

Research Article

Cite this article: Alrashdan, H., Darawsheh, N., Almheiri, A., Aljanabi, Y., Al-Khataybeh, M., & Al-Quran, N. (2025). The Effect of Administrative Bullying on the Quality of Education. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 18, e2025515.
<https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.18.515>

Received July 14, 2025

Accepted October 5, 2025

Keywords: Administrative Bullying, Quality of Education, Higher Education, Jordanian Universities

Author for correspondence:

Najwa Darawsheh

 najwadarawsha@gmail.com

 Department of Educational Foundations and Administration/Faculty of Educational Sciences, Jadara University-Jordan)



OPEN ACCESS

© The Author(s), 2025. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

The Effect of Administrative Bullying on the Quality of Education

Hanadi Alrashdan^{}, Najwa Darawsheh^{}, Abdulla Almheiri^{}, Yaseen Aljanabi^{}, Majid Al-Khataybeh^{}, Nahla Al-Quran^{}

Abstract

Background/purpose. Administrative bullying has become associated with inappropriate behaviors at work. This raised some concerns about how to define and measure it precisely. Nonetheless, there is a theoretical and practical gap in educational literature. So, this study explores the impact of administrative bullying on the quality of education.

Materials/methods. The sample consisted of (300) employees selected randomly from employees working at Jordanian universities. To achieve the objectives of the study, Administrative Bullying and Quality of Education questionnaires were developed

Results. The results showed that the level of administrative bullying practiced at Jordanian universities was low ($M=2.30$, $SD=0.13$); that the level of the quality of education was moderate ($M=2.69$, $SD=0.30$). The findings also showed a negative correlation between administrative bullying and the quality of education ($r=-0.047$, $sig.=0.413$).

Conclusion. The study examined the effect of administrative bullying on the quality of education and worked on identifying the level of administrative bullying at higher education institutions in Jordan, attempted to determine the level of education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan, and investigated the effect of administrative bullying on education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan, providing an instrument that can be used to determine the effect of administrative bullying on the quality of education.

Limitations. The study was confined to employees at public and private universities in Jordan and this limits the generalization of the results to other populations in other geographical regions.

1. Introduction

Advocates have pushed for the implementation of state and local laws and policies addressing bullying. Research in the field of bullying has also expanded, aiming to uncover the root causes, predictors, effects, and effective strategies for intervention and prevention. (Kaki& Alnusair, 2023). The concept of bullying has emerged recently in the administrative field, focusing on a philosophy and authoritarian management styles that have become a central axis for many administrative problems. Educational institutions suffer from this, as many non-physical practices and behaviors issued by an individual or a group of individuals targeting a specific person or group, to the exclusion of others. This targeting is considered a repeated aggressive behavior resulting in gaining power at the expense of others, affecting the morale of the workers.

As highlighted by Alatyat (2021), bullying by managers is often manifested as nit-picking, unjustified criticisms, or unfair treatment compared to other employees. However, labeling these actions as bullying may not always be accurate. These issues typically stem from a lack of clarity in defining bullying, setting performance expectations, and agreeing on outcomes between managers and employees. When bullying and harassment come from another employee, it commonly takes the form of negative body language, nitpicking, and unjustified criticism.

1.1. Problem of the Study

Administrative bullying has become associated with inappropriate behaviors at work. There are debates in the literature on how to precisely define and measure this negative phenomenon. Despite numerous studies that have addressed administrative bullying and its impact in our current era, there is a theoretical and practical gap in educational literature regarding conducting studies that specifically examine the impact of administrative bullying on the quality of education. For Example, a study by Alatyat (2021) examined the impact of administrative bullying on the employee performance. In another study, Kaki and Alnusair (2023) investigated the reality of the practice of administrative bullying behavior on employees of Sirte University. So, this study aims to explore the impact of the administrative bullying on the quality of education.

1.2. Questions of the Study

The study attempted answering the following questions:

1. What is the level of administrative bullying at higher education institutions in Jordan?
2. What is the level of education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan?
3. Is there an effect for administrative bullying on education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan?

1.3. Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is two folded. Firstly, it opens the venture for future researchers interested in higher education administration organizational behaviors by opening their eyes on one of the organizational variables that have not been the main focus of these researchers, that is administrative bullying. Although such a behavior has been noticed and documented in some business organizations, it is still under investigated in higher education institutions. Secondly, this study may open the eyes of HR personnel in higher education institutions to develop some rules and regulations able to reduce the level of administrative bullying in these organizations.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The study sought to achieve the following three objectives:

1. Identifying the level of administrative bullying at higher education institutions in Jordan.

2. Determining the level of education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan.

3. Investigating the effect of administrative bullying on education quality at higher education institutions in Jordan.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

Several limitations can restrict the generalization of the study results. For example, the study was confined to employees at public and private universities in Jordan and this limits the generalization of the results to other populations in other geographical regions. Furthermore, the study was conducted in the academic year 2023/2024, and this is a major obstacle in generalizing the results to other time periods.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Administrative Bullying: A type of control or intimidation aimed at others, involving verbal or written mistreatment, using derogatory language, excluding from activities, or pressuring to complete specific tasks. Specifically, it occurs when managers mistreat their employees, exerting authority over them and causing some to resign due to the harassment endured (Alshater & Alsalem, 2024).

