

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i6.2176>

Democratic Educational Behavior among Faculty Members at Yarmouk University from the Students' Perspective in Light of Certain Variables

Alaa Khaled Al-Rashidat¹, Suleiman Mohammad Qazaqzeh²

Abstract

This study aimed at identifying the democratic pedagogical behaviour of the faculty at Yarmouk University from the perspective of students in the light of some variables. In order to achieve the study's objectives, an identification tool has been developed to identify the level of educational democratic behavior of the faculty at Yarmouk University from the perspective of students in the light of some variables: Gender, College, Place of Residence, School Year, with four areas: Freedom, Justice, Participation and Cooperation, Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism. To collect quantitative data, the sample was selected in a random manner from the school community, consisting of 306 students. The study produced a set of results, most notably: the absence of statistically significant differences between the calculated averages of the study sample's estimates of democratic behaviour among faculty members, in the four areas (total) according to variables (sex, housing, school year). There are statistically significant differences between the computational averages of the study sample estimates of democratic behavior among faculty members in the four (total) fields according to the college variable.

Keywords: Democracy, Democratic Behavior, Faculty Members.

Introduction

Democracy is both an ancient and a modern concept, having first emerged thousands of years ago in ancient Greece. It gained considerable significance in the modern era as societies sought a system of governance that would liberate them from the oppression of autocracy and the tyranny of religious rule. Democratic systems began to appear in Europe and were found to serve their populations better than the American system of governance, which failed to achieve its foundational goals such as liberty, equality, and equal opportunity. Nevertheless, the democratic model began to decline gradually. Historical records indicate that the ancient Greeks were the first to use the term *democracy*, referring to a system in which the people govern themselves (Rabee', 2016).

Dundar (2013) defined democracy as an ancient concept dating back to the city-state of Athens and the Roman Empire. Some historians argue that the idea of democracy existed even before the philosophies of Socrates and Aristotle, and that it fundamentally means "rule of the people by the people." The Athenian experiment in democracy is considered one of the earliest human attempts to implement such a system. Jarrah (2013) also described democracy as a humanistic system that emphasizes the value and dignity of the individual, based on citizens' participation in organizing their affairs and engaging in decisions that affect their lives.

¹ PhD Researcher in Foundations of Education – Yarmouk University, Email: alaairshedat1098@gmail.com

² Professor of Foundations of Education – Yarmouk University, Email: S.M.qazaqzeh@yu.edu.jo



Democracy seeks to ensure equality among all members of society, allowing for role exchange without coercion or pressure. Therefore, governments must consider the interests of citizens equally and value their opinions, such that the voice of the poor holds the same weight as that of the wealthy. Democracy promotes dialogue and persuasion as means to resolve disputes, granting individuals the right to express themselves through democratic discourse (Abu Safaqa, 2020).

Jordan took a strategic step toward democracy by holding parliamentary elections in 1989. This decision was viewed as a significant indicator of the Jordanian government's seriousness in promoting democratic values and behaviors among individuals in society. The Educational Reform Conference, chaired by His Royal Highness King Hussein Bin Talal in 1987, was the first initiative to call for education to play a role in building a democratic society, beginning with students at the school level and continuing through university education. The goal was to foster good citizenship and empower individuals to actively participate in the development of their society (Al-Momani, 2019).

Democracy and Education

The significance of democratic education in Jordan emerged clearly through the educational philosophy adopted by the Ministry of Education, which embraces democratic principles and values. The Jordanian educational system emphasizes the importance of human dignity, individual freedom, and the development of positive attitudes toward others. It promotes an educational policy designed to nurture the personality of the citizen (Ministry of Education, 2016).

Education and democracy are interrelated, as both aim to improve society. The authors argue that democracy and education are two sides of the same coin. Education is a progressive tool aimed at transforming society by equipping learners to become active citizens. In this sense, education serves as a vehicle for instilling the true principles of democracy.

The link between democracy and education is deeply rooted in educational philosophies and policies, touching upon all aspects of the educational system. Therefore, the issue of democracy in education is a pedagogical one. Accordingly, democratic education strives to move away from imposing a single mold on students. Instead, it embraces their diverse interests and talents, encouraging them to express and discuss their ideas (Hussein et al., 2018).

This interdependence underlines the importance of maintaining a strong connection between democracy and education. Separating the two often leads to the failure of democratic ideals. The evident underdevelopment in many countries is a testament to the absence of democracy in educational systems. Democratic education is associated with several core elements, including democratic practices in teaching and democratic awareness, which aim to embed democratic values within the educational process (Zayadi & Shaaban, 2023, pp. 65–66).

Hijazi and Al-Hayajneh (2016) identified three key dimensions of democratic education, through which the principles, values, and orientations of democracy can be applied via education. These dimensions are crucial for enhancing an individual's ability to coexist within society. The researchers argue that if these dimensions are implemented within the educational system, individuals will be empowered to build both themselves and their communities in a modern democratic manner. These dimensions include:

Democracy in Education

Democracy of Learning: This refers to the construction of the educational system, organizing its inputs, outputs, and implemented processes in a way that upholds the principle of equal opportunity for learners. It ensures the development of the learner's personality and capabilities without allowing social or economic status to hinder their educational advancement.

