

Suggested alternatives for Self-Financing of public Universities in Saudi Arabia in light of international universities Experiences

Dr. Maher Ahmed Hassan

Mamohamed@iau.edu.sa

Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8070-8129>

Abstract:

The study aimed to identify the proposed alternatives to self-financing for Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University under the new university regulations, using the descriptive survey method, applying a questionnaire to a stratified random sample of 197 members (39 academic leaders, 158 faculty members) in King Saud University, King Faisal University and Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University, and it found that the study sample is compatible with the proposed alternatives to self-financing at the university $M=4.13$, also, found a strong compatibility with the requirements for activating self-financing at the university $M=4.38$, and found statistically significant differences between administrative leaders and faculty members at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) in the proposed alternatives to self-financing for the benefit of faculty members, while there are no differences between them in the requirements for activating self-financing, and statistically significant differences were found between theoretical and practical faculties at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.001$) in the proposed alternatives to self-financing and the requirements to activate them for the theoretical faculties side.

Keywords: Self-financing, Public Universities, International Universities.

I. Introduction:

Funding is one of the important issues facing universities in different countries, at all levels of economic growth. It is a renewed issue due to the global economic changes, expansion of universities, increased demand for them, and high operating costs.

Education funding is one of the pillars which enables the universities to perform their functions of: education, scientific research and community service, due to the fact that the university education is the primary mechanism for achieving social and economic progress, and it is responsible for producing the human resources necessary to achieve economic growth, and this is what urged economists to use funding as a tool to pressure on the universities to meet the needs of the labor market (Ahmed et al, 2019).

Therefore, universities in developed countries are interested in searching for

additional funding sources to increase their financial resources, and on the other hand to have funding independence away from the government, Shaheen (2016) confirmed that universities in developed countries depend for their funding on partnership with the surrounding economic environment, although the state intervenes in supporting universities, but the prevailing trend is to share costs with community institutions, and the student bears part or all of the costs of higher education, and the charitable endowment represents a source of income for most of the prestigious universities, Akili & Al-Qahtani (2019) confirmed that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the United States of America presented An ideal and advanced model for universities that depend on their production for their financing, as Al-Shanifi (2019) confirmed that the United Kingdom has established models for industrial universities that focus on education in

production sites, as indicated Lee (2007) Malaysia has expanded the establishment of specialized universities that are funded by major public companies, and examples of these universities are the University of Communications, which is funded by Telekom Malaysia Company, Energy University funded by Tenaga National Company, The Oil University funded by the Petrona Company, and Agricultural University Putra and others.

The higher education sector in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has received special attention from the state. This was represented in the development plans that granted support and many privileges to the education by different ways and generously spent on it. The education budget in 2021 is about 186 billion SR, representing about 18.8% of the total State expenditures, of which about 27.2% are allocated to higher education (Ministry of Finance, 2021).

Despite the emphasis on the Ministry of Education strategic plan (1430 -1440 AH) in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to develop regulations that allow universities to diversify sources of funding, universities still depend on government funding, which its continuity is subjected to the changes in oil prices, as its revenues are the largest part of the state budget, and in the case that government funding for universities is reduced, this will reflect on the universities' fulfillment of their roles in achieving development, and on their internal and external efficiency, and this is confirmed by the studies of (Al -Harbi, 2017; Mukhlis, 2017; Shami, 2018) that in the economic changes that Saudi society is going through and the fluctuation of oil prices it is no longer possible for universities to fully rely on government funding, but rather they must search for self-financing sources that are an alternative to government funding.

Many studies determined the reality of education financing in Saudi universities, and searching for alternative funding sources to enhance their financial resources. The study of Al-Majed (2018) confirmed the need to

transform Saudi universities into productive universities, so that they depend on themselves in providing their funding sources, Al-Ghamdi (2021) confirmed on the necessity of rationalizing university education expenses, and adopting the idea of a productive university and investment projects. The study of Al-Dahmish (2019) confirmed the need to encourage and motivate the private sector to participate in financing universities and pay attention and focus on applied research and its investment.