Quality of Education: A set of policies and objectives are adopted to achieve the control of the performance of the educational institution to achieve its goals related to educational quality (Haddad, 2019).

1.7. Theoretical Framework

Employees in the educational environment face significant challenges due to administrative bullying and psychological pressures they experience. These problems affect the quality of work and the educational environment in general. According to Bulut and Hihi (2021), about 75% of bullying cases in the workplace were from managers on employees. Additionally, it was concluded that 90% of American workers have experienced bullying. The socioeconomic effects of workplace bullying are significant. Bullied workers often experience a decrease in job performance and quality due to difficulties in concentration and decision-making. Additionally, absenteeism increases among bullying victims, leading to reduced productivity. In the same vein, administrative bullying can have detrimental effect on both teachers and students, impacting their emotional, cognitive, and social development. Moreover, the negative outcomes of such behaviors highlight the importance of addressing this issue to create a healthier educational environment for all involved (Flores, 2019).

Al Shater and Al Salem (2024) defined administrative bullying as any domination or intimidation that targets others, including verbal or written abuse, name-calling, exclusion from activities, or forcing someone to do something. Although the methods and forms of bullying may vary, they all aim to harm others. Administrative bullying is any use of hostile behavior against a colleague or a manager towards their employees. It is also known as bosses' control over employees, harassing them until some are forced to leave their jobs. In addition, Awar (2023) defined administrative bullying as both extreme and negative behaviors in the workplace resulting from a power imbalance, leading to distress and negative outcomes for subordinates.

According to Kaki and Alnusair (2023), administrative bullying is the practice of administrative tasks and duties that demonstrate dominance, intimidation, and organizational behaviors aimed to excluding others, illustrating the tendency of employers to control and dominate subordinates and harass them with dominance and abuse. Al-Ajmi and Al-Anzi (2021) stated that the impact of administrative bullying has various psychological and social challenges within their communities and workplaces, as well as affecting their academic performance and self-perception negatively. Employees have emotions, dignity, and rights in the workplace. Degrading or belittling them can lead

to negative emotions, psychological harm, and a desire for retaliation among colleagues (Awar, 2023).

Mufti (2020) mentioned that administrative bullying poses a significant threat to human capital and creativity in the work environment by focusing on superficial aspects rather than actual knowledge and skills. It isolates talented and creative employees, leading them to feel neglected and marginalized, redirecting their efforts and innovations in unproductive directions. This behavior negatively impacts individuals, diminishing their potential and creativity. As Fettache (2024) points out, various studies have highlighted the prevalence of this type of hostility in all workplaces, with a more pronounced occurrence in specific sectors like education. Undoubtedly, workplace bullying poses ethical concerns and significantly impacts teachers' lives, affecting both personal and professional quality.

Bukhari and Akhter (2022) confirm that the emotional toll of bullying on employees is profound, leading to stress, anger, anxiety, fatigue, and impatience, all of which can impact their performance and work quality. Employees may experience a decline in quantity and quality of work completed and increased desire to leave their job and lose interest in their work. Therefore, bullying results in a shift in perspective, loss of interest in work, sleep disturbances, challenges in interpersonal interactions, and difficulties with concentration. These effects lead to decreased job satisfaction, reduced job motivation, difficulty focusing, efficiency, lack of effort and dedication, and strained relationships with managers and colleagues.

As of, Al Yousefi (2022) states that when teachers are bullied or feel mistreated by their colleagues or principals, they react by engaging in knowledge hiding practices such as withholding information or remaining silent when asked for knowledge. These behaviors can stem from a desire to protect their knowledge and resources in response to feeling bullied or encountering rudeness from their co-workers or managers. Arifin (2019) highlights the negative impact of bullying by managers on employee performance and well-being, focusing on how workplace bullying affects job performance, employee engagement, and job satisfaction, underscoring the importance of addressing this issue in organizational settings.

In the same line, workplace bullying has severe consequences on employees' wellbeing and job performance. Bullying in the workplace is indeed a significant form of work stress that can have detrimental effects on both the organization and its employees. It can impact physical, psychological, and mental health. Bullying involves repeated harmful behaviors towards colleagues, creating a hostile work environment. This behavior is a targeted form of intimidation towards individuals or groups, leading to negative consequences for all involved (Al-Romeedy et al. 2023).

In general, when teachers experience bullying from principals, it can lead to increased stress, decreased job satisfaction, and lower morale. This hostile environment affects their ability to focus on teaching effectively, impacting student learning outcomes. Additionally, administrative bullying creates a toxic work culture that hinders collaboration and professional growth among educators. Addressing and preventing administrative bullying is crucial to maintaining a positive teaching environment and enhancing the quality of education provided to students.

