



Global Journal of Arts and Humanities (ISSN:2637-4765)



The Level of Freedoms in Jordan from the Perspective of University Graduates

Amani G. Jarrar^a

^aAssociate Professor - Philadelphia University, Jordan

ABSTRACT

The concept of freedom is one of the fundamental concepts discussed by many thinkers relating it to different aspects, whether behavioral, social, philosophical, political or moral problems of human societies. The study handles the issue of freedom in terms of applied philosophy and in practice. The study aims at identifying the level of freedoms in Jordan from the perspective of Jordanian university students. It discussed the research variable (freedom) according to differences in the fields of freedoms in terms of the variable of specialization (scientific - human). It also aims at identifying the level of freedoms in Jordan in various areas. The study reached conclusions that may be the normal case in different countries but not in Jordan. It reflected the level of freedom in different areas, presented both quantitatively and qualitatively. It concluded that there is no absolute freedom, and the citizen must strive to free oneself from potential control, working according to the need of mental or rational motives. And to reach a state of freedom, people should be the source of all authorities. And to establish freedom and democracy, federal coalition principle must be practiced.

Keywords: Freedom; Jordan; universities; graduates; philosophers; pluralism; rights; political participation.

*Correspondence to Author:

Amani G. Jarrar

Associate Professor - Philadelphia University, Jordan

How to cite this article:

Amani G. Jarrar. The Level of Freedoms in Jordan from the Perspective of University Graduates. Global Journal of Arts and Humanities, 2019, 2:9

 eSciPub
eSciPub LLC, Houston, TX USA.
Website: <https://escipub.com/>

1.1 Introduction

The concept of freedom is an important concept that many thinkers discussed in terms of its fundamental relation with the various behavioral, social, philosophical, political and moral problems faced by human societies. It is a controversial concept that has become a problem that is more evident than it was before. The concept of freedom is falsely recognized in the mind of youth, reflecting the nature of the Arab society in which negative manifestations are present. The exercise of freedom if being away from the values of society in a state of chaos may lead to the loss of reliability and therefore loss of rights. According to Nietzsche, freedom is the need for private human life, which is valuable and requires self-recognition and freedom based on an awareness of the concept of freedom.

Freedom is a representation of full humanity, as freedom is exercised by the individual, being aware of its extent and limits, being responsible for its results of exercise. The respect for freedom is a goal that the individual voluntarily chooses and lives to seek. Respect for others' right to dignity and independence is often a source of conflict. For this reason, the interest in freedom is often subject to many social and political problems. In his study of personality, Fromm (1973) points out that freedom resulted in individual independence and rationality, but at the same time may result isolation. This isolation, in turn, made him anxious that he could not tolerate isolation, facing the alternatives whether to choose either to escape from this freedom or to move forward to achieve positive freedom.

1.2 Problem statement

Our society has inherited a number of political, social and economic inheritances, so that affected changes in freedom that the individual or the people are not prepared. All of these trends are confused. Therefore, we must understand that we have a crisis of awareness of the concept of freedom. The researcher

studied the problem trying to measure the level of freedoms in Jordan from graduate students' perspective, trying to reach out whether the country is considered free or semi-free or not free.

1.3 Study importance

A full realization of freedom is based on the uniqueness of individuality, and that the realization of this positive freedom and individualism depends on economic and social changes that will allow the individual to become free for self-realization.

The following reflects the importance of the current study:

Freedom in its various dimensions is the basis of human life and the basis of its moral existence, its interaction with the conditions of society, as a fact of life, and the more freedom is safeguarded and guaranteed to achieve, the greater is the human prosperity of societies. While compromising this freedom or restricting it affects the ability of the human being to move forward, shaking one's confidence in community and surroundings, referring to a mere object of will, driven by others as well.

Our current Arab society is undergoing major political and social transformation trying to reach a free democratic society striving to achieve our goals and aspirations.

The current research is an important study in the field of political development in the Arab world.

1.4 Study goals

Measure the level of freedoms in general from the perspective of university students.

Differences in freedom as defined by gender variable (male – female).

Identify differences in freedom perspectives according to the specialization variable (scientific – human).

Identify the differences in the fields of freedom according to the variable specialization (scientific – human).

Identify differences in perspectives of the areas of freedom as defined by gender variable (male-female)

- Identify the level of freedoms and their different areas.

1.5 Study limitations

The research deals with Jordanian university students for the academic year (2015-2016), specialization and gender.

1.6 Terminology

Freedom is defined by both Sartre (1943) who defined freedom as man choosing independently, the independence of choice, and it appears psychologically in desires, will and voluntary actions. To him freedom imposes motives without reason, which is far from vision and rationality. It is simply an expression of the organism's spontaneity. and Najjar & Others (1960): It is emancipation of man from constraints and behavioral controls refusing man's conviction and awareness, away from accepting interference in the affairs of others or violation of their right to freedom.

Also Silba (1971) defined freedom as it is salvation from coercion, social coercion, and freedom is in accordance with.

Alaswad (1990) confirmed that freedom is the right to be or act as pleased. Veenhoven (2000) defined freedom as the possibility of choice when circumstances allow the individual some choices that require a chance to choose.

