-appraisals-managers/docview/211593402/se-2>
3. Antonioni, D. (1994). The effects of feedback accountability on upward appraisal ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 47(2), 349. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/effects-feedback-accountability-on-upward/docview/220142760/se-2>
4. Antonioni, D. (1995). Problems Associated with Implementation of an Effective Upward Appraisal Feedback Process: An Experimental Field Study. In *Human Resource Development Quarterly* (Vol. 6, Issue 2, pp. 157–171).
5. Atwater, L., Roush, P., & Fischthal, A. (1995). The Influence of Upward Feedback on Self- and Follower Ratings of Leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(1), 35–59–59. <https://doi.org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01745.x>
6. Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., Atwater, D., & Cartier, P. (2000). An upward feedback field experiment: Supervisors' cynicism, reactions, and commitment of subordinates. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(2), 275–297. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/upward-feedback-field-experiment-supervisors/docview/220141300/se-2>
7. Auteri, E. (1994). Upward feedback leads to culture change. *HRMagazine*, 39(6), 78. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/upward-feedback-leads-culture-change/docview/205085258/se-2>
8. Bernardin, H. J. (1986). Subordinate appraisal: A valuable source of information about managers. *Human Resource Management*, 25(3),

- 421-439–439. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/hrm.3930250307>
9. Brindusa Maria POPA. (2021). The Effects of Limiting Negative Upward Feedback upon Organizational Performance. *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, 12(2), 145–152.
 10. Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
 11. Cathleen Hutchison, & J. Robert Carleton. (1991). Upward appraisal: A feedback tool for the performance technologist. *Performance + Instruction*, 30, 18–23.
 12. Churchill Jr, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of marketing research*, 64-73.
 13. Darryl Forsyth, & Gary Oldcorn. (2013). Upward Feedback and Leadership Development: Perceptions from Senior Employees. 3rd Annual International Conference on Human Resource Management and Professional Development in the Digital Age (HRM&PD 2013).
 14. De Vellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
 15. Dunoon, D. (1994). Upward feedback as a tool in the development of leadership skills: developing the leadership skills profile and testing the instrument at D'Eluxe Hotel'. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.26190/unsworks/9766>
 16. Executive's "planned" upward appraisal benefits board, administrator and staff. (2007). *Board & Administrator: For Administrators Only*, 23(8), 1–3.
 17. Graeme D. Ruxton. (2006). The unequal variance t-test is an underused alternative to Student's t-test and the Mann–Whitney U test, *Behavioral Ecology*, Volume 17, Issue 4, July/August 2006, pages 688–690.
 18. Hegarty, W. H. (1974). Using subordinate ratings to elicit behavioral changes in supervisors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(6), 764–766.
 19. Jeremy. P. Alexander, Bartholomew Spencer, Alice J. Sweeting, Jocelyn. K. Mara, Sam Robertson. (2019). The influence of match phase and field position on collective team behaviour in Australian Rules football. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 37:15, pages 1699-1707.

20. Jhun, S., Bae, Z., & Rhee, S. (2012). Performance change of managers in two different uses of upward feedback: A longitudinal study in Korea. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(20), 4246. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/performance-change-managers-two-different-uses/docview/1037677993/se-2>
21. Johnson, J. W., & Ferstl, K. L. (1999). The effects of interrater and self-other agreement on performance improvement following upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(2), 271-303. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/effects-interrater-self-other-agreement-on/docview/220140579/se-2>
22. Johnsson, H. (2022). Utilizing upward feedback in organizations: A qualitative interview study about managers use of upward feedback to develop organizations and leadership.
23. Karen Stoneman, Edward Bancroft, & Carole Hailing. (1995). Upward feedback for organizational change. *Performance + Instruction*, 34, 12–17.
24. Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
25. Kudisch, J. D., Fortunato, V. J., & Smith, A. F. R. (2006). Contextual and individual Organization Management, 31(4), 503-529. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/contextual-individual-difference-factors/docview/203352556/se-2>
26. Mary P. Rowe. (1984). The non-union complaint system at M.I.T.: An upward-feedback, mediation model. *Alternatives to the High Cost of Litigation*, 2, 10–18.
27. Ministry of Education, 2024. Main site: knowledge, information & statistics, university education statistics, A statistical summary of faculty members, administrators, and technicians by educational institution for the academic year 1438-1439 AH, 2017-2018. Retrieved from: <https://moe.gov.sa/ar/knowledgecenter/dataandstats/edustatdata/Pages/HigherEduStat.aspx>
28. Nunnally, JC 1978, *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edn, Mc Graw Hill: New York.