Democracy within Education: This involves the democratic structuring and administration of the educational system at both local and central levels, ensuring the participation and cooperation of all stakeholders in the educational process, both within and beyond the institution.

Education for Democracy: This refers to equipping learners with democratic concepts, skills, values, and attitudes to help them practice democracy in their communities and contribute to its development.

Democratic educational institutions are considered fundamental pillars that provide students with positive experiences through their interactions with teachers, principals, and staff. These institutions grant students a degree of freedom to express their opinions and respect others, enabling them to live a democratic life that helps develop their awareness (Kesici, 2008, p. 193).

Democratic Behavior in Education

Practicing democracy at various levels is a primary goal of education. Educational philosophies in developed countries seek to provide individuals within the system opportunities to practice democratic behaviors, viewing them as the foundation for building a democratic society based on justice, equality, and participation in democratic activities. These practices reinforce students' sense of belonging and their value as individuals capable of contributing to the future of their society (Al-Momani, 2019).

Democratic behavior is a cornerstone for building and advancing societies, empowering individuals to deal with challenges and adapt to events. Democratic values are essential for independent living and decision-making for individuals and communities. Educational systems that seek progress emphasize the importance of democratic behavior in shaping citizens who contribute to societal advancement (Akar, 2016).

Democratic behavior is based on positive interaction and participation, grounded in a climate of social understanding, freedom, equality, justice, and acceptance of others. This behavior is vital in educational institutions as it influences student attitudes, behaviors, and academic achievement. Its purpose is to foster a democratic educational environment where educational goals are achieved and effective human relationships are built within the learning community, encouraging cooperation between teachers and students (Saleh, 2014).

The Role of Faculty Members in Practicing Democratic Behavior

Faculty members are among the most influential figures in shaping the performance and achievements of individuals and groups, thus achieving the objectives of educational institutions. They play a vital and dynamic role in studying educational activities and are expected to embody democratic values, as these are pivotal in driving change and development (Zriba & Khamees, 2013).

University faculty must diversify their teaching methods beyond traditional lectures and rote learning. Doing so enhances student engagement and freedom, helping foster democratic

practices. Faculty should be capable of selecting appropriate teaching strategies and methods and must embody democratic behavior in practice, not merely in theory (Qandil, 2020).

Faculty promote democracy among students through positive interaction, practicing academic and interpersonal skills, mutual respect, and awareness of individual differences. If faculty fail to demonstrate these qualities, it may deteriorate the relationship with their students (Fouad & Ibrahim, 2017).

University instructors deepen democratic practices among students by avoiding authoritarianism in teaching. Instead, they should promote collaboration, responsibility, innovation, and give students the freedom to choose activities related to their studies. They should encourage free expression, respect students' opinions regardless of differences, foster critical thinking and participation, and utilize methods that promote problem-solving relevant to students' academic challenges (Saleh, 2014).

Saleh (2014) identified the following skills essential for democratic educational behavior:

1. **Human Skills:** Including cooperation, respect for others, tolerance, rational dialogue, stress management, effective communication, and consideration of individual differences among students.
2. **Decision-Making Skills:** These enable teachers to adapt to different situations, choose optimal alternatives, answer student inquiries, manage relationships without coercion, delegate responsibilities, and identify key issues and interests.
3. **Social Interaction Skills:** Such as listening, self-criticism, communication, collaboration, and fostering a sense of belonging and affection among students.

Statement of the Problem

Amid the transformations of the 20th century, democracy has become a fundamental component of the educational process, especially in higher education, given its role in societal development and progress. Based on their experience in the "Education and Democracy" course, the researchers emphasize the importance of embedding democratic values through faculty members' democratic practices in educational environments.

The problem addressed in this study emerges from the researchers' observation of certain negative behaviors among university students. Democratic educational behavior practiced by faculty members serves as an indicator of an institution's success and its true value. Al-Sharafat (2019) also emphasized the importance of faculty members practicing democratic methods, noting that students occasionally express complaints. Promoting a democratic learning environment is essential for shaping students' personalities and should be a core responsibility of higher education institutions.

This study aims to bridge the gap between theoretical literature and previous research by examining the extent to which university faculty members practice democratic educational behavior. It also explores students' perceptions of these practices and whether they reflect authentic democratic engagement, offering valuable insights for stakeholders to enhance educational practices.

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of democratic educational behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University from the students' perspective?
2. Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) in the participants' assessments of faculty members' democratic behavior due to the variables of (gender, faculty, place of residence, academic year)?

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

1. Identify the extent to which democratic behavior is practiced by faculty members at Yarmouk University, and its role in advancing society.
2. Explore students' perceptions regarding the democratic behavior practiced by their faculty members.
3. Examine whether statistically significant differences exist in the sample's estimations of faculty members' democratic educational behavior based on selected variables.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study stems from the increasing focus on democracy and its impact on students in both scientific and humanities faculties at Yarmouk University. It aims to assess the extent to which faculty members apply democratic educational behavior, and to determine students' views on such practices in light of specific variables. The study's significance lies in the following:

Theoretical Significance:

The significance emerges from the study's focus on democratic educational behavior among faculty members, as perceived by students under certain variables.