Hafni (2003): The individual frees from constraints and the individual can act freely whatever wanted, choosing and thinking as inspired.

Al-Rubaie (2006): The ability of an individual to choose freely when faced with threat of an external source, and the ability to choose among several alternatives with willingness to do something despite the threats and obstacles, and the ability to show commitment to this choice and the realization of self-control over behavior.

Al-Rubaie (2007): The right of the individual to practice civil, political and intellectual activities without pressure and threats and without harming others.

Procedural definition: The degree which the examinee registers in response to the level of freedoms questionnaire.

1.7 Freedom and human existence in existentialism

Freedom has a broad meaning according to Sartre, the leader of French existentialism philosophy, who believes that man is free and freedom is the very core of human existence. Choice to Sartre is synonymous with existence or life in general, so that the only way I can make that choice is to take this way, our self depends on the world in which we live, without which we will not be anything, but the picture seems to us as the world depends first and foremost on us. We are taking the world out of its meaning, because the world itself does not involve what is the meaning, and when the existentialists say we are what we are, we create the world, and our creation of the world creates ourselves, and that human feeling chooses itself only by choosing the world in a way that will appear to it, it creates its own creation for its own world. Freedom from Sartre's point of view is only that of self-capacity to form one's self, to choose one's own way of life and to choose one's own self at every moment of our existence, that freedom is the feeling of existence itself, and many people feel that their freedom disturb them, so that they run to the idea of "constraint". The idea of responsibility is within the idea of anxiety, Sartre says (Our freedom is the source of the psychological anxiety that takes us in the act, and the concern here is in the choice without being able to predict the results of one's actions, and this concern is one of the necessities of the act so as not to sleep, but it is a blow of psychological distress that lived by all the souls that felt responsibility. The concern described by Sartre is separated from the sense of direct responsibility that lies with us towards others. Concern is not a barrier to action; it is an integral part of the act itself. The existence that man enjoys is not existence in the sense of being but presence in the sense of being. A human being is the existence by which one changes nothingness into existence, and therefore one is not free but because one's

existence is a deficient presence filled by nothingness on all sides. Indeed, the choice that Sartre speaks about is absolute and unconditional choice. It is choice without constraints. It should be noted that Sartre's theory of freedom is not devoid of rationalism, and that the foundations of rational principles should be sought in the field of freedom. Humanity is the one that creates values and freely establishes the foundations of truth, goodness and beauty, and we feel the responsibility of creating for ourselves and others the standards of human values. In fact, human freedom is limited to our own choice for our purposes, because the choice of these ends is the nature of our existence. Reason justifies itself. It is true that any person may view the motives of his/her actions and the justifications of actions as necessary, as if they are the consequences of their consequences. Change is to define its purpose and motives; the act is the only expression of human freedom that is rushing towards achieving our potential in a single movement that includes motivation, motivation and purpose together, or what we call vision and deliberate management. It is in Sartre's eyes just self-deception, How can a man judge the motives as true rule, like every mental exercise, by virtue of that original choice by which it creates itself and determines its existence, it is not the motive or the motive of value, but what is taken away by my destination and my original project, for I am the one who created my desire. This means that when the will intervenes, the design will be taken before, so that the value of the will is not merely revealed or shown clearly. Freedom is nothing other than the existence of our will and disobedience. Hence, the freedom that Sartre speaks about does mean never get what you want; it just means Freedom is the independence of choice and self-fulfillment. Therefore, it is the whole psychological life, manifested in desires as manifested in will and actions. The free act is not an act of reason emanating from motives and rationales .And far from all vision and rationality and

transcendence of all other motives , so that reasons becomes not really (reasonable. Freedom of Sartre is closely related to instinct; it is not actually an expression of the spontaneous organism, but if we look at Sartre's doctrine of responsibility, we see that it gives responsibility a wide meaning that he makes man. A question about humanity to Sartre is in making man responsible to freedom to choose. Here emerged another philosopher, Merleau-Ponty, who modified Sartre doctrine of absolute freedom and the basic idea underlying the theory of Merleau-Ponty freedom, saying that "There is no freedom except if there is something that emanates from within. Absolute freedom is free from the idea of commitment because the design that is achieved in the present must be in the future, while at the same time preserving something that is preserved. If what came next moment, which preceded it benefited from moments, says Merleau-Ponty that every choice must be based on a previous commitment and that freedom always requires the existence of any field. It requires that there is something that separates it from its goals.

1.8 The problem of freedom according to modern philosophers

The history of the problem can be traced in short, so that we can see through the enormous intellectual debate that took place between supporters of freedom and its opponents, the mystery of the important civilization crisis that the liberal doctrine has suffered from through history. According to Hobbes freedom is the greatest force in society, who believes in the handover of power to one individual. His political doctrine was based on absolutism, while Spinoza determined that the more individuals enjoyed freedom and equality the better the government is, particularly a democratic government in a republican system in which the will of the people is to govern, where the state should not impose on its members to embrace any doctrine. Spinoza also emphasized freedom of opinion, separation between religious authority and civil

authority. As for Locke (1632, 1704) who is the founders of Free will doctrine, with his famous saying that all people were born free, believing in the principle of political freedom rather than domination, rule or tyranny. Individuals are entrusted with rights of civil and political society to ensure that they are well protected, applying the right to punishment and the application of justice. Here Locke assesses civil and political powers, also judging criminal(punitive) justice , making civil authority as the goal of every government , so that every civil society is to preserve the private rights of individuals, particularly their lives, freedom and money, which is therefore the goal of every civil system. Then, Locke speaks, in his work entitled (A Letter concerning Toleration) about the need to separate between civil authority and religious authority, so that Locke wanted to guarantee all rights to all individuals, including their freedom of religion.

