



*Faculty of Education
Journal of Education*



Sohag University

**The Degree of Faculty Members' Practice of Democratic
Leadership in Saudi Universities from Their Point of
View**

Prepared by

Dr. Wasmiah S. Al-Basri

Assistant Professor, Educational Administration,
College of Education

Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University IMSIU
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

wsalbasri@imamu.edu.sa

Receipt date: 26 January 2025 - Date of acceptance: 3 February 2025

Abstract:

This research aimed to identify the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership in Saudi universities from their point of view. The research used a descriptive analytical approach and was applied to a sample of 380 faculty members from three Saudi government universities in the Riyadh region. The sample included 184 males and 196 females with different academic levels: teaching assistant, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, professor. The questionnaire was used for collecting data and consisted of five dimensions. The research found that all the dimensions that measure the degree of democratic leadership practice among faculty members appeared to be generally high from their point of view. There were no statistically significant differences in the degree of their practice based on gender or years of experience, but there are statistically significant differences based on the academic level.

Keywords: Democratic leadership, faculty members, university students, Saudi university

درجة ممارسة أعضاء هيئة التدريس للقيادة الديمقراطية في الجامعات السعودية من وجهة نظرهم

د. وسمية سليمان البصري

أستاذ الإدارة التربوية المساعد، كلية التربية

جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية

wsalbasri@imamu.edu.sa

المستخلص:

هدفت هذه الدراسة معرفة درجة ممارسة أعضاء هيئة التدريس للقيادة الديمقراطية في الجامعات السعودية من وجهة نظرهم واستخدمت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي التحليلي وتم تطبيق الدراسة على عينة قدرها ٣٨٠ عضو هيئة تدريس من ثلاث جامعات حكومية سعودية في منطقة الرياض. ١٨٤ ذكورا و١٩٦ إناثا. بمختلف الرتب الأكاديمية: معيد محاضر أستاذ مساعد أستاذ مشارك أستاذ. استعملت الاستبانة كأداة لجمع البيانات وتكونت من خمسة محاور. جاءت نتيجة الدراسة بأن جميع المحاور التي تقيس درجة ممارسة القيادة الديمقراطية لدى أعضاء هيئة التدريس ظهرت بدرجة مرتفعة بشكل عام من وجهة نظرهم. ولا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في درجة ممارستهم باختلاف متغير النوع أو سنوات الخبرة، ولكن يوجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية باختلاف متغير الرتبة الأكاديمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القيادة الديمقراطية، أعضاء هيئة التدريس، طلبة الجامعة، الجامعة

السعودية

Introduction:

Democratic education is one of the key intellectual and political issues in the contemporary world. Educational institutions have become more concerned today than ever before with working to build a democratic culture that produces values of tolerance, acceptance of difference, and acceptance of others in the face of the waves of violence and extremism that are sweeping the entire world (Al-Rumedi, 2010). Democracy has become widespread in the current century all over the world, especially after the emergence of globalization. It is noted that the spread of democracy is more prevalent in rich, advanced countries rather than in poor countries, and this results in a conditional link between progress and democracy on the one hand and backwardness and the lack of democracy on the other hand (Al-Hajjar, 2003).

If democracy is linked to all areas of life, then its link to the field of education is stronger, to the extent that democracy cannot be achieved in any society unless education is widely accessible. Educational opportunities are widely available among all its members, and the right to education is ensured for all. The educational movement plays a crucial role in shaping democracy (Marzouk, 2019). Human experience has confirmed throughout history that the democratic life of a nation depends on its educational foundation, because the existence and integration of democracy in a nation is dependent on the extent to which democratic values are rooted in people's minds and consciences. Education in all its stages and forms must contribute to the democratic development of individuals in human society, as the educational process is a key gateway to every democratic development, and this means that the cycle of democratic life cannot be completed or mature unless it is deeply embedded within the educational framework of societies (Al-Hajjar, 2003). Democratic education is crucial in universities as it establishes values and attitudes on which serve as the foundation of many principals to understand the level of students' awareness of the concept of democracy and the methods of its application in universities, which students recognize in developing their understanding of democracy and its application. in terms of awareness and understanding methods that must be implemented in universities (Al-Kalidy, 2019). If the growth of democratic thought is dependent on the development of the democratic dimensions of social life in general, then universities and educational institutes were and still are the most important links in the process of this growth, as science does not grow except through creativity, and thus the values of freedom and democracy are the crucible that forms the foundations of creativity and renewal in its stages. Universities and