1. It provides professionals and university administrators with insights into the key democratic behaviors expected from faculty members.
2. It emphasizes the importance of promoting democratic behavior among students by their instructors.
3. It bridges the knowledge gap by offering more theoretical literature and previous studies concerning the role of democratic behavior in education.

Practical Significance:

Practically, the study highlights the importance of practicing democratic behaviors by faculty members across colleges, and emphasizes the role of such behavior in instilling values such as ethics, honesty, freedom, and respect among students, thereby contributing to the organization of student behavior and academic success.

It also serves researchers interested in conducting further studies on the topic.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions:

The study includes the following key terms and their definitions:

Democracy (conceptually):

"A word of Greek origin, composed of two parts: 'Demos' meaning 'people,' and 'Cratos' meaning 'rule' — thus, the rule of the people" (Abu Al-Hijja, 2017, p. 33).

Democracy (operationally defined by the researchers):

Granting every citizen the right to express themselves and enjoy freedom in their community, as well as the right to participate in decision-making and the resolution of political issues. In the educational context, it refers to students enjoying equal educational opportunities and having a role in decision-making related to their academic institutions.

Democratic Behavior (conceptually):

"The set of behaviors and actions based on the principles of freedom, equality, and social justice as demonstrated by teachers" (Al-Zaboun, 2011, p. 654).

Democratic Behavior (operationally defined):

Ethical and educational practices performed by university faculty members to foster and enhance democratic behavior among students, aiming to ensure their academic success and achievement of educational goals.

Faculty Members (operationally defined):

Individuals responsible for teaching at university colleges, performing their duties effectively, and holding a doctoral degree in a specific academic discipline.

Previous Studies

This chapter presents previous studies related to the research topic, organized chronologically from the oldest to the most recent:

Al-Khalidi (2019) conducted a study titled *"The Degree to which Faculty Members in Jordanian Universities Apply Democratic Methods to Their Students from the Students' Perspective."* The study aimed to identify the degree to which faculty members in Jordanian universities apply democratic methods to their students, considering the variables of gender and academic level. The sample consisted of 329 students from Jordanian public universities. A 22-item questionnaire was distributed, and the descriptive survey method was employed. The results indicated that students perceived the application of democratic methods by faculty members as high. Statistically significant differences were found based on gender (favoring females) and academic level (favoring fourth-year students over second-year students).

Al-Momani (2019) conducted a study entitled *"The Degree of Practicing Democratic Behaviors by Secondary School Teachers in Irbid Governorate from the Perspective of Principals and Educational Supervisors and Ways to Improve Them."* The study aimed to identify the level of democratic behaviors practiced by secondary school teachers in Irbid and to reveal differences based on gender, years of service, academic qualification, and job title. The sample included 191 school principals and 194 educational supervisors. A questionnaire was used as the study instrument. The findings indicated that the overall level of democratic practices was high.

Statistically significant differences were observed in principals' responses based on age, while no significant differences were found based on gender or years of service. However, differences were statistically significant for gender in the supervisors' responses, favoring females, with no significant differences related to age.

Al-Zubaidi (2022) carried out a study titled *"The Role of University Professors in Developing Democratic Values Among University Students in Light of a Democratic Society."* The study aimed to identify the role of university professors in fostering democratic values among students. To achieve this, the researcher designed an exploratory questionnaire administered to a sample of faculty members in the Department of Education and Psychology at the College of Education for Women at the University of Baghdad. The results showed that democracy has become a way of life encompassing social, cultural, and professional aspects, grounded in principles such as respect for individuality, justice, equality, belonging, and loyalty.

Senturk and Oyman (2014) conducted a study that explored the perceptions of students at the Faculty of Education at Hacettepe University in Turkey regarding the democratic practices of faculty members. The sample consisted of 194 students. In-depth interviews were used as the research instrument. Results showed that the most commonly practiced democratic concepts by faculty members were freedom, equal rights, student participation in decision-making, and freedom of expression.

Kayalar (2016) conducted a study titled *"The Attitudes of Law Faculty Students in Turkish and Ukrainian Universities Toward the Democratic Behaviors of Faculty Members."* The study aimed to compare students' attitudes toward the democratic behaviors of faculty members. The sample included 226 law students selected randomly, and a democratic behavior scale was used to collect data. The findings revealed that students in both Turkish and Ukrainian universities had positive attitudes toward justice, equality, respect for others, and freedom of expression.

Payne (2018) conducted a study in the United States titled *"The Level of Democratic Practices Among Special Education Teachers Collaborating with General Education Teachers in Inclusive Schools."* This study aimed to assess the level of democratic practices among special education teachers collaborating in inclusive schools. The sample included six special education teachers selected randomly, and a questionnaire was used as the study instrument. Results showed that the level of democratic practices was moderate overall, with the highest-ranked practices being those related to collaborative relationships with general education teachers.

Study Methodology

The descriptive-analytical approach was adopted, being suitable for the purposes of the present study.

Study Population

The study population consisted of all students at Yarmouk University, totaling 8,944 students, according to the academic year 2023–2024 statistics.

Study Sample

The study instrument (questionnaire) was applied to a randomly selected sample of 306 students from the study population.