Montesquieu (1689-1755) was the first political thinker who called for the separation of powers and called for the strengthening of individual liberties. He also made it clear that the difference between authoritarian rule and monarchy is not a difference in nature. He believed that it is the people themselves who are both the ruler and the ruled who votes expressing ones will. At the same time being subject to those rulers they appointed. People have the right to make laws and choose rulers, being responsible for both the legislative and executive powers. Montesquieu also decides that political freedom is not limited to acting according to one's will. In fact, the only freedom that can be done in the state, in a society governed by laws, is that which the individual can do without being obliged, Montesquieu believed in the separation of powers as the best proof of freedom and equality among individuals. Montesquieu believed that every man with authority will be driven to abuse of use), so he asked to increase the number of authorities to set balance. The Montesquieu also asked for the independence of the judiciary power, as a vital necessity for peace and

security, determining that the Constitution alone would not suffice to avoid attacks on rights, that must be consolidated and respected by the people and the public opinion, asking every legislator to work on drafting a constitution for the people with the spirit of the nation.

According to Rousseau (1712-1778), freedom or free will is the pillar of social justice, as the individual is principle of society itself. In Rousseau's view, the state is a partnership among a group of citizens, so that freedom is the cornerstone of building the entire political community. Thus, the main problem is that of finding a social form that is capable of protecting people and defending their property. The social contract in Rousseau's view is to resort to the idea of a social consent for the free contract between the people who are interconnected. Social contract is that each individual puts one's strength in the se, accepting each of the society's members as an integral part of all. Social contract in the eyes of Rousseau is the principle of legitimacy of authorities. The principle of freedom of citizens is therefore, that in understanding the rights of each individual according to the social contract. It is a determination to become part of the political body, and freedom is a principle of duty and right at the same time, saying that the freedom of will is a moral action, so that the social contract requires real concessions. This doesn't mean that individuals relinquish their freedoms, but that this contract is indeed the result of increased freedoms of individuals, so that in the eyes of Rousseau political freedom is merely an expression of respect for the sovereignty of the people ,and that this sovereignty is limited to people's will and therefore public freedom.

On the other hand, Rousseau believes that sovereignty is achieved when separating between the legislative, the executive and the judiciary authorities, and the people remain with sovereignty. Rousseau advocated the principle of the people's infallibility.so that law is merely an expression of the general will, and the people have the right to amend or abolish laws

when necessary. Rousseau decides that sovereignty is to the state alone, and that the government is only entrusted by the people. Rousseau believes that it is better and necessary for this authority to remain in the hands of the nation itself. The executive authority, however, must be accountable to the people so that it can at any time withdraw. The reform of the state comes through dividing jobs, making the people able to choose to have agents, with specific mandates that can be withdrawn from them at any time, making them accountable effectively. Law is an expression of public will, and people are represented through the executive power rather than the legislative authority. Rousseau resorts to the principle of alliance and federal union among the smaller states. Rousseau concludes that the real republic is the federal republic, like the regime in Switzerland. On the other hand John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) was interested in the study of freedom and the relationship between the individual and society and the link between freedom and power. He has established a theory based on the following question: What is the legitimate limit on which the individual's sovereignty is to depend on? Where does the power of society begin? Mill believed that the only purpose that justifies the use of force with any individual living in a civilized community is to prevent this individual from harming other individuals. He believes that totalitarianism is a legitimate means to rule uncivilized people provided that the goal is to protect them. Mill argues that it is not the right of the society to intervene in the individual, and that is why he calls for freedom of thought and conscience, stressing that the individual has absolute freedom in thought and emotion provided that our actions do not cause any harm to others.

1.9 Types of freedoms

- Economic Freedom: It is the opportunity to exchange goods and services depending on several things, such as the existence of common language, mutual trust and customs. It is the absence of restrictions on free trade such

as the absence of control or control of prices and high taxes and various market practices.

Political Freedom: The rights of individuals to participate in government, such as the right to vote, based on the absence of restrictions on participation in the system of government. Political freedom is concerned with some civil rights such as freedom of speech.

Social & Personal Freedom: Most of the restrictions on social and personal freedom are informal. The degree of informal social control in countries can be estimated based on the practice of religious rites, travel from country to country, marriage, divorce and childbirth, This type of freedom is sometimes imposed formally by strict laws, and informally imposed through the constraints of social rejection of different lifestyles.

1.10 Conditions of Freedom

Possibilities: The first condition is the permissibility of the act as being not necessary. This means that things must be possible and not obligatory. If the opposite is true, that is, if each incident is restricted to what is preceded.

Motives: Freedom implies that the act is based on probable causes. These causes may be mental or emotional, but in both cases it must include compliance with the reasons.