institutes can only fulfill their historical role in a democratic atmosphere (Al-Feel, 2008). University represents the pinnacle of the educational pyramid, not just because it is the last stage of the educational system, but because it fulfills a crucial role in shaping young people's intellect, values, actions, and sense of belonging. University graduates are the leaders of society in various scientific, economic, political, administrative and cultural fields, through which society continues its progress, stability or decline. In the university, the seeds of democracy are planted (Al-Azmi and Al-Otaibi, 2013). Democracy is one of the issues with multiple political, social and economic dimensions that express the individual's awareness and direct their behavior towards contributing to construction in an effective manner. Universities have a broad influence on people's lives and play an important role in providing students with the concepts and principles that guide their behavior in life. Therefore, universities receive the attention of various segments of society and successive governments, and the principles of democracy focus on justice, equality and freedom of expression (Al-Sharafat, 2019). Democracy constitutes a major aspect in terms of ensuring the creation of educated and cultured citizens who are able to participate in dialogue, the decision-making process, and protect the rights of individuals in terms of ensuring life, freedom, happiness and goodness for individuals. The goal and purpose of learning democracy in educational institutions is the continuous ability to grow in all aspects of life to develop responsible and engaged citizens (Hussein et al., 2018). Educational practices in their various manifestations in any educational institution are its cornerstone, and the university as an educational institution constitutes a system that performs various functions. Therefore, democratic practices within universities in their various forms work to develop intelligence among their students and enhance in them the values of achievement and striving for self-realization (Hazaemh et al., 2022). School and university have an important role in consolidating democratic practices in society in word and deed. Authoritarian education produces only passive and repressed individuals, because the learners adopt many behaviors and practices from their teachers which may lead them to adopt authoritarian behavior in the future. In addition, lenient education produces individuals who are unable to bear responsibility in the future (Beni Irshaid & Bani Nasur, 2012). The educational institution is a social institution that raises individuals to practice democracy, and prepares generations with their own experiences and expertise, who believe in democracy as a way of life, and are able to exercise their right to freedom in the larger society. This does not happen

unless the university is an environment characterized by the true practice of democracy on the part of all its employees (Al-Hajjar, 2003).

Important of the research:

This research is of great importance to understand the extent to which democratic leadership is practiced in Saudi universities by faculty members when dealing with students, and to highlight the impact of this practice on the quality of education and the effectiveness of academic relations.

Theoretically, the research contributes to providing additional knowledge about the application of democratic leadership in the Saudi academic context, especially with regard to the relationship between faculty members and students.

In practical terms, the research helps to enhance academic partnership by providing recommendations for the effective application of democratic leadership. In addition, the practice of democratic leadership may enhance student satisfaction and their sense of interest and participation, which is positively reflected in their academic performance. It contributes to supporting an educational environment that stimulates creativity, participation, and communication between students and faculty members.

Finally: The research helps to achieve the goals of Vision 2030, which focuses on developing education and improving the quality of its outputs by enhancing the concepts of transparency and participation.

Research problem:

Considering the major transformations witnessed by Saudi universities to achieve academic excellence and improve the quality of education, the importance of democratic leadership emerges as one of the leadership styles that focuses on participation, transparency, and mutual respect between faculty members and students. However, many observations indicate that the degree to which faculty members practice democratic leadership in their dealings with students may be insufficient, which influences the academic relationship between the two parties.