Variable	Level	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	135	44.1%
	Female	171	55.9%
	Total	306	100.0%
Faculty	Scientific	118	38.6%
	Medical	54	17.6%
	Humanities	134	43.8%
	Total	306	100.0%
Place of Residence	Village	201	65.7%
	City	105	34.3%
	Total	306	100.0%
Academic Year	First	56	18.3%
	Second	109	35.6%
	Third	62	20.3%
	Fourth	57	18.6%
	Fifth or higher	22	7.2%
	Total	306	100.0%

Table (1): Distribution of Study Sample According to Variables (Gender, Faculty, Place of Residence, Academic Year)

The sample includes a variety of attributes and information (demographic variables), namely: gender, academic qualification, years of experience, and school level. Table (1) presents frequencies and percentages for each category of the mentioned variables. The table indicates a relative gender balance, with females representing 55.9% of participants, and males accounting for 44.1%. Furthermore, the most common faculty among participants is "Humanities" (43.8%), followed by "Scientific" (38.6%), and lastly "Medical" (17.6%). The table also shows that the vast majority of participants live in villages (65.7%), while the rest reside in cities (34.3%). In terms of academic year, most of the sample is in the "second" year (35.6%), followed by the "third" year (20.3%), "fourth" year (18.6%), "first" year (18.3%), and finally "fifth or higher" (7.2%).

The questionnaire was developed as a tool for the study after reviewing previous relevant studies such as Zubaidi (2022); Mahmoud & Mohammad (2019); and Saleh (2014). The instrument consisted of two main parts:

Part One: Included demographic information of the respondent.

Part Two: Contained the questionnaire items designed to measure the level of democratic educational behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University from the students' perspective. The preliminary version of the tool consisted of 42 items distributed across four domains:

Freedom (12 items): reflecting the degree of freedom exercised by faculty members with their students.

Justice (10 items)

Participation and Cooperation (11 items)

Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism (9 items)

Instrument Validity

To ensure the validity of the instrument, the following procedures were undertaken:

1. Content Validity (Face Validity):

The instrument was reviewed by a panel of 10 referees with expertise in educational administration and foundations of education. These referees were academic staff members (professor, associate professor, assistant professor) at public Jordanian universities. They evaluated the linguistic formulation, relevance to the study topic, and suggested modifications, replacements, or deletions. All suggested revisions were implemented accordingly (see Appendix B).

2. Construct Validity:

To verify construct validity, the tool was administered to a pilot sample of 35 students from the target population but outside the main sample. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of its domain (r_1), and between each item and the total score of the entire instrument (r_2), as shown in Table (2).

r2	r1	Item No.	Dimension
.666**	.756**	1	Freedom
.879**	.901**	2	
.864**	.878**	3	
.620**	.687**	4	
.589**	.622**	5	
.672**	.717**	6	
.831**	.844**	7	
.655**	.729**	8	
.796**	.856**	9	

.729**	.839**	10	
.729**	.774**	11	
.848**	.843**	12	Justice
.844**	.839**	13	
.790**	.832**	14	
.821**	.882**	15	
.870**	.907**	16	
.879**	.922**	17	
.762**	.846**	18	
.750**	.827**	19	
.793**	.791**	20	
.856**	.852**	21	Participation and Cooperation
.888**	.911**	22	
.851**	.907**	23	
.740**	.820**	24	
.835**	.850**	25	
.867**	.910**	26	
.767**	.807**	27	
.785**	.821**	28	
.842**	.853**	29	
.869**	.875**	30	
.897**	.910**	31	Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism
.766**	.869**	32	
.817**	.880**	33	
.798**	.897**	34	
.680**	.815**	35	
.871**	.917**	36	
.687**	.829**	37	

Table (2): Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Each Item and its Domain Total (r1), and Between Each Item and the Total Instrument Score (r2), for the Instrument Measuring Democratic Educational Behavior of Faculty Members at Yarmouk University From the Students' Perspective

Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$

As shown in Table (2), all correlation coefficients are statistically significant. These values are considered suitable for the purposes of this study, especially since none of the correlations fell below 0.20 (Kilani & Al-Shraifeen, 2011, p. 431). Accordingly, no items were deleted from the instrument across its dimensions, indicating the construct validity of the instrument.

Instrument Reliability

To verify the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients (internal consistency) were calculated. The tool was administered to a pilot sample consisting of 35 students from the targeted study population but outside the main study sample, as shown in Table (3).

Scale	Internal Consistency Reliability	Number of Items
Freedom	0.94	11
Justice	0.95	9
Participation and Cooperation	0.96	9
Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	0.96	8
The instrument as a whole	-	37

Table (3) Indicators of the Reliability of Educational Democratic Behavior Among Faculty Members at Yarmouk University from the Students' Perspective and Its Domains

As shown in Table (3), the internal consistency reliability coefficients for the domains ranged between 0.94 and 0.96, all of which are higher than 0.70, indicating a high reliability of the scale (Cronbach, 1951).

Scoring Criteria for the Study Instrument

In order to calculate the overall score of the study instrument, the five-point Likert scale was adopted (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree). The scoring was as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). An interpretive standard consisting of five defined levels was used to classify the means, by dividing the scale (1–5) into five equal intervals, as shown in Table (4).