The Kingdom's Vision 2030 confirmed the need to find new financing alternatives to the higher education to improve its efficiency, which imposes on universities the need to search for self-financing sources to support their activities and achieve their goals, and to achieve this vision, the Cabinet (2020) approved the new university regulation to reduce operating costs. Universities are encouraged to find self-financing sources to reduce their dependence on the state budget. In its first phase, the new university regulation was applied on three universities: King Saud University, King Abdulaziz University, and Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University, and then it is expanded to include all universities in the Kingdom Saudi Arabia, and under the new universities system, the universities is now have to search for self-financing sources to support its own budget. Hence, the problem of the study was determined in the following questions:

- 1- What are the proposed alternatives for self-financing of public Universities in light of international universities?
- 2- What are the requirements to activate the self-financing of public Universities in light of international universities?
- 3- Are there statistically significant differences between the responses of the study sample about the proposed alternatives to self-financing for public Universities and the requirements for its activation according to the

variables of job degree and type of faculties ?

2. Literature review:

2.1 The concept of self-financing:

The method of self-financing of universities appeared during the last ten years of the twentieth century in the United States of America, Russia and some developed countries, to face the financial pressures and challenges faced by universities by relying mainly on government allocations for their funding (Tjeldvoll, 2014). Hence, The Service Universities (universities that depend on self-financing) appeared and became a more distinguished trend to provide the necessary funds for them by selling their services based on scientific research or knowledge to their customers (Hussain *et al*, 2011).

Hussein *et al* (2011) defined self-financing as the university's ability to acquire additional resources for it by investing and employing its own resources as the best possible investment, Al-Juhani (2008) defined it as what the university works alone to obtain non-governmental income resources and use them to cover its expenses and develop its programs. Chisenga (2016) defined it as the university's ability to provide sufficient income to finance its own activities.

Self-financing depends on universities searching for alternative sources of funding outside the scope of the government budget by investing their capabilities, services and resources, such as student tuition fees, investment funds, marketing scientific research and innovations, partnership with the industry sector, community service, continuing education, charitable endowments, donations, etc.

2.2 The importance of self-financing for universities:

The importance of self-financing for universities depends on the following (Ezz El-Din, 2020):

- Achieving academic and financial independence for universities, because

reliance on external and local funding forces them to be subjected to the policies and conditions of the donors.

- Achieving financial stability and not feeling afraid of the future, due to the lack of stability and stability of government funding and being affected by external conditions.
- Providing the necessary financial resources for universities, which helps them to improve their academic and research programs and university services.
- Reducing the financial burden on the state's general budget, by depending on universities' own resources, and marketing their services to provide the necessary financial resources.
- Achieving sufficient flexibility for universities in spending their financial resources according to their needs.

2.3 Justifications for self-financing of universities:

The justifications for self-financing of universities are as follows :

2.3.1 The government's role in financing universities has shrunk due to the waves of recession and downturn that the global economy is going through, which has led to a lack of financial resources needed for scientific research, and then universities have become unable to perform their roles with the required efficiency.

2.3.2 The trend towards applying economic standards to universities, which is represented in competition, maximizing returns and confirming profitability, and considering scientific research as an investment that exceeds the return on investment in other fields (Nayel, 2015).

2.3.3 The intensity of competition between universities locally and globally, and the desire to excellence over competitor universities, and this

imposes the need to search for additional self-resources to enable them achieve their goals.

- 2.3.4 The trend towards implementing a free market policy and privatizing universities as a response to governments' failure to fulfill the requirements of providing financial resources for education (Abdul Aziz, 2016).
- 2.3.5 The increase in demand for higher education institutions, escalation and the facilitation of admission requirements, which requires a significant increase in spending amounts that exceeded the government's ability to provide them (Al-Ghamdi, 2021).

2.4 Self-financing methods for universities:

The methods of self-financing for universities are as follows:

- 2.4.1 Research contracts:** Universities establishing cooperative relationships with community institutions, in order to conduct scientific research to solve the problems they suffer in return for a fee (Shuaib, 2021).
- 2.4.2 Donations and gifts:** that the private sector, charities and individuals provide in cash or in-kind to fund universities (Al-Harbi, 2015).
- 2.4.3 Charitable Endowments:** The real estate, money, or land that community members or institutions allocate for spending on universities.
- 2.4.4 International aid:** it is the in-kind or financial aid provided by international organizations to countries to help them achieve their educational goals (Al-Tuwairqi, 2012).
- 2.4.5 Private companies:** where they invest their money by providing financial loans to students and recover them

with part of the profits after their graduation (Al-Harbi, 2015).

2.4.6 Producing Universities: Universities achieving additional resources for the university through the establishment and marketing of production centers and activities, continuing education, consultancy and contractual research.