The teacher is responsible for preparing and raising future generations who can participate effectively in developing, modernizing and successfully leading their societies. This is achieved through the leadership role of the conscious teacher, who has been prepared in a democratic spirit, believes in these values and embodies them in his behavior, words and deed (Al-Ahmad & Zidane, 2006). This problem highlights the need for in-depth research to understand the reality of the

practice of democratic leadership, and to identify the methods that can be developed to enhance positive interaction between faculty members and students. Most studies that have examined this topic have addressed the students' point of view, but few studies have addressed the faculty members' point of view.

Research questions:

- 1- What is the degree to which faculty members practice democratic leadership from their point of view?
- 2- Are there statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership from their point of view according to the variables (gender, academic level, years of experience)?

Research Objectives:

- To determine the extent to which faculty members practice democratic leadership from their own perspective.
- To identify whether there are significant differences among the sample participants due to variables such as gender, academic level, or years of experience.
- To determine which democratic dimension is most prevalent among the five dimensions:
 1. Enhancing participation and expression of opinion
 2. Consultation and participation in decision-making
 3. Promoting mutual respect and cooperation
 4. Encouraging critical thinking and self-responsibility
 5. Transparency and fairness in evaluation research questions

Research limitations:

- The research data was collected in the second semester of 1446 AH - 2024 on a sample of faculty members from three government universities in the Riyadh region of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, males and females.
- The research was limited to faculty members in three government universities in the Riyadh region, numbering 12,880, and the sample consisted of 380 participants.

Literature review:

The concept of democracy:

The definition of democracy can be said to be a system of human values based on the principle of freedom, communication, rights, and acceptance in an effort to achieve the human self with all its ambitions of existence, presence, innovation, and creativity (Al-Rumedi, 2010). Democracy as a contemporary concept represents a comprehensive and integrated system of life based in its content on freedom, equality, and social justice, and is embodied by most of the world's peoples, and its societies aspire to it (Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi, 2013). Democratic practices can be defined as a system of social, emotional, and scientific ties that arise between teachers and learners through the various aspects of university life (Al-Hajjar, 2003).

Since educational practices are a social process that also addresses the individual and shapes his personality to adapt to his society, as a productive citizen, and these educational practices that adopt democracy as an approach to living, building, and changing. They become a tool for society to spread the principles of democracy in thought and behavior through the educational process (Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi, 2014). The concept of democracy is a complex concept that organizes an entity of practices, relationships and free principles that can root in humans the values of justice, freedom of thought, values of criticism, dialogue, respect for others, and acceptance of the principle of equality. This also includes values that affirm the reality of human growth and development, the principle of feeling dignity and freedom, participation, self-development, and creativity (Al-Rumedi, 2010).

Democratic practices in education leadership:

The educational organization contributes to achieving social cohesion by reconciling the perceptions of individuals, by establishing the basic concepts of accepting others and respecting their existence, and taking them out of the narrow frameworks related to culture, region or sect, especially for some countries characterized by cultural and linguistic diversity (Louglaithi & Hasni, 2023).

The responsibility lies with the teacher to prepare and raise future generations who participate and contribute to the development, modernization, progress and successful leadership of their societies through the leadership role of the conscious and democratically prepared teacher who at the same time believes in democracy in word and deed (Al-Ahmad & Zidane, 2006). Strengthening the values and principles of democracy can only be achieved through education, as education is the