Adam et al. (2022) emphasize the need for a clear understanding of quality teaching to enhance students' achievement and promote social justice. The complexity of determining teacher effectiveness underscores the importance of promoting effective teaching practices and providing supportive conditions. Teachers must also be equipped to address diverse student learning needs to ensure quality education. Education quality has various interpretations and is divided into dimensions like healthy learners, conducive environments, relevant curricula, child-friendly pedagogy, and useful outcomes. Each of these elements has a crucial role in shaping a robust educational system that

upholds the right to effective learning for students (Thinley, 2021). Therefore, the need for safe school environment for teachers free of administrative bullying becomes prominent.

Papantymou and Darra (2023) defined quality of education as a contribution to moral development, personality integration, and spiritual growth. Therefore, another definition suggests focusing on meeting the needs and expectations of the learners to encompass a more comprehensive view of quality education. Moreover, Organization that provides services must have five services quality indicators: tangible (Physical evidence), dependable (reliability), responsiveness, assurance (guarantee) and empathy (Tešić, 2020). Tangible involve physical evidence means that learners want evidence that employees can show to satisfy them, such as interactions with learners (Abbas, 2020), reliability in the manner that employees are dependable in carrying out tasks assigned to students (Ali et al., 2021), responsiveness requires prompt responses to student needs, assurance entails knowledgeable and trustworthy staff, free of danger, risk, through student engagement with academic leaders, lecturers, and employees (Upadhyay et al., 2019), empathy involves understanding and addressing individual student needs (Latif et al., 2019).

In the same hand, quality service consisted of five indicators and these indicators have a vital role in shaping the overall quality of services provided by organizations.

1. Reliability:

Reliability involves delivering on promises consistently and accurately. Customers value firms that uphold their commitments, which significantly influence their perception of service quality and loyalty. Service providers must understand and meet customer expectations. Additionally, reliability encompasses aspects like regularity, attitude towards complaints, and communication with customers, consistency, and adherence to procedures. Reliability is building trust and maintaining strong customer relationships in the service industry (Ramya et al. 2019).

2. Tangible:

Tangible refers to the physical aspects such as the appearance of the facilities, equipment, and service provider personnel. The dimension includes include attributes like modern equipment, visually attractive facilities, well-groomed and professional-looking employees, and materials that enhance the visual appeal of the services provided. These tangible elements have in shaping customers' perceptions of service quality and can contribute to a positive overall experience (Setiono & Hidayat, 2022).

3. Responsiveness:

Responsiveness is all about how quickly and effectively customer support addresses issues or problems faced by customers. This includes handling complaints due to any service failures promptly and efficiently. Businesses need to be proactive in resolving customer concerns and compensating for any inconveniences or financial losses (Salome et al. 2022).

4. Empathy:

According to Widyaningrum (2020), empathy refers to the organization's ability to comprehend costumer issues, prioritize customer interest, provide personalized attention, and offer convenient operating hours. It involves understanding and addressing customer needs effectively to build strong relationships and enhance customer satisfaction.

5. Assurance:

Assurance reflects the level of trust and confidence clients have in the organization's ability to provide the service. It is largely influenced by the trust clients place in the staff of the service provider.

Clients will not be satisfied unless they are confident in the competence of the service provider (Denboba, 2020).

2. Literature Review

This section presents previous studies addressing administrative bullying in educational institutions in addition to studies examining the indicators of education quality indicators. It should be noted that the researcher did not find any previous study that investigated the effect of administrative bullying on education quality in both schools and universities. Thus, the presentation of previous studies is confined to those studies related to each of the two variables in this study. Thus, this paper is different from previous studies since it attempts to highlight the effects of administrative bullying on quality of education in the Jordanian universities. In one of these studies, Daka and Changwe (2020) examined the relationship between education quality and GBA. The sample of the study consisted of (69) students. To achieve the objectives of the study, Meta-analysis design was adopted. The findings of the study showed that Low GPA can result in low graduation rates and low retention of students, and The best predictors to graduation of students are undergraduate GPA, gender and race.

In the same vein, Alhaji (2020) investigated the administrative bullying in the Saudi government agencies from various aspects. A descriptive approach was adopted. The sample of the study include (580) employees. The results revealed that the administrative bullying is rarely practiced in government agencies. The results also indicated that the director represents the first source, then the co-workers, the superior manager, the beneficiaries of the service and the subordinates. Moreover, the study revealed that the main reasons of bullying, which are as follows: the power and the authority as well as psychological, legal, organizational and ethical reasons.

In Indonesia, Arman et al. (2020) analyzed the relationship between education and growth in Indonesia and (2) compile a formulation of education policy as an important driving factor in long-term growth. The sample of the study consisted of (33) provinces in Indonesia in the period 2013-2015. To achieve the objectives of the study, empirical model was employed. The findings of the study showed that the level of prosperity and prosperity was positively correlated with regional economic growth. This shows that the more qualified human development and increasing prosperity, the better economic growth in the region. Furthermore, the better the quality of education, the better economic growth.

In another study, a study by Alatyat (2021) in Jordan determined the impact of the administrative bullying on the employee performance. To achieve the study objective, the study adopted a descriptive analytical approach. The sample of the study consisted of (250) employees. The findings of the study showed that the extent of prevalence of administrative bullying behaviors in municipalities in Jordan is high. The findings also showed that administrative bullying has negative impacts on municipalities and victimized employee. In addition, administrative bullying negatively affects the employee performance.