Spontaneity: Freedom requires that the action is spontaneous.

Characteristics of a free action: The free act is not independent of its reasons, nor is it a matter of control, based on the knowledge of the probable causes.

1.11 Methods and producers

1.11.1 Study population

The research population consists of students from Jordanian universities for the academic year (2016-2017). The total number of students is (66800), (30200) male, (36600) female, distributed in (8) humanitarian colleges and (5) scientific colleges making (40500) in the humanities colleges and (26300) students in the scientific colleges. Table (1) shows this.

Table (1): The study population reflecting gender and specialization variables

Students		Faculty	Total
Male	Female		
8330	9305	Literature	17635
4630	5682	Education	10312
2255	3456	Management and economy	5711
3870	4877	Basic Education	8747
1220	2363	Law	3583
488	544	Political science	1032
259	594	Physical education	853
297	578	Tourism and Hotels	875
3704	3356	Engineering	7060
2962	3257	Sciences	6219
855	948	Medicine	1803
710	879	Pharmacy	1589
620	761	Dentistry	1381
30200	36600		66800

1.11.2 Study sample

The sample was selected by the method (the statistical sample). The sample is used in the case of heterogeneous statistical societies, i.e. the selection of units from each category is subject to the control of the researcher, thus forming the total sample size is required. The

researcher tested (200) students from the Faculty of Science, and Law Faculty from the University of Jordan with (95) male students and (105) female students, distributed by specialization, (200) in scientific stream and (200) human stream, and table (2) shows that.

Table (2): The study sample distributed by the specialization and gender variables

Faculty	Humanities		Scientific		Total
	female	male	female	male	
Science			51	49	100
Law	54	46			100
Total	100		100		200

1.11.3 Study tool

For the purpose of achieving the objectives of the research, the researcher built a measurement tool to measure the (level of

freedoms) based on the literature that dealt with the concept of freedom, particularly: Ibrahim, Zakaria (1972) in his study (The problem of freedom), and Mill, John Stewart (2013).

1.11.3.1 Description of the scale of freedom measurement

The Freedom Level Scale consists of (30) items as shown in Annex (1), divided into (7) areas including civil liberties and political rights. Civil liberties include: Freedom of expression and belief, freedom of association, freedom of the rule of law, freedom of personal independence, whereas political freedoms include: Freedom of the electoral process, freedom of pluralism, participation and freedom of government performance. And both are distributed over (30) items as follows:

1. Freedom of expression and belief is measured in items (13, 14, 15, and 16).
2. The rights of assembly and organization are measured in items (17, 18, 19, and 20).
3. The rule of law is measured in items (21, 22, 23, 24, and 25).
4. Independence of personal and individual rights is measured in items (26, 27, 28, 29, and 30).
5. The electoral process is measured in items (1, 2, and 3).
6. Pluralism and participation are measured in items (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8).
7. Government Performance is measured in items (9, 10, 11, and 12).

The scores were pointed in light of a Likert five-point scale starting with the first response (always applied to me), taking the highest score (5) and (mostly applying) with a score of 4, and (sometimes applying) with a score of 3, then (rarely applicable) with a score of 2, and finally (not applicable at all) with a score of 1.

1.11.3.2 Survey Study

The objective of the survey is to know the level of clarity of the items in terms of formulation and meaning, as well as to know the effectiveness of the scale alternatives and the difficulties that the respondent may face, for the purpose of avoiding that problem before applying the meter in its final form. The researcher applied the scale on a sample of

(20) students, (10) female and 10 male, from both faculties of Science and Law at the University of Jordan, so that the items of the scale and instructions were both valid.

1.11.3.3 Correction of the scale

That is technically pointing out the degree of response of the examinee on each item of the scale, then collecting these scores to find out the current score, and the items were corrected to reach (30) items, so that the total score of the scale was (150) and the lowest was (30).

Procedures to measure the level of freedom:

The method of the two extreme groups

After applying the freedom level measurement on the sample of the study of (200) students, divided into (93) males (107) females, and correcting the questionnaire to extract the discriminatory force of the items, as follows:

Correct the answers, determining the total score for each respondent.

The forms were arranged in descending order from the highest score to the lowest score.

Twenty-seven percent of the top-level responses were designated, top-level, and 27% of the lower-score forming the lower-score group. Thus, the total number of members in each group was 54, so that we have two groups with the largest volume of its distribution according to natural distribution and with maximum variation.

The cut point was determined by applying the following equation $0.27 \times 200 = 54$ degree.

The t-test was applied to two independent samples to test the difference between the upper and lower groups in each item. After calculating the means and deviation for both the upper and lower groups, the T calculated value represents the discriminant force of the items between the two groups by comparing them to the critical T value of (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05), and the degree of freedom (106). All the items were ok and distinct, and thus the measure consists of (30) distinct items, as table (3) shows.