2.4.7 Tuition fees: the fees and expenses that students pay annually in return for obtaining educational services.

2.4.8 Marketing of university services: Universities marketing their educational, research and training services, and their scientific and research advice to the beneficiary institutions, in return for financial fees that the university benefits from.

2.4.9 Investing university property: Universities investing lands, buildings, halls, workshops, restaurants, and clubs that they own, and renting them in return for a financial consideration for the institutions benefiting from them (Ezz El-Din, 2020)

2.4.10 Partnership and cooperation with the private sector: Concluding cooperation and partnership agreements with the private sector so that part of its annual profits are allocated to fund the university (Mohammed, 2018)

2.5 The pioneering experiences in self-financing in International Universities:

For decades, advanced universities have been interested in diversifying their sources of income to enable them to completely spend with government funding, and to achieve a great deal of independence and academic freedom. Among the most prominent international experiences in this field are the following:

2.5.1 British universities: The main sources of funding for UK universities are credits from local education authorities, the Higher Education Funding Council, external research and tuition councils, and donations from charitable organizations. In the eighties of the twentieth century, the British government encouraged the private sector to bear the costs and the development of higher education, and to improve its outputs, and began to privatize its universities, where the private sector bears the education expenses that were borne by the government sector, with participation of parents, private companies, and social service institutions to pay the fees for educational services such as books, references, buildings, equipment, etc., and the state bears the expenses of educational services provided by governmental or private educational institutions (Al-Harbi, 2015).

2.5.2 American universities: Funding for American universities depends on taxes imposed by the federal, state and local governments, including income tax, sales tax, endowment institutions, grants, loans, gifts and donations, business sector aid, research contracts, and the producing university (Al-Otaibi, 2018).

2.5.3 Japanese universities: The Japanese government provides about 75% of the funding for public universities, and provides 9.1% of the funding for private universities. The universities complete their budgets from their own sources, which are school expenses paid by students, their income from university hospitals, student loans, gifts and grants External, research contracts, and competitive external funds (Hussain *et al*, 2011)

2.5.4 Australian universities: Australian universities tended to adopt university education marketing policies and were concerned with issues of quality, accounting and transparency in education.

Universities were also interested in diversifying their own financial sources, which were represented in tuition fees paid by students, marketing university services, scholarships, deferred student loans, and university endowments (Al-Otaibi, 2018)

2.5.5 Malaysian Universities: Malaysian universities are financed through several sources represented in government funding, educational loans, scholarships and educational endowments, in addition to the universities generating revenues for themselves through many sources such as training, scientific and research consultancy, marketing research innovations, research contracts and selling their educational services research and production activities (Abdullah & Abdul Rahman, 2011).

3. Methodology:

3.1 Study methodology:

The study used the descriptive approach, with the help of a questionnaire that was applied to collect information on the proposed alternatives to self-financing in universities, and the requirements for its activation.

3.2 Population:

The study population consisted of all faculty members and academic leader in King Saud University, King Faisal University and Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University.

3.3 The sample:

A stratified random sample of (39) academic leaders and (158) faculty members in King Saud University, King Faisal University and Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University were selected.

3.4 Questionnaire design:

The study used a questionnaire consisting of two parts, the first section: general information, and the second section consists of two axes, the first: to identify the proposed alternatives to the university's self-financing in light of international universities,

and it consists of (17) phrases divided into five dimensions They are: The first dimension: tuition fees for students and consists of (2) statements, the second dimension: the establishment of investment funds at the university and consists of (4) statements, the third dimension: marketing university services and consists of (5) statements, the fourth dimension: endowments, gifts and donations and consists of (3) phrases, the fifth dimension: partnership with the private sector (3) phrases, and the second axis measures the requirements for activating the university's self-financing, consisting of (20) phrases divided into four dimensions, namely: The first dimension: financial and administrative requirements and consists of (6) phrases, second dimension: physical and technical requirements and consists of (5) phrases, the third dimension: educational and research requirements and consists of (5) phrases, dimension IV: partnership requirements with the private sector consists of (4) phrases, was the use of Likert scale quintet (5 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree, 3 Neutral, 2 Disagree, 1 Strongly Disagree) for the answer about the questionnaire.