Level	Weight	Weighted Mean Range
Very Low	1	1.00–Less than 1.80
Low	2	1.80–Less than 2.60
Moderate	3	2.60–Less than 3.40
High	4	3.40–Less than 4.20
Very High	5	4.20–5.00

Table (4) Interpretation Standard for the Means of Educational Democratic Behavior Among Faculty Members at Yarmouk University from the Students' Perspective

Study Results

This chapter presents and discusses the study results.

First Research Question:

"What is the level of educational democratic behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University from the students' perspective?"

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations were calculated for the level of educational democratic behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University from the students' perspective. Table (5) presents the results.

No.	Rank	Domain	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
4	1	Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	3.72	0.35	High
3	2	Participation and Cooperation	3.35	0.48	Moderate
1	3	Freedom	3.19	0.40	Moderate
2	4	Justice	3.01	0.54	Moderate
		Overall Level of Educational Democratic Behavior	3.30	0.30	Moderate

Table (5): Means and standard deviations of the level of educational democratic behavior among faculty members at yarmouk university, ranked in descending order

As shown in Table (5), the means ranged from 3.01 to 3.72. The domain of "Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism" ranked first with the highest mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.35, indicating a high level. It was followed by "Participation and Cooperation" in second place with a mean of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 0.48, indicating a moderate level. Next was "Freedom," ranked third, with a mean of 3.19 and a standard deviation of 0.40, also indicating a moderate level. Finally, "Justice" ranked last with a mean of 3.01 and a standard deviation of 0.54, indicating a moderate level as well.

The overall mean of the instrument was 3.30, with a standard deviation of 0.30, indicating a moderate level.

Furthermore, the means and standard deviations for the students' evaluations of the items within each domain were calculated separately and will be presented accordingly.

First: The Domain of Freedom

The means and standard deviations for the respondents' estimations regarding the items of the domain of freedom were calculated, as shown in Table (6) below:

No.	Rank	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
3	1	The faculty member allows students to enter his/her office during office hours.	3.65	0.89	High

5	2	The faculty member grants students freedom in making decisions related to the course material.	3.41	1.15	High
4	3	The faculty member encourages students to present new ideas.	3.37	0.99	Moderate
6	4	The faculty member allows students to engage in discussions about the course content.	3.34	0.99	Moderate
7	5	The faculty member encourages students to engage in open discussions with each other.	3.23	0.95	Moderate
8	6	The faculty member gives students sufficient time to complete assigned tasks and activities.	3.18	1.03	Moderate
11	7	The faculty member provides a supportive environment for freedom of opinion and expression among students.	3.08	1.04	Moderate
2	8	The faculty member grants students freedom to ask questions.	3.02	0.94	Moderate
10	9	The faculty member encourages critical thinking, creativity, and innovation among students.	3.01	1.08	Moderate
9	10	The faculty member fosters leadership skills among students.	2.93	1.04	Moderate
1	11	The faculty member allows students to express their opinions.	2.92	1.03	Moderate
Domain of Freedom	-	-	3.19	0.40	Moderate

Table (6) shows that the means ranged from (2.92 to 3.65). Item (3), "The faculty member allows students to enter his/her office during office hours," ranked first with a mean of (3.65) and a standard deviation of (0.89), indicating a high level. Item (1), "The faculty member allows students to express their opinions," ranked last with a mean of (2.92) and a standard deviation of (1.03), indicating a moderate level. The overall mean for the domain of freedom was (3.19) with a standard deviation of (0.40), indicating a moderate level.

Second: The Domain of Justice

The means and standard deviations for the respondents' estimations regarding the items of the domain of justice were calculated, as shown in Table (7) below:

No.	Rank	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
20	1	The faculty member distributes tasks and activities among students fairly.	3.24	0.98	Moderate
19	2	The faculty member considers individual differences among students.	3.23	0.96	Moderate

17	3	The faculty member listens to students' opinions without ignoring them.	3.06	1.11	Moderate
12	4	The faculty member treats students fairly.	3.05	1.03	Moderate
18	5	The faculty member interacts with all students respectfully and courteously.	2.99	1.05	Moderate
15	6	The faculty member forgives students for late submissions when justified by personal circumstances.	2.96	1.10	Moderate
16	7	The faculty member deals with students democratically and without discrimination.	2.94	0.99	Moderate
14	8	The faculty member respects students' feelings without embarrassing them.	2.86	0.98	Moderate
13	9	The faculty member grades students fairly.	2.77	0.92	Moderate
Domain of Justice	-	-	3.01	0.54	Moderate

Table (7) indicates that the means ranged between (2.77 and 3.24). Item (20), "The faculty member distributes tasks and activities among students fairly," ranked first with a mean of (3.24) and a standard deviation of (0.98). Meanwhile, item (13), "The faculty member grades students fairly," ranked last with a mean of (2.77) and a standard deviation of (0.92). The overall mean for the domain of justice was (3.01) with a standard deviation of (0.54), indicating a moderate level.