In Nigeria, Patrick et al. (2022) aimed to determine workplace bullying and how it affects employees' performance. To achieve the study objective, a survey was used. The sample of the study consisted of (167) staff. The findings of the study indicated that a positive relationship exists between workplace aggression and occupational stress and that a 90% change in occupational stress is a result of changes in workplace aggression ($R = .904$; $R^2 = .898$; F statistics = 7097.588; p -value < .05).

In Palestine, a study by Awer (2023) examined the effect of administrative bullying on organizational commitment and job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in the city of Jerusalem. To achieve the study objective, a quantitative descriptive approach was used. The sample of the study included (200) male and female employees. The results indicated that a statistically

significant effect of the behavior of administrative bullying on the organizational commitment of secondary school teachers in the city of Jerusalem. The results also showed a statistically significant effect of the behavior of administrative bullying on the organizational commitment of secondary stage teachers in the city of Jerusalem.

A study by Al Shater and Al Salem (2024) in Libya sought to identify the reality of the practice of administrative bullying behavior on employees of Sirte University. To achieve the study objective, a questionnaire was adopted. The sample of the study consisted of (1579) male and female employees. The findings of the study showed that there are behaviors of administrative bullying practiced against employees at Sirte University at a high rate, and others occur at a moderate rate. The findings also showed that there are statistically significant differences according to the gender variable in favor of females in exposure to administrative bullying behavior.

3. Methodology

3.1. Design of the Study

The study adopted the descriptive-analytical design to achieve the study objectives. The descriptive analytical design focuses on a specific issue, providing a detailed and accurate description both quantitatively and qualitatively. This method aims to understand the issue's connections to other aspects and draw conclusions that can enhance comprehension of the phenomena under study.

3.2. Population and Sample of the Study

The study population consisted of all employees working at Jerash University in Jordan during the second semester of the academic year 2023/2024. While the study sample consisted of (300) employees selected using random sampling method from the population of the study. Table (1) presents the distribution of the study sample based on their demographic variables.

Table 1. Study Sample Distribution based on the Study Variables

Gender	Male	124	41.3%
	female	176	58.7%
University type	Public	107	35.7%
	Private	193	64.3%
Experience	Less than 5 years	87	29%
	5-10	147	49%
	More than 10	66	22%

The descriptive data in table 2 shows that (41.3%) of the participants were male and (58.7%) were female. As for the University type, (35.7%) of the study sample were from public universities and (64.3%) were from private universities. With respect to work experience, (29%) were (less than 5) years of experience, (49%) were in (5-10) years of experience and (22%) have (more than 10) years of work experience. Since the researchers are faculty members and administrators in the Jordanian universities, they made sure that all of those determined to be eligible for the participation in the study are given the two scales and they returned them after the researchers supervised the

completion of the instruments. The administration of the scales lasted for 2 weeks beginning from December, 12th, 2024 to 26th of the same month.

3.3. Instruments of the Study

To achieve the objectives of the study, and after reviewing the literature and previous studies such as Alatyat (2021), Awer (2023) and Papanthymou and Darra (2023), two questionnaires were used in the study. The first was to assess administrative bullying while the second was to measure education quality. The Administrative Bullying scale was developed by Alhajj (2020) contains 25 items measures the reality of the prevalence of administrative bullying between the administrators in the university. A 5-point Likert scale (Strongly agree 5, Agree: 4, Neutral: 3, Disagree: 2, strongly Disagree: 1) was employed. (5) indicates that administrative bullying is at its highest level, while (1) indicates that administrative bullying is at its lowest level. Thus, the level of each item can be extracted as well as the total level of administrative bullying after defining the mean score of the responses on the items.

While the Quality of Education scale was developed by Haddad (2019) consisted of 20 items measures the perspectives of education quality assessors in the Ministry of higher Education to ensure educational quality in universities. 5-point Likert scale (Strongly agree 5, Agree: 4, Neutral: 3, Disagree: 2, strongly Disagree: 1) was employed, (5) indicates that quality of education is at its highest level, while (1) indicates that quality of education is at its lowest level. Thus, the level of each item can be extracted as well as the total level of each domain, after defining the mean score of the responses on the items. As for the discussion of the results, the following scale was adopted:

3.4. Validity and Reliability

The scale was shared, reviewed with faculty experts, and pilot tested before distribution to obtain any feedback to improve the questionnaire and ensure that the instrument was appropriate. Face validity of the scales was checked using a panel of experts from faculty members of different Jordanian universities. As for content validity, the scales were distributed to a pilot study, then, correlation coefficient (Pearson) was calculated for the total score of the tool and the correlation coefficient (Pearson) between each statement and the total score of the tool using the statistical program (SPSS).

Table 2. Results of Internal Consistency (Cronbach Alpha) for the Study Measure

	Number Item	Cronbach alpha
Administrative Bullying	25	0.84
Quality of Education	20	0.75

As for reliability, internal consistency was computed. Table (2) shows that internal consistency coefficients using Cronbach alpha was (0.84) for Administrative Bullying total scale while it was (0.75) for Quality of Education total scale.

Table (3) presents internal consistency coefficients using Cronbach alpha for Administrative Bullying scale.