3.5 Honesty :

The validity of the questionnaire was verified by presenting it to (11) experts, to get to know their views on its axes, dimensions and phrases, and the extent to which the statements are related to its dimensions, and it was modified under their opinions. Pearson correlation coefficient between the degree of dimension and the total degree of the axis to which it belongs, and coefficients for the dimensions of the axis of the proposed alternatives for self-financing for universities ranged between (0.67-0.88), and for the dimensions of the axis of requirements for activating self-financing in universities ranged between (0.82- 0.96).

3.6 Stability :

The reliability of the questionnaire as a whole and its axes was verified by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The stability coefficient for the axis of suggested alternatives for self-financing was (0.78), for the axis of requirements for activating self-financing (0.94), and for the questionnaire as a whole (0.93)

3.7 Study procedures:

A questionnaire was prepared and ensured its validity, reliability, and suitability for application. It was applied electronically to academic leaders and faculty members in King Saud University, King Faisal University and Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University in the first semester of 2021 .

3.8 Statistical processing:

The SPSS 21 was used to calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient to verify the validity of the questionnaire, Alpha Cronbach coefficient to verify the stability of the questionnaire, calculating the arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the questionnaire's axes and phrases, and calculating T test To find out the differences between the scores of the study sample.

In order to identify the degree of agreement of the sample members to the statements and dimensions of the questionnaire, the value of the weight of the responses was calculated, and then the response would strongly disagree with the dimension or phrase if the mean was (1.79) or less, disagree if the mean is limited to (1.80 - 2.59), neutral if the mean is limited to between (2.60 -3.39), agree if the mean is limited to between (3.40-4.19), and strongly agree if the mean is (4.20) or more.

4 The Results:

4.1 Results of the proposed alternatives to self-financing for public Universities:

Table 1 : the mean and standard deviation of the proposed alternatives to the university's self-financing of public universities:

No	The dimension	Mean	SD	Rank
1	Charging tuition fees to students	2.67	1.01	5
2	Establishing university investment funds	4.47	0.51	3
3	University Services Marketing	4.44	0.49	4
4	Acceptance of endowments, gifts and donations	4.57	0.52	1
5	Partnership with the private sector	4.51	0.53	2
Total proposed alternatives to self-financing		4.13	0.34	

It is clear from Table 1 that the mean of the total proposed alternatives to self-financing as a whole was $M=4.13$ and standard deviation $SD=0.34$, The degree of responses for the study sample was agree in all the alternatives except for the alternative of charging tuition fees to students, where the response was neutral, and the mean of the dimensions of the proposed alternatives for self-financing was between (2.67- 4.57), the standard deviation is between (0.49-1.01) This confirms the presence of convergence in the opinions of the study sample, and that the proposed alternatives to self-financing with a

higher arithmetic average are the acceptance of endowments, donations and gifts $M= 4.57$, followed by partnership with the private sector $M= 4.51$ In the second Rank, then the establishment of investment funds at the university in the third rank $M= 4.47$, Then, marketing university services in the fourth rank $M= 4.44$, and finally impose tuition fees on students ranked last $M= 2.67$.

4.2 The results of the requirements for activating the self-financing of public universities:

Table 2: The mean and standard deviation of the requirements for activating self-financing of public universities:

No.	N	Mean	SD	Rank
1	Administrative and organizational requirements	4.45	0.47	3
2	Physical and technical requirements	4.43	0.51	4
3	educational and research requirements	4.53	0.49	1
4	Partnership requirements with the private sector	4.49	0.55	2
Total requirements to activate self-financing		4.38	0.44	

It is clear from Table 2 that the mean of the total dimensions of the requirements for activating self-financing as a whole was: $M= 4.38$ and standard deviation $SD=0.44$ The degree of responses of the study sample was strongly agree with all requirements, and the mean of the dimensions of the requirements for activating self-financing was limited to between (4.43- 4.53), the standard deviation is between (0.47-0.51), This confirms the presence of convergence in the opinions of the

study sample, and that the requirements with the highest arithmetic average are educational and research requirements $M= 4.53$ Where it ranked first, followed by the requirements of partnership with the private sector $M=4.49$ In second Rank, then organizational and administrative requirements $M= 4.45$ In third Rank, finally the physical and technical requirements $M= 4.43$ in last Rank.

4.3 The results of the differences between the average responses of the sample members in the proposed alternatives to self-financing and the requirements for its activation according to the

variables of the job degree and the type of faculties:

4.3.1 The differences between the responses of the sample members according to the job degree variable

Table 3: The results of the test "T" between the means of the responses of the sample by job degree variable .