Third: The Domain of Participation and Cooperation

The means and standard deviations for the respondents' estimations regarding the items of the domain of participation and cooperation were calculated, as shown in Table (8) below:

No.	Rank	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
26	1	The faculty member guides students' behavior positively when making decisions related to the course material.	3.67	1.05	High
22	2	The faculty member discusses and shares the course plan with students.	3.46	0.91	High
23	3	The faculty member works with students through positive dialogue to solve issues related to the course material.	3.42	0.97	High
28	4	The faculty member makes students feel they are an important and valuable part of the decision-making process.	3.41	0.89	High

24	5	The faculty member promotes values of love, cooperation, respect, and participation among students.	3.35	0.97	Moderate
21	6	The faculty member encourages students to collaborate with their peers.	3.29	0.92	Moderate
29	7	The faculty member discusses assigned tasks with students.	3.27	0.77	Moderate
27	8	The faculty member shares his/her opinions with students.	3.20	0.93	Moderate
25	9	The faculty member promotes the practice of democratic principles among students.	3.06	1.03	Moderate
Domain of Participation and Cooperation	-	-	3.35	0.48	Moderate

Table (8) shows that the means ranged from (3.06 to 3.67). Item (26), "The faculty member guides students' behavior positively when making decisions related to the course material," ranked first with a mean of (3.67) and a standard deviation of (1.05), indicating a high level. Item (25), "The faculty member promotes the practice of democratic principles among students," ranked last with a mean of (3.06) and a standard deviation of (1.03), indicating a moderate level. The overall mean for the domain of participation and cooperation was (3.35) with a standard deviation of (0.48), indicating a moderate level.

Fourth: The Domain of Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism

The means and standard deviations of the sample members' responses on the items related to the domain of responsibility and acceptance of criticism were calculated. Table (9) below presents the results.

No.	Rank	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
36	1	Accepts directed questions and does not avoid answering them	4.08	0.78	High
37	2	Takes responsibility for mistakes and assures students of their ability to handle decisions and consequences	3.92	0.83	High
35	3	Accepts criticism from students without emotional reaction	3.90	0.68	High
31	4	Ensures accuracy and objectivity in the information provided to students	3.80	0.74	High
34	5	Applies modern teaching methods	3.75	0.78	High
33	6	Holds students accountable for completing tasks and activities	3.65	0.95	High
32	7	Consistently follows up with students on their tasks	3.58	0.96	High
30	8	Listens to students' opinions even when they	3.07	1.14	Moderate

		differ from their own			
Overall, Domain	–	–	3.72	0.35	High

As shown in Table (9), the means ranged from (3.07 to 4.08). The item "Accepts directed questions and does not avoid answering them" (Item 36) ranked first, with a mean of (4.08) and a standard deviation of (0.78), at a high level. In contrast, the item "Listens to students' opinions even when they differ from their own" (Item 30) ranked last, with a mean of (3.07) and a standard deviation of (1.14), at a moderate level. The overall mean for this domain was (3.72), with a standard deviation of (0.35), which indicates a high level.

Results Related to the Second Research Question:

"Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in students' evaluations of faculty members' democratic behavior attributed to the variables of gender, faculty, place of residence, and academic year?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations were calculated for faculty members' democratic behavior as perceived by students, according to the variables of gender, faculty, place of residence, and academic year. Table (10) presents these results.

Variable	Level	Freedom	Justice	Participation and Cooperation	Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	Overall Democratic Behavior
Gender	Male	M = 3.20	3.00	3.30	3.71	3.28
		SD = 0.37	0.52	0.49	0.34	0.29
	Female	M = 3.19	3.02	3.39	3.73	3.31
		SD = 0.42	0.55	0.48	0.36	0.31
Faculty	Scientific	M = 3.16	2.88	3.24	3.67	3.22
		SD = 0.38	0.53	0.45	0.38	0.26
	Medical	M = 3.45	3.48	3.64	3.87	3.59
		SD = 0.37	0.41	0.45	0.32	0.31
	Humanities	M = 3.12	2.94	3.33	3.70	3.25
		SD = 0.39	0.48	0.48	0.33	0.26
Place of Residence	Village	M = 3.18	3.01	3.32	3.73	3.29
		SD = 0.41	0.55	0.45	0.36	0.30
	City	M = 3.22	3.01	3.40	3.70	3.32
		SD = 0.38	0.52	0.54	0.33	0.31
Academic Year	First	M = 3.16	2.89	3.23	3.71	3.23
		SD =	0.61	0.54	0.34	0.32

		0.39				
	Second	M = 3.26	3.11	3.40	3.68	3.35
		SD = 0.37	0.51	0.43	0.34	0.27
	Third	M = 3.20	3.03	3.44	3.80	3.35
		SD = 0.43	0.52	0.51	0.32	0.32
	Fourth	M = 3.12	2.91	3.35	3.68	3.24
		SD = 0.37	0.52	0.42	0.36	0.28
	Fifth and above	M = 3.09	3.03	3.14	3.80	3.24
		SD = 0.50	0.47	0.56	0.48	0.36

Table (10): Means and standard deviations of faculty members' practice of democratic behavior at Yarmouk university according to gender, faculty, place of residence, and academic year

M: Mean | SD: Standard Deviation

Table (10) reveals apparent differences in the means and standard deviations for faculty members' practice of democratic behavior according to gender, faculty, place of residence, and academic year. To determine the statistical significance of these differences across the four domains (and overall), a Four-Way ANOVA was conducted. Table (11) presents the results.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Sig.
Gender	0.024	1	0.024	0.328	0.567
Faculty	5.336	2	2.668	36.605	0.000
Place of Residence	0.090	1	0.090	1.237	0.267
Academic Year	0.489	4	0.122	1.677	0.155
Error	21.649	297	0.073		
Total	28.008	305			

Table (11): Four-Way ANOVA results for students' evaluations of faculty members' democratic behavior according to the study variables

The results in Table (11) indicate:

- No statistically significant differences in students' evaluations of faculty members' democratic behavior were found based on **gender**, **place of residence**, or **academic year**.
- Statistically significant differences were found based on the **faculty** variable. To identify the source of these differences, a Scheffe post-hoc test was conducted, as shown in Table (12).