Table (3): The arithmetic means, the standard deviation, and the calculated T value of the freedom level and field scale, according to the two extreme groups

Field	Item	Highest group		Lowest group		T value	significance
		Arithmetic mean	Standard Deviation	Arithmetic mean	Standard Deviation		
Electoral process	1	3.63	1.40	2.70	1.44	3.44	significant
	2	3.50	1.11	2.37	1.21	5.03	significant
	3	3.70	1.00	2.31	1.87	6.59	significant
Participation and pluralism	4	3.90	1.05	2.75	1.28	5.07	significant
	5	3.53	1.19	2.64	1.11	3.99	significant
	6	3.85	1.12	3.31	1.06	7.31	significant
	7	3.53	1.09	2.31	1.04	5.94	significant
	8	3.66	1.13	2.29	1.03	6.55	significant
Government performance	9	3.59	1.22	2.31	0.98	5.98	significant
	10	3.62	0.93	2.29	1.19	6.46	significant
	11	2.77	1.50	1.81	0.89	4.05	significant
	12	3.09	1.12	2.12	0.95	4.81	significant
Freedom of speech and belief	13	3.90	1.16	2.20	1.03	8.01	significant
	14	3.81	1.19	2.44	1.23	5.84	significant
	15	3.68	1.17	2.18	1.02	7.04	significant
	16	3.94	0.94	2.25	1.08	8.62	significant
Right of assembly and organization	17	3.75	1.19	2.40	1.03	6.27	significant
	18	3.62	1.15	2.44	1.23	5.14	significant
	19	3.18	1.16	1.83	0.92	6.66	significant
	20	3.37	1.32	2.29	0.94	4.85	significant
Rule of law	21	3.59	1.25	1.92	1.16	7.16	significant
	22	4.62	0.78	2.87	1.50	7.16	significant
	23	3.68	1.22	2.40	1.15	5.56	significant
	24	3.25	1.34	2.07	1.06	5.07	significant
	25	3.38	1.20	2.27	1.10	4.99	significant
Individual rights and personal rights	26	4.05	1.03	2.59	1.12	7.03	significant
	27	4.18	0.91	2.92	1.30	5.82	significant
	28	3.22	1.11	2.29	1.15	4.23	significant
	29	4.09	1.06	2.68	1.25	6.27	significant
	30	3.14	1.26	2.07	1.13	4.65	significant

1.11.4 The statistical validity of the questionnaire items

Relation of the degree of the item to the total degree of the scale and the internal consistency of the scale based on the relationship between the degree of the item and the total degree of the scale, using Pearson correlation coefficient, using (200) forms, that are the same forms that

were subject to statistical analysis in light of the excellence of the item scale. The correlation was statistically functional when compared to the correlation value of the correlation coefficient reaching (0.14) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (198) and table (4) shows that.

Table (4): Calculated value coefficients of correlation for the freedom level scale items

Item	Coefficient of correlation	Item	Coefficient of correlation
1	0.36	18	0.41
2	0.41	19	0.45
3	0.50	20	0.39
4	0.41	21	0.49
5	0.33	22	0.49
6	0.46	23	0.42
7	0.37	24	0.41
8	0.41	25	0.38
9	0.42	26	0.45
10	0.42	27	0.34
11	0.33	28	0.34
12	0.34	29	0.33
13	0.50	30	0.38
14	0.41		
15	0.47		
16	0.56		
17	0.45		

And relation of the item to the value of field to which it belongs, the study uses Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficients ranged from 0.84 to 0.52. All correlation coefficients were statistically

functional when compared to the correlation coefficient of 0.14 at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (198). Table (5) shows that.

Table (5): Coefficients of correlation between the degree of the item and the degree to the field it belongs to

The field	Total Number of items	Number of item	Coefficients of correlation between item and field
Electoral process	3	1	0.84
		2	0.79
		3	0.78
Pluralism and political participation	5	4	0.58
		5	0.59
		6	0.68
		7	0.59
Government performance	4	8	0.63
		9	0.62
		10	0.61
		11	0.63
Freedom of speech and belief	4	12	0.64
		13	0.68
		14	0.71
		15	0.61
Rights of assembly and organization	4	16	0.66
		17	0.66
		18	0.63
		19	0.59
Rule of law	5	20	0.62
		21	0.55
		22	0.68
		23	0.67
		24	0.69
Independence of personality and rights of individuals	5	25	0.65
		26	0.59
		27	0.62
		28	0.54
		29	0.62
		30	0.52

1.11.5 Statistical virtual validity of the scale

The virtual validity of the scale has been verified by presenting the scale to a group of experts and specialists in the field of development, political science, and measurement and evaluation specialists, asking them to evaluate the validity of the scales and fitness with the subject of

evaluation. The researcher accepted a percentage of agreement that is (80%) and above for the validity of the scale, taking into consideration the opinion of experts to modify some items rather than deleting them, so that the standard has finally become reliable. See annex (2)

1.11.6 Reliability of the scale

The reliability of the scale is derived by *laVa Cronbach* method of evaluation. This method is used to calculate the coefficient of reliability with α coefficient, and it is used in finding the reliability coefficient for the testing the objective and subjective clauses. This parameter is used when the objective is to estimate the coefficient of reliability of the scale in the emotional and personal aspects, since they include degrees in measures that do not have correct or wrong answers. The coefficient of reliability in this equation was 0.84. The reliability degree was also retrieved in a retesting manner, where 40 random forms were withdrawn, forming (20) male and (20) female, and then the scale was applied once again for the second time after a period of (2) weeks, on the same sample from the Faculty of Science, Department of Mathematics, and the Faculty of Law, where the correlation coefficient was (0.74).