The Axes	Functional Class	N	M	SD	Df	T	Sig
Suggested alternatives to self-financing	academic leaders	39	4.06	0.29	195	3.17	0.002
	faculty of school	158	4.26	0.35			
Requirements to activate self-financing	academic leaders	39	4.50	0.46	195	1.831	0.069
	faculty of school	158	4.36	0.36			

It is clear from the table 3 There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.001$) Between the responses of academic leaders and faculty members at the university in the total proposed alternatives to self-financing in favor of faculty members, while there are no differences between academic leaders and

faculty members in the requirements for activating self-financing at the university.

4.3.2 The differences between the responses of the sample members according to the type of faculties.

Table 4 : The results of the test "T" between the means of the responses of the sample according to the type of faculties variable.

The Axes	Ganger	N	M	SD	Df	T	Sig
Suggested alternatives to self-financing	theoretical faculties	135	4.25	0.28	195	2.33	0.021
	Practical faculties	62	4.13	0.44			
Requirements to activate self-financing	theoretical faculties	135	4.56	0.37	195	4.37	0.000
	Practical faculties	62	4.28	0.53			

It is clear from the table 4: There are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) between the responses of faculty members in theoretical faculties and practical faculties in the total proposed alternatives to self-financing in favor of theoretical faculties, there were also statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.001$) Between the responses of faculty members in theoretical and practical faculties in the total axis of the

requirements for activating the university's self-financing in favor of theoretical faculties.

5 Discussion:

5.1 Suggested alternatives for self-financing of the public universities:

5.1.1 The suggested alternatives to self-financing as a whole:

The results showed the approval of the sample members on the proposed alternatives to the university's self-financing

M= 4.13 ,Where approved by respondents to accept the University of endowments, donations and donations, and partnerships with the private sector, and the establishment of investment funds university, and marketing of university services as sources of basic self-financing of the university under the new university system, they agree this result with the findings of my study both (Al-Ghamdi, 2021; Al-Majed, 2018) which confirmed the need for universities to be interested in searching for sources of funding alternative to government funding to increase their financial resources.

5.1.2 Acceptance of endowments, gifts and donations:

The results showed that the sample members strongly agreed on the university's acceptance of endowments, gifts and donations M=4.57 , Establishment of projects endowment charity, accepting donations and grants, and the establishment of research chairs endowment establishment of research chairs endowment contribute to increased financial resources for self-University (Appendix No.1) and agree this result with the findings of the study (Al-Shanifi, 2019) which confirmed that endowments and donations It is a source of funding for universities.

5.1.3 Partnership contract with the private sector:

The results showed that the sample members strongly agreed to conclude partnerships and cooperation agreements with the private sector to finance the university M=4.51, The private sector allocates a percentage of its annual profits to finance the university ,establish joint economic projects between the university and the private sector, as well as invest the expertise of faculty members in solving the problems of the private sector in return for financial fees contributes significantly to increasing the financial resources of the university (Appendix No. 1) and these agree The result is with the

findings of a study (Mohammed, 2018) which indicated the role of the private sector in financing universities

5.1.4 Establishing University Investment Funds:

The results showed that the sample members strongly agreed to establish university investment funds as a primary source of self-financing for the university M=4.47 , Establishment of financial funds financed by the productive and service institutions, and the establishment of investment projects such as markets and commercial real estate, factories, schools, farms producing and renting, and the application of the university system produced alternatives that contribute to the financing of universities (Appendix No. 1)

5.1.5 Marketing of university services:

The results showed that the sample members strongly agreed on the necessity of marketing university services to increase the financial resources of the university M= 4.39 , In the marketing of educational, training and research services, discoveries and innovations, and carry out research projects for the society side, and evening programs in exchange for a fee, and the postponement of the university facilities contribute significantly to increase the financial resources of the University (Appendix No. 1) and agree this result with the findings of the results A study (Shuaib, 2021) which confirmed the need to market university services

5.1.6 Imposing tuition fees for students

The results showed that the response of the sample members to imposing tuition fees on students was neutral M= 2.67, by reference to (Appendix No. 1) we find that the sample members are not inclined to impose financial fees on students in return for their education, or to provide banks and the private sector with soft loans for students to cover their education expenses to be recovered after

their graduation from the university as alternatives to the university's self-financing.