Faculty	Scientific	Medical	Humanities
Scientific	—	0.3735*	0.0303
Medical	—	—	0.3432*
Humanities	—	—	—

Table (12): Scheffe Post-Hoc test results according to faculty variable

*Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table (12) shows that statistically significant differences exist between the Medical faculty and both the **Scientific and Humanities** faculties, in favor of the Medical faculty.

To determine the significance of the differences in students' evaluations of each of the four domains of democratic behavior separately, according to the study variables (gender, faculty, place of residence, academic year), a multiple Four-Way ANOVA was conducted. The results are presented in Table (13).

Source	Hotelling's Trace Test Value and Significance	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Value	Statistical Significance
Gender	F = 0.70 Sig = 0.592	Freedom	0.021	1	0.021	0.144	0.704
		Justice	0.005	1	0.005	0.020	0.888
		Participation and Cooperation	0.356	1	0.356	1.704	0.193
		Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	0.027	1	0.027	0.226	0.635
College	F = 9.644 Sig = 0.000	Freedom	4.335	2	2.168	15.005	0.000
		Justice	13.209	2	6.604	27.386	0.000
		Participation and Cooperation	5.852	2	2.926	14.001	0.000
		Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	1.223	2	0.612	5.104	0.007
Place of Residence	F = 0.836 Sig = 0.503	Freedom	0.224	1	0.224	1.551	0.214
		Justice	0.014	1	0.014	0.056	0.812
		Participation and Cooperation	0.475	1	0.475	2.275	0.133
		Responsibility and Acceptance of	0.029	1	0.029	0.240	0.625

		Criticism					
Year of Study	F = 1.497 Sig = 0.093	Freedom	0.988	4	0.247	1.710	0.148
		Justice	1.355	4	0.339	1.405	0.232
		Participation and Cooperation	1.947	4	0.487	2.329	0.056
		Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	0.568	4	0.142	1.186	0.317
Error		Freedom	42.905	297	0.144		
		Justice	71.624	297	0.241		
		Participation and Cooperation	62.071	297	0.209		
		Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	35.595	297	0.120		
Total		Freedom	48.632	305			
		Justice	87.544	305			
		Participation and Cooperation	71.219	305			
		Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	37.666	305			

Table (13): Results of the Four-Way ANOVA analysis of the study sample's perceptions of democratic behavior from the students' perspective across the four domains, separately, according to study variables

From Table (13), it can be concluded that:

- There are no statistically significant differences between the means of the study sample's perceptions of democratic behavior from the students' perspective across the four domains (overall), according to the variables of gender, place of residence, and year of study.
- There are statistically significant differences between the means of the study sample's perceptions of democratic behavior according to the "college" variable. To identify the source of these differences, Scheffe's post-hoc test was conducted, as shown in Table (14).

Variable	College	Scientific	Medical	Humanities
Freedom	Scientific	-	0.2949*	0.0392
	Medical	-	-	0.3341*

	Humanities	-	-	-
Justice	Scientific	-	0.6017*	0.0663
	Medical	-	-	0.5354*
	Humanities	-	-	-
Participation and Cooperation	Scientific	-	0.4037*	0.0876
	Medical	-	-	0.3161*
	Humanities	-	-	-
Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism	Scientific	-	0.1910*	0.0211
	Medical	-	-	0.1698*
	Humanities	-	-	-

Table (14): Results of Scheffe's Post-Hoc Test for the Domains According to the College Variable

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

From Table (14), it is evident that there are statistically significant differences between the "medical" college and both the "scientific" and "humanities" colleges, in favor of the "medical" college across all four domains.

Discussion of Results

Discussion of the First Question: What is the level of educational democratic behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University from the students' perspective?

The study results indicate that, overall, the educational democratic behavior among faculty members at Yarmouk University, as perceived by students, was at a moderate level. It was practiced at a moderately high to moderate level across the four domains of democratic behavior. Specifically, the domain of "Responsibility and Acceptance of Criticism" was the most practiced by faculty members, followed by "Participation and Cooperation," "Freedom," and then "Justice."

This highlights the importance of educational democracy among faculty members in enhancing students' engagement in decision-making related to their education and increasing their participation in the learning process.

It suggests that democracy, when detached from education, may lead to the failure of democratic practices within the educational process.

Discussion of the Second Question: "Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the study sample's perceptions of faculty members' democratic behavior due to the variables of gender, college, place of residence, and year of study?"

The study results showed statistically significant differences in the perceptions of faculty members' democratic behavior attributed to the "college" variable.