1.12 Results and discussion

The following results are presented based on the research objectives:

1.12.1 The first objective: To measure the level of freedoms in general from the perspective of graduate students.

To verify the first objective, the arithmetic means and the standard deviation was calculated for the performance of the sample on the freedom level scale ,and to see if there were statistically functional differences at (0.5) in the average of the performance of the sample considered for the scale as a whole. The t-test was used for one sample , where the calculated value was (0.05), which is smaller than the critical scale of (1.96), at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (199). Table (6) shows this.

Table (6): The calculated T value of the sample as a whole on the Freedom Level scale

Variable	Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Hypothetical Mean	T-test		significance
					T-calculated value	Critical T - value	
Degrees of freedom	200	90.06	15.69	90	0.05	1.96	Non-Functional differences

From the table above, it is clear that the calculated T value is less than the critical value. In other words, there is no functional difference between the arithmetic means and the hypothetical means. Therefore, the level of freedom from the point of view of the university students is medium, which is described as semi-free. This can be interpreted according to Aristotle, so that there is no absolute freedom. While according to the behaviorist psychologist Skinner man is governed starting by family control then community and state. Man is controlled by law, institutions and all forms of social institutions, and if man is convinced that his behavior is controlled by environmental reinforcements, this can lead to a better life by

designing identify better enhancement programs.

1.12.2 Second Objective: To identify the differences in freedom according to gender variable.

To investigate the second objective, the mean and the standard deviation of the sample were calculated on the freedom scale. And to find out if there were functional differences between males and females in freedom, the t-test was used for two independent samples. The calculated T value was (0.81) which is less than (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05) with a degree of freedom as (198) , and table (7) shows.that

Table (7): The arithmetic means, the standard deviation, and the calculated and critical T value, to determine the significance of differences between males and females on the scale of freedom

Variable	Gender	Total	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-test		Significance
					T-calculated value	Critical T - value	
Freedom level scale	male	93	89.09	15.19	0.81	1.96	Non-Functional differences
	female	107	90.90	16.14			

From the table above, it is clear that the calculated T value is less than the critical. In other words, there are no statistically functional differences between males and females in freedom. This indicates that freedom is not related to gender, it is related to the formation of goals, as noted in the theory of freedom. As freedom is related to the ability to form goals, no matter what gender is, and one's ability to implement these goals, and take the responsibilities, so this is what distinguishes one from another.

1.12.3 The third objective: To identify the differences in freedom according to the variable of specialization (scientific, human).

To investigate the third objective, the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation of the sample performance was calculated on the freedom scale. To find out if there were differences between (scientific, human) in freedom scales, the t-test was used for two independent samples, where the calculated value was (0.29) which is less than (1.96) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1.96). Table 8 illustrates this.

Table (8): Arithmetic means, standard deviation, and T-test of two independent samples to determine the functional differences between (scientific, humanitarian) in the freedom scale.

Variable	Specialty	Total	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-test		Significance
					T-calculated value	Critical T - value	
Freedom level scale	scientific	104	90.37	17.27	0.29	1.96	Non-Functional differences
	Humanitarian	96	89.72	13.86			

Based on the table above, the calculated t-value is less than the critical T value, which means there are no functional differences in freedom level based on specialty. The interpretation of the result of the third goal as explained by the result of the second goal according to the theory of freedom shows that freedom is not related to a particular specialization. So according to the Dutch sociologist, Veenhoven (2000); he believes that in order for the individual to be free in his choices, one must have the opportunity to

choose an environment, and testing this opportunity requires two things:

Something selected.

Others do not prevent this choice.

Therefore, freedom relies on social lifestyle, so that developing communities provide their members with a very specific lifestyle that differs from advanced industrial societies.

1.12.4 Fourth Objective: To Identify the differences in the fields of freedoms according

to the variable of specialization (scientific, human).

In order to verify the fourth objective, the arithmetical averages and the standard deviations of the performance of the sample were calculated on the freedoms scale. To find

out the significance of the differences in the fields of freedoms that are (seven), showing the specialization variable (scientific, human), where the independent samples were used as shown in Table (9).

Table (9): Arithmetic means, standard deviations and T-calculated values, to identify differences in the fields of freedom, according to the specialization variable (scientific, human)

Field	Specialty	Total	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-test		Significance
					T-calculated value	Critical T value	
Electoral process	Scientific	104	12.29	3.61	0.53	1.96	Non-significant
	Humanitarian	96	12.04	3.10			
Freedom of government performance	Scientific	104	10.97	3.23	0.32	1.96	Non-significant
	Humanitarian	96	11.11	2.99			
Rights of assembly and organization	Scientific	104	15.94	3.81	2.73	1.96	significant
	Humanitarian	96	14.56	3.27			
Rule of law	Scientific	104	14.67	4.22	2.12	1.96	significant
	Humanitarian	96	15.93	4.19			
Pluralism and political participation	Scientific	104	16.00	3.71	2.47	1.96	significant
	Humanitarian	96	14.69	3.71			
Freedom of belief and speech	Scientific	104	15.96	3.81	2.73	1.96	significant
	Humanitarian	96	14.56	3.27			
Personal independence and individual rights	Scientific	104	15.94	3.81	2.73	1.96	significant
	Humanitarian	96	14.56	3.27			

From the table above, there are differences in the fields of freedom according to the variable of specialization, such as freedom of assembly and organization, freedom of pluralism, participation, freedom of speech and belief, freedom of independence, human rights, that are in favor of scientific specialization. There are also differences in the rule of law and in

favor of human specialization. On the other hand, there are no differences between the scientific and humanitarian specialization in the field of freedom of the electoral process and freedom of government performance.