5.2 Requirements for activating the self-financing of the public universities:

5.2.1 Requirements for activating self-financing as a whole:

The results showed that the sample members strongly agreed on the need to provide the necessary requirements to activate the financing Self – University $M= 4.47$, activating the self - financing university requires the need for a contract of partnership agreements with the private sector, and the provision of educational, research, regulatory and administrative requirements, material and technology that enables the university to invest its resources and its property to increase its financial resources.

5.2.2 Activating the partnership with the private sector

The results showed the strong agreement of the sample members that activating self-financing requires concluding cooperation and partnership agreements with the private sector $M= 4.51$, activating self-financing requires the need for private encouraging sector to allocate a percentage of their annual profits to finance the university, holding cooperation and partnership educational and research agreements, and the establishment of economic and investment projects, and the establishment of centers of research university and incubators of innovation and entrepreneurship at the university and financing (Appendix No. 2), and conform to this result With the findings (Mohammed, 2018), which confirmed the need for cooperation and partnership with the private sector.

5.2.3 Educational and Research Requirements

The results showed the strong agreement of the sample members that activating self-financing requires providing the educational and research requirements

available at the university $M= 4.49$, activating self-financing university requires the need to market educational services and research university, and focus on applied research, and the expansion of the evening school programs, and the programs of cooperative education and training programs, consulting and marketing of beneficiary institutions in exchange for a fee (Appendix No. 2).

5.2.4 Regulatory and Administrative Requirements:

The results showed the strong agreement of the sample members that activating self-financing requires the necessity of providing the regulatory and administrative requirements. $M= 4.45$, activating the self-financing requires the need for the establishment of the university centers for marketing services, education, research and training in the institutions of society, and the granting faculties autonomy to contract agreements and partnerships with the private sector, and the development of regulations and university systems, and the provision of specialized human resources in the field of marketing (Appendix No. 2)

5.2.5 The Physical and technical requirements:

The results showed the strong agreement of the sample members that activating the university's self-financing requires the necessity of providing the material and technical requirements $M= 4.45$, activating self-financing of the University requires the need to provide the necessary support innovations and scientific discoveries of financial resources, and the provision of modern technology, and the establishment of business incubators, and increase investment in the areas of real estate, industry and the stock market.

5.3 The differences between the responses of the sample members according to the

variables of the job degree and the type of faculties:

5.3.1 The differences between the responses of the sample members according to the job degree variables:

The results showed that there were statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.001$) between the responses of academic leaders and faculty members at the university in the total proposed alternatives to self-financing for the benefit of faculty members ($t = 3.17$, $p = 0.002$), and this confirms the increased conviction of faculty need to provide alternatives to the attention of the university self-financing for the development of financial resources under the new members of the university system, while there were no statistically significant differences between the academic and the members of the faculty leadership in the total requirements for activating the self-financing of the University ($t = 1.831$, $p = 0.069$). This confirms their agreement on the necessity of providing the organizational, administrative, financial, educational and research requirements and concluding partnership agreements with the private sector necessary to activate the university's self-financing.

5.3.2 The differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable of the type of faculties:

The results showed that there were statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) Between the responses of faculty members in theoretical and practical faculties in the total proposed alternatives to self-financing in favor of theoretical faculties ($t = 2.33$, $p = 0.02$). This confirms the increased interest of faculty members in theoretical faculties on the need to provide alternatives to self-financing to achieve their financial and administrative independence under the new university system, and statistically significant differences were found at the level of significance

($\alpha \leq 0.01$) between the responses of faculty members in theoretical and practical faculties in the total requirements for activating self-financing at the university in favor of theoretical faculties ($t = 4.37$, $P = 0.000$), confirming Increasing the conviction of faculty members in theoretical faculties on the necessity of providing the necessary organizational, administrative, financial, educational and research requirements to activate the university's self-financing.

6 Conclusion:

The results of the study concluded that the study sample agreed on the need to search for new alternatives to self-financing for the university to increase its financial resources, and the study sample strongly agreed on the need to provide educational, research, organizational, administrative, material and technical requirements, and to conclude cooperation and partnership agreements with the private sector to activate the university's self-financing.

References:

- [1] Abdel Aziz, H. (2016). The role of marketing university services in improving competitiveness from the point of view of students at Helwan University. *The Scientific Journal of Economics and Trade*, (1), 383-434.
- [2] Abdullah, N. & Abdul Rahman, S. (2011). Making Strategy at a Malaysian Higher Education Institution, *International Conference on Economics, Business and Management*, IPEDR (22), IACSIT Press, Singapore
- [3] Ahmed, A.; Abul-Wafa, J. & Mohamed, F. (2019) University Education Developing Financing Requirements in Egypt under the Malaysia's Experience. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, (120), 290-308.