basis for building a democratic society, and at the forefront of that is the university professor, as he is the active element in the process of building, strengthening and spreading those values and principles, as the university professor plays an active and influential role in the educational process (Zubaidi, 2022). If democracy is to become a way of life in Arab societies, there is an urgent need for teachers committed to achieving education with a democratic character. This is particularly important because of the increasing diversity in government institutions, where teachers must make decisions about the best methods to meet the needs of all students (Al-Musawi, 2008). Educational institutions are a place where students are prepared to practice democratic lifestyles. The free, aware teacher who believes in the values of democracy can achieve what he believes in by diversifying his relationships with his students, satisfying their educational needs, and developing their innovative abilities and creative thinking. He can also create a social atmosphere saturated with the spirit of love, brotherhood and equality through which he can remove psychological and social obstacles among students and create social responsiveness among them (Al-Ahmad and Zidane, 2006). Democratic educational behavior is determined by the climate of freedom, justice and equality that prevails in educational institutions and educational situations that, when they achieve the principles and values of democracy in education, can be called democratic educational institutions and situations (Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi, 2013). Democracy is based on several foundations, namely freedom, participation, equality and justice, transparency and accountability, human rights, pluralism, acceptance of others and tolerance. As for democratic education for the student, its importance stems from the educational process through developing the student's personality and giving him the ability to express an opinion, discuss, make decisions, solve problems, participate with others, respect the opinions and rights of others, put the public interest above personal whims, leadership, preparing the opportunity for him, and developing to the maximum extent his personal readiness and abilities (Hussein et al., 2018).

The educational environment within universities is primarily responsible for building and consolidating the values and concepts of democracy. This is evident in the teaching style, as the professor is keen to ensure that a social atmosphere and mutual respect prevail, works to raise the morale of students, seeks accuracy and objectivity, and clarifies the controls of balanced mental openness to other cultures. He criticizes students' performance in a constructive manner. He is interested in students' participation in solving educational problems and guiding them.

He motivates students to innovate and draw inspiration from good ideas (Mahgoub, 2014). Democracy and educational practices lie in the free atmosphere of the educational process with its values and standards. Therefore, free interaction relationships form the educational and social basis that achieves opportunities for growth, prosperity and integration (Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi, 2014). Enhancing the democratic culture among students is done by establishing the principles of freedom and equality, as well as developing self-esteem and introducing them to the principles of human rights, developing democratic trends such as respecting the law and respecting the value and dignity of the human being, encouraging positive interaction with societal changes, training students to bear the consequences of their actions, establishing the concept of transparency among students in dealing with members of society, encouraging opening the door to dialogue between teachers and students, developing respect for the law among students, and urging students to respect the freedoms of others (Al-Salim & Abu Ali 2024). The relationship between education and democracy is a dialectical and close relationship, as it is impossible to talk about education and upbringing in the absence of private and public freedoms and the lack of true democracy based on equality and equal opportunities and also built on social justice and belief in difference and the legitimacy of pluralism (Al-Kalidy, 2019). The purpose of educational democracy is to provide opportunities for qualified individuals to achieve equality and justice in obtaining knowledge and science at various levels, and the participation of both faculty members and students in decision-making and the variables required by the educational process to keep pace with the global scientific development and progress (Al-Moumani and Al-Sharman, 2020). The university professor seeks justice and equality, as he respects all students without discrimination, provides his expertise and guidance to all of them objectively, treats students fairly regardless of their regional locations or intellectual beliefs, and takes into account individual differences among students. In the field of freedom of expression, he contributes to instilling democratic practices by discussing with students, listening to multiple opinions, giving students opportunities to express their opinions freely and frankly, taking into account students' suggestions, accepting objective criticism from them, and welcoming their discussions and responding to their questions (Mahgoub, 2014). Democratic practices include encouraging students to express their opinions independently, ensuring that disputes are managed in the right way among students, emphasizing the rejection of religious, sectarian and tribal fanaticism, raising community problems for discussion among students, working to establish a culture of tolerance among them,