Table 3. Correlations Administrative Bullying

	TOT		TOT
1	.784	15	.586
2	.666	16	.786
3	.581	17	.707
4	.890	18	.757
5	.884	19	.575
6	.643	20	.662
7	.660	21	.540
8	.608	22	.723
9	.557	23	.898
10	.710	24	.661
13	.624	25	.725
14	.681		

Internal consistency coefficients for Administrative Bullying scale ranged between ($\alpha=0.540$) and ($\alpha=0.898$) which signifies high internal consistency coefficients. Thus, none of the items were deleted.

Table (4) presents internal consistency coefficients using Cronbach alpha for Quality of Education scale.

Table 4. Correlations Quality of Education

	TOT		TOT
1	.650	11	.631
2	.692	12	.521
3	.618	13	.767
4	.837	14	.746
5	.513	15	.715
6	.716	16	.860
7	.526	17	.617
8	.718	18	.591
9	.857	19	.721
10	.743	20	.629

Internal consistency coefficients for Administrative Bullying scale ranged between ($\alpha=0.513$) and ($\alpha=0.860$) which signifies high internal consistency coefficients. Thus, none of the items were deleted.

3.5. Scoring

The statistical model with the thirty degree of Likert scale has been adopted, for estimating the responses means scores for the study questionnaires and individual items of each questionnaire. The statistical standard was adopted using the following equation:

High 3.67 – 5

Moderate 2.34 – 3.77

Low 1.33 – 2.33

(5) - Minimum scale (1) / Number of required categories (5)

1-5 / 3= 1.33

4. Results & Discussion

To answer the first and the second questions of the study, means, standard deviations, percentages and frequencies were obtained for the individual items and the total scales of both administrative bullying and quality of education. As for the third question of the study, correlations and regression were employed to answer this question.

4.1. Q1: What is the Level of Administrative Bullying at Jordanian Universities?

To answer this question, means and standard deviations were extracted for the level of administrative bullying at Jordanian universities. Table (5) shows the means and standard deviations of the study sample responses to each of the individual items and the total scale.

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Estimates of the Study Sample for Administrative Bullying Items in Descending Order

		Mean	Std.	Degree
1	Your administrator is using inappropriate language when speaking to you.	2.33	0.61	Moderate
2	Your administrator indirectly insults you.	2.49	0.60	Moderate
3	Your administrator mocks you in front of others.	1.68	0.62	Low
4	Your administrator raises his voice and interrupts you while you speak.	2.32	0.47	Low
5	Your administrator ignores your inquiries directed to him.	2.11	0.51	Low
6	Your administrator calls you names and attributes that do not suit you.	2.26	0.58	Low
7	Your administrator belittles you and the value of the work you do.	1.99	0.40	Low
8	Your administrator physically attacks you by raising his hand - pushing... etc.	1.36	0.51	Low
9	Your administrator deliberately speaks to you in an incomprehensible accent.	2.06	0.31	Low

		Mean	Std.	Degree
10	Your administrator often excludes you.	1.67	0.76	Low
11	Your administrator excludes you because of your weak physical build.	2.06	0.56	Low
12	Your administrator shows disdain towards you for being of a different gender (male - female).	1.74	0.68	Low
13	Your administrator brags in front of you for having advanced degrees.	2.53	0.53	Moderate
14	You are held accountable alone for mistakes with collective responsibility.	2.74	0.45	Moderate
15	Your administrator deliberately keeps you working extra hours without others.	2.60	0.52	Moderate
16	You are deprived of bonuses without any reason.	2.55	0.54	Moderate
17	You receive continuous and authoritarian orders.	2.49	0.54	Moderate
18	You are under strict surveillance by your manager.	2.59	0.56	Moderate
19	You are constantly transferred between workplaces without reason.	2.55	0.59	Moderate
20	Your administrator revokes your authority without justification.	2.58	0.56	Moderate
21	Your administrator assigns tasks to you that do not align with your job nature.	2.53	0.59	Moderate
22	You are not involved in making the decisions entrusted to you.	2.52	0.56	Moderate
23	You are frequently subjected to psychological abuse and your dignity is violated.	2.52	0.57	Moderate
24	You feel like your administrator monitors work to catch mistakes.	2.62	0.51	Moderate
25	Your administrator handles your office devices without any legitimate reason.	2.64	0.52	Moderate
Total Administrative Bullying		2.30	0.13	Low

The results show that means ranged between (1.36 – 2.74), where item (14) which states "*You are held accountable alone for mistakes with collective responsibility*" ranked first with a mean of (2.74), while item (8) stating "*Your manager physically attacks you by raising his hand - pushing... etc*", ranked last, with a mean of (1.36). The mean score of the administrative bullying as a whole was (2.30), which indicates that the level of administrative bullying in Jordanian universities was low. This result may be due to the fact that universities are academic institutions that always work on encouraging the positive behaviors that should be the dominating ones in the university. Also, head of departments, deans of faculties and academic leaders in the different university positions in the diverse faculties are individuals holding the highest degrees and have gained the needed experience

to be professional leaders able to contribute in the advancement of the university they are honored to work in,

In this respect, Kaki and Alnusair (2023) affirmed that effective leaders are those who know the consequences of administrative bullying on the wellbeing of employees working in the different departments and sections of the organization. Since the employees working in Jordanian universities were the sample of this study, it can be inferred that they work with leaders knowing the negative effects of practicing administrative bullying in the workplace. As such, leaders in these universities are relatively aware that bullying is one of the aggressive behaviors that have been documented in the psychological literature as having severe outcomes on achievement and productivity.