29. Oldcorn, G., & Forsyth, D. (2015). Upward Feedback and Leadership Development: Perceptions from Senior Local Government Employees. *New Zealand Journal of Human Resources Management*, 15(1), 36–61.
30. Pallant, J. (2007): *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Version 15)*, 3rd Edition. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
31. Pratt, J. R. (2000). How'm I doing? the case for upward feedback. *Home Health Care Management & Practice*, 12(5), 63. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/howm-i-doing-case-upward-feedback/docview/232508689/se-2>
32. Reilly, R. R., Smither, J. W., & Vasilopoulos, N. L. (1996). A longitudinal study of upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(3), 599. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/longitudinal-study-upward-feedback/docview/220134202/se-2>
33. Roger Cockfield. (1996). Upward Feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 387–390.
34. Rubin, R. (1995). Upward Appraisal: What do Subordinates Consider Important in Evaluating Their Supervisors? In *Library & Information Science Research* (Vol. 17, Issue 2, pp. 151–161).
35. Smith, A. F. R., & Fortunato, V. J. (2008). Factors Influencing Employee Intentions to Provide Honest Upward Feedback Ratings. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(3), 191–207. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9070-4>
36. Smither, J. W., Wohlers, A. J., & London, M. (1995). A Field Study of Reactions to Normative versus Individualized Upward Feedback. *Group & Organization Management*, 20(1), 61-89–89. <https://doi-org.sdl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1059601195201005>
37. Smither, J. W., London, M., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., & al, e. (1995). An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(1), 1. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/examination-effects-upward-feedback-program-over/docview/220134257/se-2>
38. Stein, J. E. (1995). Upward Appraisal: A Tool for the Continuous Improvement of Library Managers' Skills.

39. Tavakol M, Dennick R. post-examination analysis of objective tests. *Med Teach*. 2011; 33:447-58.
40. Thomas, A., Wells, M., & Willard, J. (1992). A novel approach to developing managers and their teams: BPX uses upward feedback. *Management Education and Development*, 23(1), 30. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/novel-approach-developing-managers-their-teams/docview/223632956/se-2>
41. Wooten, T. C., & Brown, B. K. (1998). Upward performance appraisals for audit teams: Professional development that is simple: Certified public accountant. *The CPA Journal*, 68(11), 60-62. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/upward-performance-appraisals-audit-teams/docview/212282758/se-2>
- 1- Workers Polled. (1944). *BusinessWeek*, 795, 32–34.
- 2- موضوعية نظام تقييم (2015). النصور، ميساء عبداللطيف محمد، و صالح، أحمد علي أداء الموارد البشرية وأثرها في سلوك المواطنة التنظيمية : الدور الوسيط لأسلوب التغذية الراجعة 360 درجة: دراسة ميدانية في الجامعات الخاصة الأردنية (رسالة دكتوراه غير منشورة). جامعة العلوم الإسلامية العالمية، عمان. مسترجع من <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/864475>
- 3- الثبتي، خالد عواض عبدالله. (2019). تقييم أداء رؤساء الأقسام التربوية في جامعة المجلة التربوية، الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية من وجهة نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس مسترجع من 192 - مج34، ع133، 149 <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1029181>

Software

IBM Corp. Released 2023. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 29.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.