1.12.5 The fifth goal: Identifying the differences in the fields of the seven freedoms according to gender variable.

Table (10): Arithmetic mean, standard deviations and T- calculated value to identify the sample on the freedoms scale (according to gender)

Field	Gender	Total	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-test		Significance
					T-calculated value	Critical T value	
Electoral process	male	93	14.87	3.41	1.49	1.96	Non-significant
	female	107	15.63	3.77			
Freedom of government performance	male	93	10.93	3.23	0.44	1.96	Non-significant
	female	107	11.13	3.01			
Rights of assembly and organization	male	93	11.34	2.95	1.70	1.96	significant
	female	107	12.07	3.09			
Rule of law	male	93	15.41	4.28	0.43	1.96	significant
	female	107	15.15	4.23			
Pluralism and political participation	male	93	14.87	3.41	1.49	1.96	significant
	female	107	15.63	3.77			
Freedom of belief and speech	male	93	11.79	3.27	1.48	1.96	significant
	female	107	12.50	3.43			
Personal independence and individual rights	male	93	14.87	3.41	1.49	1.96	significant
	female	107	15.63	3.77			

From the table above, it is clear that there are no statistically functional differences in terms of gender in all seven areas of freedom. This result was reinforced by the result of the second goal.

1.12.6 Sixth Objective: To identify the level of freedoms and their different areas.

To achieve the sixth objective, the relative position measures (quartile) were used, ie, if a group is arranged from the smallest to the highest score, it is divided into four equal parts by three points. Each of these three points is called a quartile, and there are three quartile ,

the first point is called the first quartile, the second point is the second quartile, the third point is the third quartile , the first quartile is the point where 25% of the cases occur below it ,and (75%) of the cases occur above it, the second quartile is the point where (50%) of the cases occur below it ,and the third quartile is the point where (75) % of the cases are below it ,and (25%) of cases are above. The following results show the level of civil liberties and political freedoms and their different fields.As shown in tables 11, 12 and 13.

Table (11): The level of freedom of government performance based on the Quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	3	18 – 13	66	%33
semi-free	12	12 – 10	71	%35.3
not free	9	9 – 4	63	%31.5

Table (12): The levels of freedom of pluralism and participation determined by the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	18	25 – 18	58	%29
semi-free	15	17 – 14	79	%39.5
not free	13	13 – 5	63	%31.5

Table (13): Levels of freedom of the electoral process determined based on the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	12	15 – 12	56	%28
semi-free	9	11 – 8	90	%45
not free	7	7 – 3	54	%27

The results of Tables 11-12-13 show that all belong to political freedoms. The result is that all areas of political freedom are semi-free from the students' point of view. One can interpret this result in the view of Montesquieu (1689-1755) believed that the people under democratic rule may seem to do what they want but political freedom is not limited to acting as one wishes. In fact, the only freedom that can be in the state is that the individual can do what should be, without being compelled to do what should not be done. Freedom does not mean absolute individual autonomy, but it means the right to act as required by the laws, and if the individual has the right to do what the laws

prohibit, there will be no freedom, because others as well will not hesitate to use this right, and accordingly, Montesquieu does not believe that the ability of the people is equal to people's freedom, he would rather decide on the contrary - that the people whose Constitution gives people the right to do everything, on the pretext that this is freedom, and this means that political freedom is the "right to do everything allowed by law. According to Kant freedom in essence is the ability to perform our duty. As for the levels of the areas of civil liberties, they are shown in Table (14), (15), (16) and (17), respectively.

Table (14): The levels of freedom of personal independence and the individual rights determined based on the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	18	23 – 18	55	%27.5
semi-free	15.5	17 – 12	79	%39.5
not free	13	13 – 8	66	%33

Table (15): Levels of freedom of expression and belief according to the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	14	20 – 14	72	%36
semi-free	12	13 – 11	62	%31
not free	10	10 – 4	66	%33

Table (16): Levels of freedom of assembly and organization rights according to the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	14	19 – 14	56	%28
semi-free	12	19 – 11	79	%39.5
not free	10	10 – 4	65	%32.5

Table (17): Levels of freedom of rule of law according to the quartile measure

Level	Cut points	Scores limits	Total	Percentage
free	19	25 – 19	51	%25.5
semi-free	16	18 – 13	89	%44.5
not free	12	12 – 5	60	%30