Furthermore, the academic leaders are well-informed about to how extent practicing administrative bullying may hinder the progress of the department they assume responsibility of leading to achieve the strategic objective of these departments. As it is known, Jordan is an oriental country and the majority of the population in this Middle East country are Muslims. Islam calls for having good manners and to be a role model for followers. Academic leaders in the Jordanian universities work to set an example of the behaviors that should be encouraged and those behaviors that must be avoided, and this applies to administrative bullying.

This result is different from the results reported in Al Shater and Al Salem study (2024) indicating that level of administrative bullying at Sirte University was high, while the results of this study showed that administrative bullying is low. May this may be attributed to the differences in the demographic characteristics of the two samples participating in these studies. This result is also different from the results indicated by Alatyat (2021) in the study he conducted in Jordanian municipalities. Although these two studies were conducted in Jordan, it can be assumed that the sample of this study was from employees working in the Jordanian universities while the sample of Alatyat (2021) study were employees working in municipalities.

4.2. Q2: What is the Level of Quality of Education at Jordanian Universities?

To answer this question, means and standard deviations were extracted for the level of quality of education at Jordanian universities. and the following table shows that. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Estimates of the Study Sample for Quality of Education Items in Descending Order

		Mean	Std.	Degree
1	The university focuses on building positive values and attitudes among students	2.35	1.31	Moderate
2	The university provides opportunities for collaborative leadership among university staff.	2.42	1.32	Moderate
3	The university relies on diversifying teaching strategies and considering individual differences to meet students' needs. .	2.57	1.30	Moderate
4	Continuous development initiatives are adopted in the university and are continuously evaluated.	2.53	1.27	Moderate
5	The University staff serves as a role model for the students.	2.54	1.28	Moderate

		Mean	Std.	Degree
6	The university provides sufficient learning resources that suit students' learning and educational needs, helping them take responsibility for their learning.	3.08	0.95	Moderate
7	The University provides a healthy and safe environment that is well-maintained and continuously cared for.	2.61	1.03	Moderate
8	The University cares about connecting knowledge to life.	3.18	0.80	Moderate
9	The University works on employing competencies and skills to deal with students with special needs, talented students, slow learners, and sensory and mental disabilities.	2.55	1.33	Moderate
10	The University works on employing various strategies and methods to modify and adjust students' behavior effectively.	2.70	1.25	Moderate
11	The university adopts individual and cumulative student assessment results efficiently to support student learning and the university' developmental plan.	2.23	1.26	Low
12	The university adopts an institutional communication methodology.	2.43	1.29	Moderate
13	The university engages in reciprocal partnerships with the local community to support the university' development.	2.73	1.24	Moderate
14	The university is keen on monitoring students' achievements transparently and fairly, reflecting their actual performance.	2.72	1.16	Moderate
15	The university values working as a learning community, providing opportunities for professional development and self-improvement for the staff.	2.76	1.16	Moderate
16	The university is keen on spreading a culture of high and positive expectations within the university community.	3.03	1.14	Moderate
17	The university focuses on involving parents in the university.	2.83	1.25	Moderate
18	The university provides various opportunities for students to engage in leadership activities.	2.94	1.12	Moderate
19	The university' activities are all driven by its vision and mission.	2.72	1.10	Moderate
20	The university invests in human, financial, and material resources.	2.89	1.08	Moderate
Total Quality of Education		2.69	0.30	Moderate

The results show that means ranged between (3.98 – 3.73), where item (18) stating "*The university provides various opportunities for students to engage in leadership activities*" ranked first

with a mean of (2.94), while item (11) stating "*The university adopts individual and cumulative student assessment results efficiently to support student learning and the university' developmental plan*", ranked last, with an arithmetic mean of (2.23). The mean score of the Quality of Education total scale was (2.69). This value indicates that quality of education is at moderate levels as reflected by the responses of the study sample on the Quality of Education scale.

The results of the study also showed that quality of education in the Jordanian universities was at moderate levels. This result is relative mirroring the status quo of the situation of these universities that are suffering from financial hardships due to the insufficient funding from the central movement in Jordan. As known, the Jordanian government is experiencing difficulties in providing the needed financial and human resources that can be described as the main contributor sin improving the quality of education in the educational institutions.

Although this result may be disappointing since the quality of education in the Jordanian universities was moderate, it reflects an important fact that these universities are doing their best to provide students with quality education despite the difficulties they are experiencing. Jordanian universities are always working to develop their academic programs based on the results of the scientific research in the various academic disciplines. Nonetheless, this needs enormous infrastructure and human capital, and the Jordanian universities are lacking these resources in the time being.