- [4] Akili, A.& Al-Qahtani, M. (2019) .Higher and vocational education and its financing in Germany and Saudi Arabia: a comparative study. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*,3(17), 30-51.
- [5] Al-Dahmish, K.(2019) .A proposed conception for the development of financing university education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia under the 2030 vision .*New Horizons in Adult Education*, (26), 51-94.
- [6] Al-Ghamdi, H. (2021). A proposed strategy for financing university education in Saudi universities. *Journal of Educational Sciences and Human Studies*,(15), 241-268.
- [7] Al-Harbi, A. (2017), Financing Education in Saudi Arabia: Challenges and Alternatives . *Educational Sciences Journal* , 2(1), 58-87.
- [8] Al-Harbi, M.(2015), Suggested alternatives for financing education in public universities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, (103) , 141-172.
- [9] Al-Juhani, M. (2008). Public and Higher Education: Who Pays the Costs .*Education Journal*, (3), 38-45.
- [10] Al-Majed, I.(2018) .A proposed conception of funding alternatives in Saudi universities under the university's productive philosophy. *Journal of the Islamic University of Psychological and Educational Studies*, 26(6), 30-52.
- [11] Al-Otaibi, H. (2018). The experiences of some developed countries (America - Britain - Japan - Australia) in financing higher education and ways to benefit from it. *Educational and Psychological Sciences Journal*,2(25), 1-31.
- [12] Al-Shanifi, Ali. (2019). Suggested alternatives for financing higher education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of the experiences of some developed countries .*The Arab Journal of Science and Research Publishing*, 2(10),410-415.
- [13] Al-Tuwairqi, N. (2012) .Sources of financing higher education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Britain: a comparative study .*Arab Studies in Education and Psychology*,1(24), 205-246 .
- [14] Chisenga, A. (2016). *Self-Financing of Public Universities in developing countries : A case of the university of Zambia* , university of Zambia , <http://dspace.unza.zm/bitstream/handle/123456789/4988/Main%20Document.PDF?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- [15] Ezz El-Din, H. (2020) .Self-financing of higher education: the productive university as a suggested model. *Algerian Journal of Social and Human Sciences*,8(2), 389-403
- [16] Hussein, K.(2011) .Alternatives to fund Egyptian public university education in light of the experiences of some countries . *Education* , 14(32), 245-310.
- [17] Hussein, K.; Hasan, Z. & Mutawa, W. (2011) Self-financing is an entry point to support the financing of public university education in Egypt. *Scientific Research in Education Journal*,3(12), 705-726.
- [18] Lee, M. (2007). Global Trends, National Policies and Institutional Response: Restructuring Higher Education in Malaysia, *Educational Research for Policy and Practice* , 3 (1), 31-46, DOI:10.1007/s10671-004-6034-y
- [19] Ministry of Finance (2021). A statement of the state's general budget for the fiscal year 1442-443. https://www.mof.gov.sa/budget/2021/Documents/Budget2021_AR.pdf
- [20] Mohammed, H. (2018). Activating the role of research partnership in

- achieving the competitive advantage of Egyptian universities *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 33(4), 472-516.
- [21] Mukhlis, M. (2017). A proposed vision for developing the cost-sharing of higher education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in light of some international experiences. *The Arab Journal for Quality Assurance of University Education*, 1(27), 3-32.
- [22] Nayel, S.(2015) .An evaluation study of the marketing of university services under total quality management in Egyptian universities .*Arab Studies in Education and Psychology*, (61), 297-374.
- [23] Shaheen, M. (2016). Financing higher education in Palestine between reality and hope. <https://www.birzeit.edu/en/content/tmwyl-ltlym-lly-fy-flstyn-byn-lwq-wlmmwl-bqlm-d-mhmd-hmd-shhyn>
- [24] Shami, H.(2018) .The reality and future of education spending and financing in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Social Work Journal*, 59(4), 40-62.
- [25] Shuaib, I. (2021) .Diversification of funding sources in education and its impact on educational policies. *The Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing*.(30), 210-225.
- [26] Tjeldvoll, A. (2014). The Service University in the Global Marketplace, *European Education*, 30 (4), 5-19.