In the tables (14-17), we note that the areas of civil freedom from the point of view of students are semi-free, except for freedom of expression and belief, and we can interpret this result in the following manner. According to K. Jaspers, absolute freedom is ultimately not that freedom becomes empty if there is nothing to oppose it), so that the human freedom according to Jaspers is not absolute freedom; it is rather freedom of struggle that one must go through a stage of conflict and contradiction until it reaches the necessary stage of existence. To Hegel, absolute freedom is purely negative in the sense of the lack of access to freedom; it cannot be anything but the existence that is maintained by the denial of freedom in the same time. Anne Braden also thinks that freedom is a constant struggle; she believed that freedom is an absolute fact, but in fact, human freedom is inseparable from self-realization and self-realization is a continuous process that requires constant movement and

continuous endeavor. We do not perceive freedom as a grant or a gift, but we also have to work to gain it. We grow by the rising movement of freedom. There are two steps to reach freedom; the first is liberation then freedom as free will, and therefore we cannot reach the stage of total absolute freedom, but we must constantly be working to liberate ourselves without being able to be away from the process of liberation, so the person who undergoes this process, must feel that he/she has been partially liberated, and this perception is the same that allows them to test the psychological state that the liberated self feels that one is no longer constrained according to the mental necessity.

1.13 Conclusion

Although the following conclusions may seem the normal case in many countries, while the following statements are to be considered for the case of Jordan as such, bearing in mind the

different problems the Arab world is facing nowadays:

There is no absolute freedom, so the citizen must strive to free oneself from potential control, working according to the need of mental or rational motives. When the citizen exercises the free act, he/she must assess the motives until one reaches the desired freedom. Jordanian citizens realized the importance of providing the greatest measure of security, freedom, tranquility and equal opportunity for every citizen. The state should not impose on its members any beliefs, but all that it should ask is to act according to the law. Governments should work on teaching the principles of freedom and respect for law and human rights. To ensure freedom, the constitution must guarantee the respect for public freedoms. The state should adopt political freedom, so that people have the right to reserve the right to amend the laws or abolish them when necessary. Reaching a state of freedom means letting the people choose, and the government officials have the right to be authorized. They can also be withdrawn from any authority, being accountable for that. To reach a state of freedom, people should be the source of all authorities. To establish freedom and democracy, the federal coalition principle must be practiced. Freedom of expression entails that thinkers must prepare themselves to bear the consequences of their opinions. Freedom of expression does not mean that one should say whatever one likes without accepting any consequences. One should rather express thoughts bearing all views and consequences.

References

1. Abdel Ghaffar, A. (1976). Introduction to Mental Health, Arab Renaissance House, Cairo.
2. Al-Arwi, A. (1976). Concept of Freedom, Arab Cultural Center, Morocco.
3. Alaswad, Sadiq (1990). Political Sociology: Foundations and Dimensions, Baghdad University, Faculty of Political Science.
4. Al-Bayati, Abdul-Jabbar Tawfiq, et al. (1977), Descriptive and Inductive Statistics in Education and Psychology.
5. Al-Hafni, A. (2003). Psychological Institution for Psychology, Madbouli Library, Cairo.
6. Al-Rubaie, S. (2006). Freedom of choice and its relationship to individuality, Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Baghdad University, Faculty of Arts.
7. Bateson, G., Jackson Don, D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. Psychologie de la communication.
8. Devarieux, A. (2013). Puissance (s) du moi: Louis Lavelle et Maine de Biran. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, 69(1), 35-56.
9. Drost, J. (2014). " Caspar David Friedrich, peintre de l'angoisse romantique"-le surréalisme et l'héritage romantique allemand.
10. Foulquié, P. (1947). L'Existentialisme: Collection «Que Sais-Je»?.
11. Fromm, Erich (1973). Escape from Freedom, translated by Mujahid Abdel Moneim, Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing, Beirut.
12. Greimas, A. J. (2000). *L'actualité du saussurisme* (pp. 371-382). Presses Universitaires de France.
13. Hattamah, Yassin, et al. (2009), Methods of descriptive statistics, Dar Safa for publication, Amman.
14. Hijazi, Mustafa (2006), The Lost Man, II, Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Morocco.
15. Massey, Gerald (1988). The Right Personality, Translated by: Muwaffaq al-Hamdani, The Higher Education Press, Baghdad.
16. Najjar et al. (1960). Dictionary of Education and Educational Psychology, Dar Al-Tarbiyyah, Beirut.
17. Nettelbeck, C. (2000). L'Edition française à New York pendant la Deuxième Guerre mondiale. *Australian Journal of French Studies*, 37(2), 224-252.
18. Nofal, M. et al. (2010), Thinking and Scientific Research, Dar Al-Masirah for Publishing, Distribution and Printing, Amman.
19. Rubaie, A. (2007). The concept of freedom among university students and its relation to parental treatment methods. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Mustansiriyah University, Faculty of Education.
20. Saleh, Q. (1988). Personality in Measurement, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Baghdad.
21. Saliba, J. (1971). The Philosophical Glossary, Lebanese Book publication, Beirut.
22. Sartre, J. P. (1975). L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme. Nagel. Translated as "Existentialism is a Humanism" in W. Kaufmann, editor, Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre.

23. Teboul, M. (2005). La réception de Kierkegaard en France 1930-1960. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 89(2), 315-336.
24. Zakaria, Ibrahim, (1972), The Problem of Freedom, Egypt Library, Cairo.



For Proof Only