Confirming this fact, Papanthymou and Darra (2023) emphasized the need for providing adequate financial and human resources for improving the quality of education or any other service or product in the different organizations. In the administrative literature, improving the quality of the service or product requires the collaboration of managers, administrators in the various levels of management with employees so as the end user of the service or product can develop positive attitudes and perceptions.

In the case of quality in the educational institutions, students are those who can make informed judgements about the ability of the school or university in making the learning experience as productive as possible. This result is consistent with the results indicated by Haddad (2019) in his study.

4.3. Q3: What is the Effect of Administrative Bullying on the Quality of Education?

To answer the third question of the study, correlations and regression were employed to answer this question. Table (7) shows the values of correlations by calculating the values of Pearson coefficients between administrative bullying total score and quality of education score at Jordanian universities.

Table 7. Correlations

		Quality of Education
Administrative Bullying	Pearson Correlation	-0.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.413

As shown in the above table, *R- value* was ($r=-0.047$, $sig. =0.413$) which signifies a statistically significant and negative correlation between administrative bullying and quality of education at the Jordanian universities.

Table (8) presents the values of regression to show the effect of independent variable (Administrative Bullying) on the dependent variable (Quality of Education).

Table 8. Regression

Independent	F	Sig	df	R	R ²	β	T	Sig.
Administrative Bullying	.673	.413	.298	.047	.002	-.058	-.820	.413

Dependent: Quality of Education

As shown in the above table, there is a negative impact for administrative bullying on quality of education at the Jordanian universities ($f=, .673, df=.298, r=.047, r^2=.002, , sig=.413$). The effect size for the administrative bullying on quality of education was significant ($\beta=-.058$). These values confirm the negative and significant effect for administrative bullying on quality of education at Jordanian universities.

This result is plausible noting the negative consequences of practicing administrative bullying on the organizational commitment of employees. In this respect, several scholars have documented that administrative bullying has negative effects on employees' psychological wellbeing, which in turn reduces the productivity of the employees who are the main contributor in increasing the quality of products or services.

For example, Awer (2023) stressed that administrative bullying practices by administrators was the main contributor in demotivating employees and teachers in the educational institutions, The author explained this by indicating that being mocked in the workplace and ridiculed by the administrator increases occupational stress. Thus, employees feel insecure while being in the university or school environment. This in turn makes it easier for them to develop psychological burnout and the feelings that they are not appreciated and respected by their administrators.

In the case of Jordanian universities, the employees participating in this study indicated that feeling secure in the university environment is a key pillar of their workday hours. They expressed that when being respected, acknowledged and appreciated, they feel that they should devote their time and effort to promote the quality of the educational services provided by the university.

In the same vein, Park and Ono (2017) expressed their concern about the overlooked results of administrative bullying on employees' psychological and personal outcomes. They claimed that shouting to employees and insulting them reduces organizational loyalty among employees and this reduces their contribution in the progress of the institution.

5. Conclusion

The current study presented some important conclusions and implications for those working in the higher education. For example, there should be focus on the practice of administrative bullying in the university.

7. Recommendations

Based on the results, the study recommends the need for developing organizational rules and regulations able to decrease the level of administrative bullying at the departments levels in Jordanian universities since this study was conducted at the university level. Developing educational programs aiming to increase employees' knowledge about the importance service quality in universities are needed. Future research examining the practice level of administrative bullying in schools is of great significance.

Declarations

Author Contributions. Alrashdan; Darawsheh, Al-Khataybeh, Aljanabi: Literature review, conceptualization. Alrashdan; Darawsheh, Al-Khataybeh, ALJANABI.: methodology, data analysis. Darawsheh, Al-Quran, almheiri .: review-editing and writing, original manuscript preparation. All authors have read and approved the published on the final version of the article)

Conflicts of Interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding. This study was funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Jadara University.

Ethical Approval. Ethical approval was secured from the relevant institutional review board. Participants were thoroughly informed about the study's purpose, scope, and objectives, and written consent was obtained before their participation. The research adhered to strict ethical guidelines, ensuring the confidentiality of data and the protection of participants' rights and well-being throughout the study.

Data Availability Statement. The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. All datasets were collected and stored in compliance with institutional research ethics and privacy guidelines