Appendix No. (1):
The mean and standard deviation of the axis of the suggested alternatives for self-financing of the public universities

No.	Phase	M	SD	Rank
first dimension: Tuition fees for students:		4.44	1.01	
1	Charging tuition fees to students to cover the actual cost of studying.	2.24	1.42	2
2	Banks and the private sector provide soft loans to students to cover their education expenses	3.10	1.58	1
second dimension: the establishment of investment funds at the university:		4.47	0.51	
3	Establishing financial funds at the university to be financed by productive and service institutions in the community.	4.63	0.65	1
4	Establishing and renting markets and commercial malls.	4.34	0.95	4
5	Establishing investment projects affiliated with the university, such as real estate, productive farms, and factories.	4.56	0.64	2
6	Implementation of the productive university system in the university's various faculties and centers.	4.35	0.85	3
Third dimension: Marketing of University Services:		4.44	0.50	
7	Marketing educational and training services to community institutions for a fee.	4.61	0.56	2
8	Marketing the results of scientific research and innovations to community institutions.	4.67	0.51	1
9	Leasing the university facilities to the beneficiary institutions in return for financial fees.	4.17	1.03	5
10	Carrying out joint research projects with community institutions for a fee.	4.38	0.72	4
11	Offering evening study programs to students for a fee.	4.39	0.85	3
Fourth Dimension: Endowments, Endowments and Donations:		4.57	0.52	
12	Establishing charitable endowment projects to increase the university's revenues.	4.65	0.51	1
13	Accepting charitable donations and gifts offered by NGOs and the private sector.	4.48	0.85	3
14	Establishing endowment research chairs to fund scientific research.	4.59	0.550	2
The fifth dimension: Partnership with the private sector		4.51	0.53	
15	The private sector allocates a percentage of its annual profits to fund the university.	4.21	0.980	3
16	Establishing joint economic projects between the university and the private sector.	4.67	0.63	1
17	Investing the expertise of faculty members in solving community problems for a fee.	4.64	0.52	2
The total proposed alternatives to self-financing		4.13	0.35	

Appendix No. (2):
The mean and standard deviation of the axis of the Requirements for activating the self - financing of the public universities

No.	Phase	Mean	SD	Rank
First dimension: Administrative and organizational requirements:		4.45	0.47	
1	Establishing centers to market university services in community institutions.	4.47	0.69	4
2	Granting faculties more autonomy to conclude agreements and partnerships with the private sector.	4.51	0.77	3
3	Developing university bylaws and regulations to allow for donations, gifts and endowments.	4.56	0.59	1

4	The Ministry of Education issued laws to determine the university's self-financing sources and procedures.	4.17	1.07	6
5	Establishing investment centers at the university that provide services to the public for a fee.	4.44	0.69	5
6	Providing human cadres specialized in marketing university services	4.56	0.61	1
Second dimension: material and technical requirements:		4.43	0.51	
7	Provide the necessary financial resources to implement the university's self-financing plans and programs.	4.51	0.64	2
8	Providing the necessary modern technology to market the university's products to the community institutions.	4.49	0.70	3
9	Increasing financial allocations to support commercial innovations and scientific discoveries.	4.34	0.89	4
10	Establishing business incubators to transform research results into commercial products that can be marketed.	4.56	0.62	1
11	Expanding the establishment of investment projects at the university.	4.24	1.14	5
Third dimension: educational and research requirements:		4.53	0.49	
12	Linking educational and research services at the university to the needs of community institutions.	4.50	0.62	4
13	Focusing on applied research that contributes to solving community problems.	4.56	0.62	2
14	Marketing the results of scientific research to community institutions.	4.61	0.55	1
15	Expanding cooperative education programs in partnership with community institutions.	4.46	0.66	5
16	Expanding the training and advisory programs offered by the university to community institutions.	4.51	0.64	3
Fourth dimension: Requirements for partnership and cooperation with the private sector:		4.49	0.55	
17	Encouraging the private sector to allocate a percentage of its annual profits to fund the university.	4.35	0.92	5
18	Concluding educational and research cooperation and partnership agreements between the university and community institutions	4.52	0.65	3
19	Partnership with the private sector in establishing economic and investment projects for the university.	4.62	0.62	1
20	Urging the private sector to fund research centers at the university.	4.50	0.75	2
Total requirements for activating the self - financing		4.38	0.45	4