Faculty members in the "medical" colleges were perceived to practice democratic behavior in the domains of freedom, justice, participation and cooperation, and responsibility and acceptance of criticism to a greater extent compared to faculty members in scientific and humanities colleges. This demonstrates that educational democracy is actively practiced and viewed as a lifestyle, goal, and pedagogical approach by faculty members, which is vital for the success of the

educational process in the institution. It indicates that educational democracy should not be limited to a specific college but must be universally practiced as an essential human and educational value.

Moreover, the results revealed no statistically significant differences attributed to gender, place of residence, or year of study, meaning that democratic educational behavior is practiced equally regardless of gender, living location (rural or urban), or academic year.

This finding suggests that educational democracy is considered a universal right for all students, contributing to their development and the advancement of society.

However, the results also highlighted that "justice" was practiced only at a moderate level by faculty members, regardless of the studied variables.

This suggests that faculty members may underestimate the importance of justice in enhancing student success and capabilities.

It emphasizes the need for faculty members to strengthen their practice of justice to enhance student achievement and ensure the success of the educational process through democratic pedagogical practices.

Recommendations

Based on the results obtained, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Faculty members should practice democratic educational behavior, including its various domains, with their students.
2. Efforts should be made to instill democratic principles among students, enhancing their activity and role in practicing democratic behavior within educational institutions and their community.
3. Faculty members should promote democratic educational behavior and allow students to participate in decision-making processes that affect them, while emphasizing the importance of reinforcing democratic values for their students.
4. Continuous and regular seminars and lectures should be held on the importance of practicing democratic educational behavior among faculty members.
5. Jordanian universities should pay more attention to the necessity of practicing democratic educational behavior among faculty members and the importance of reinforcing it among students.

References

- Abu Safaqa, M. (2020). *The role of Arab universities in promoting democratic behavior: A case study of Palestinian universities (An-Najah National, Birzeit, American Arab University, Khadouri)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). An-Najah National University, Nablus.
- Abu Hayjah, A. (2017). *Democracy and its impact on the educational process*. 1st ed. Irbid: Al-Alam Al-Kutub Al-Haditha for Publishing and Distribution.
- Al-Jarah, W. (2013). *The degree of democratic value practice among students and faculty members in Jordanian universities and ways to activate its practice*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Yarmouk University, Irbid.
- Al-Khalidi, M. (2019). The degree of implementation of democratic methods by faculty members

- in Jordanian universities towards their students from the students' perspective. *Alexandria University Journal of Education*, 29(2), 195.
- Al-Zuboun, S. (2011). *Democratic practices among faculty members at Jerash University from the perspective of their students*. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 38(2), 651-653.
- Al-Zubaidi, S. (2022). *The role of university professors in developing the content of democracy among university students in light of a democratic society*. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Research*, 72(19), 343-344.
- Al-Momani, M. (2019). The degree of democratic behavior practice among secondary school teachers in Irbid Governorate from the perspective of principals and educational supervisors. *Journal of Islamic University for Educational and Psychological Studies*, 28(3), 290.
- Higazi, A., & Al-Hayajna, W. (2016). *Basic concepts in education*. 1st ed. Amman: Dar Al-Mu'taz for Publishing and Distribution.
- Hussein, M., Khalil, A., & Muntasser, M. (2018). Democratic practices of general secondary school teachers in Egypt (Reality and Future Aspirations). *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2, 419-432.
- Rabea, M. (2016). *Culture and democracy*. Duroob for Publishing and Distribution.
- Zureiba, J., & Khamis, A. (2013). *Reality of democratic behavior practices from the perspective of faculty members in light of some contemporary variables*. Shamaa.
- Saleh, A. A. R. (2014). *Democracy in education*. Dar Al-Yazouri for Publishing and Distribution.
- Saleh, S. (2014). The impact of democratic behavior of social studies teachers in the classroom on developing students' attitudes toward democracy. *Sir Min Ra'a*, Samarra University, 10(26).
- Fouad, N., Ibrahim, A., & Amal, I. (2017). *Reality of democratic educational practices among students of the College of Education at South Valley University in light of some demographic variables (Field Study)*. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 23.
- Qandeel, M. (2020). The role of faculty members in enhancing democratic practice among students and the mechanisms for its development from a community service perspective. *Journal of Studies in Social Work and Humanities*, 49(1), 310-311.
- Ministry of Education. (2016). *The educational system in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan*. Retrieved on March 30, 2016, from <https://www.Moe.gov.jo-/Menu-Details.aspx?MenuID=91>
- Ziyadi, F., & Shaban, Z. (2024). *Education and the transformation of consciousness: Approaches in education, freedom, and democracy*. Arab Press Agency.

English References

- Akar, C. (2016). Investigating students' perceptions of the democratic values of academicians. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 7(1), 96-139.
- Dundar, S. (2013). Students' participation in the decision-making process as a tool for democratic schools. *Educational Science: Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 867-875.
- Kesici, S. (2008). Teachers' opinions about building a democratic classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(2), 192-203.
- Kayalar, F. (2016). Comparison of Ukrainian and Turkish law students' attitudes towards democratic values: A cross-cultural study. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(2), 409-415.
- Payne, K. (2018). Democratic teachers mentoring novice teachers: Enacting democratic practices

and pedagogy in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 40(2), 133-150.
Senturk, I., & Oyman, N. (2014). Democratic classroom management in higher education: A qualitative study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(3), 940-945.