References

- Abbas, J. (2020). HEISQUAL: A modern approach to measuring service quality in higher education institutions, *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 67 (9), 100933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100933>
- Adam, F., Quainoo, E., & Opoku, E. (2022). What makes quality teaching? Review of related literature, *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 10 (2), 409-413.
- Al Shater, S., & Al Salem, S. (2024). the reality of the practice of administrative bullying behavior on employees of Sirte University, *Faculty of Education journal*, 3(1), 1-19.
- Al-Romeedy, B., Abou-Hamad, M., & Ali, I. (2023). The impact of psychological contract breach on job silence in tourism companies: workplace bullying as a mediator. *Journal of the Faculty of Tourism and Hotels-University of Sadat City*, 7(1), 21-39.
- Al Yousefi, S. (2022). *The impacts of workplace bullying on teachers' work behavior: Case of Yemen*, Master thesis, Final International University, Kyrenia.
- Al-Ajmi, M., & Al-Anzi, T. (2021). The degree of administrative bullying among primary school principals in the State of Kuwait. *International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, (19), 192-207.
- Alatyat, Z. (2021). The impact of the administrative bullying on the employee performance: An empirical study targetin ٧g municipalities in Jordan, *International Journal of Management*, 12 (1), 406-420.
- Ali, B., Saleh, P., Akoi, S., Abdulrahman, A., Muhamed, A., Noori, H., & Anwar, G. (2021). Impact of service quality on the customer satisfaction: Case study at online meeting platforms, *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5 (2), 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.5.2.6>
- Arifin, Z., Nirwanto, N., & Manan, A. (2019). Analysis of bullying effects on job performance using employee engagement and job satisfaction as mediator, *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 9 (6), 42-56. §
- Arman, A., Purwandaya, B., & Saefuddin, A. (2020). The impact of quality of education and higher education on economic growth. *Journal of Economic Education*, 9(1), 64- 70. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jeec.v9i1.36774>
- Bukhari, S., & Akhter, N. (2022). Workplace bullying in relation to teacher's performance at the university level, *Journal of Statistics, Computing and Interdisciplinary Research*, 4 (1), 131-146.
- Bulut, S., & Hihi, S. (2021). Bullying in the workplace: The psychological causes and effects of bullying in the workplace, *Clinical Research in Psychology*, 4 (1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.33309/2639-9113.040101>

- Daka, H., & Changwe, R. (2020). An exploration of education quality in the light of the grade point average and examination attrition rate. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 7(6), 196-207.
- Denboba, W. (2020). Contribution of service quality on customer satisfaction (Case of commercial bank of Ethiopia, Jimma district). *Journal of Process Management – New Technologies, International*, 8(3), 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.5937/jouproman8-25867>
- Fettache, N. (2024). Bullying in the academic work environment. *Afak for Science Journal*, 9(1), 282-296.
- Flores, M. F. (2019). Understanding the challenges of remote working and its impact to workers. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management (IJBMM)*, 4 (11), 40-44.
- Kaki, S., & Alnusair, D. (2023). Administrative bullying and its impact on the female work environment in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, *Information Sciences Letters*, 12 (2), 1017-1039.
- Latif, K., Latif, I., Farooq, U., & Ullah, M. (2019). In search of quality: Measuring higher education service quality (HiEduQual), *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 30 (8), 768–791. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1338133>
- Leilei, J., Siqi, H., Yuhan, S., Vijayaratham, P., Sivarajah, A., & Pengfei, D. (2023). Quality education: A study on the factors influencing enjoyment of learning English among higher educational institution students. *Migration Letters*, 20 (2023), 54-62.
- Papantymou, A., & Darra, M. (2023). Defining quality in primary and secondary public education schools. *International Education Studies*, 16 (2), 128-149. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v16n2p128>
- Ramya, N., Kowsalya, A., & Dharanipriya, K. (2019). Service quality and its dimensions, *International Journal of Research and Development*, 4 (2), 38-41.
- Salome, I., Ayotunde, O., Samuel, O., & Samuel, O. (2022). From service quality to e-service quality: Measurement, dimensions and model. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 25(1), 1-15.
- Setiono, B., & Hidayat, S. (2022). Influence of service quality with the dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 6 (9), 330-341. <https://doi.org/10.51505/ijebmr.2022.6924>
- Tešić, D. (2020). Measuring dimensions of service quality, *Strategic Management*, 25(1), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.5937/straman2001012t>
- Upadhyay, R., Jain, A. K., Roy, H., & Pant, V. (2019). A review of healthcare service quality dimensions and their measurement. *Journal of Health Management*, 21(1), 102–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972063418822583>
- Widyaningrum, I. (2020). The effect of quality of service and facilities on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty in Luminor hotel Mangga Besar Jakarta Barat. *Journal STEI Ekonomi*. 2(2), 1-19.

About the Contributor(s)

Hanadi Alrashdan,¹Faculty of Education, Jadara University,
Email: h.alrashdan@jadara.edu.jo,
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8898-3117>

Najwa Abdel Hamid Darawsheh, Department of Educational Foundations and Administration/Faculty of Educational Sciences, Jadara University, Jordan.

Email: najwadarawsha@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0907-2188>

Abdulla Sultan Almheiri, Associate professor /College of Humanities and Social Sciences/ Zayed University / Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Email: abdulla.almheiri@zu.ac.ae

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2282-058X>

Yaseen Aljanabi, Educational Administration Sciences, Dubai- United Arab Emirates

Email: yksj663@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2239-0339>

Majid Mohammad Al-Khataybeh, Department of Curricula and Instruction, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Mutah University, Mutah, Jordan.

Email: majid@mutah.edu.jo

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9852-7182>

Nahla Mohammed Al-Quran, Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychological and Educational Counseling, Faculty of Educational Sciences / Jadara University.

Email: nahla.q@jadara.edu.jo

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4361-098X>

Publisher's Note: *The opinions, statements, and data presented in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributors and do not reflect the views of Universitepark, EDUPIJ, and/or the editor(s). Universitepark, the Journal, and/or the editor(s) accept no responsibility for any harm or damage to persons or property arising from the use of ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.*