promoting the principles of justice between males and females, educating students to reject negativity and dependency, and developing a sense of responsibility towards community problems (Al-Salim & Abu Ali 2024). Democratic practices carried out by faculty members have a major role and a clear impact in developing leadership personality among students. This is achieved through democratic teaching behavior, including ensuring justice and equality among students, avoiding discrimination between them, taking into account their circumstances, giving them the opportunity to express their opinions, encouraging them to participate, and providing advice and guidance (Hazaemh et al., 2022). Democratic practices in the educational process include motivating students, listening to their opinions, being fair and unbiased, respecting the personality of their students, and enhancing their self-confidence. He deals with them honestly, objectively and affectionately, away from any threat. This encourages students to cooperate and takes into account the ideas presented by students about the curriculum (Beni Irshaid & Bani Nasur, 2012). In order to achieve this goal, teachers must be armed with the knowledge and skills necessary to develop democratic teaching methods that give students the opportunity to express their opinions freely, without fear of possible consequences. Democratic practice in university education is based on open and free dialogue that develops social responsibility (Al-Musawi, 2008). Democracy is based on several principles, including respect for the individual's personality, providing appropriate conditions for him to achieve his maximum potential, allowing him to exercise disciplined freedom and cooperate with others, and enhancing respect for work, the use of scientific thinking, social justice, equality, and respect for the law (Zubaidi, 2022). The professor promotes democratic values such as developing their leadership spirit, establishing the concept of independence, and liberating their thoughts from rigidity and violence, striving to teach students the concept of freedom, educating students about the role of social justice in achieving societal stability, strengthening the principle of Shura in decision-making, encouraging constructive criticism of negatives, training students to seriously participate in society, and paying attention to students' needs when making decisions (Al-Salim & Abu Ali 2024). The university professor develops democratic values among students, which are based on the principles of freedom, justice, and equality, and instills them in students. He bears responsibility and believes in the values of dialogue, and is flexible and conveys them to his students (Zubaidi, 2022). To raise democratic awareness among students, the professor engages in democratic practices within lectures. These practices include his keenness

to form and support good relationships between him and his students based on affection, mutual respect, consideration of individual differences between them, promotion of participation, interaction, and free expression of opinion, achieving equal opportunities, tolerance, and acceptance of others, establishing justice and equality among students, and providing opportunities for their positive participation in university life (Qandeel, 2020). Among the areas of democratic practice in university education are equal educational opportunities, academic freedom, and university academic and administrative practices towards students (Al-Hajjar, 2003). The faculty member contributes to achieving democratic awareness and practice among his students by welcoming students' discussions, responding to their questions, and respecting their opinions even if they differ from him. Thus, seeking justice and equality without bias or discrimination. Promoting dialogue, teamwork, and a critical approach, taking into account individual differences, and giving freedom in choosing activities (Al-Ahmad and Zidane, 2006) and (Al-Rwaili, 2016). Democratic education is promoting positive participation in activities, developing critical thinking, bearing responsibility, respecting laws, and the ability to make decisions (Al-Hubaydah, 2019). Also emphasizing also the principle of democracy, which does not only mean achieving equality in educational opportunities, but goes beyond that, to emphasize the great importance of democratic values in behavior within the educational institution. Accustoming students to freedom of expression and opinion, objective criticism, and dealing with each other on a human basis based on the spirit of tolerance, justice, and equality, is training them on the importance of practicing these values in public social life. Practicing democratic values is based on the values of justice, equality, freedom of expression, human tolerance, participation, and human cooperation, which teachers demonstrate during classroom interaction (Loughlaithi & Hasni, 2023). Therefore, practices in educational institutions are a tool for democracy in deepening understanding and application. The person who practices democracy is the free person worthy of survival, the tolerant person for the world of good, who controls himself, is aware of what he does, and is conscious of his goals, who seeks to develop himself and his society. Then knowledge bears fruit and educational systems bear fruit (Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi, 2014).

Previous studies on democratic practices of university faculty members:

Many studies have been conducted on democratic practices of university faculty members in several countries, including a study applied to a Kuwaiti university. A study conducted by Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi

(2013) talked about the reality of faculty members' practice of democracy from the students' point of view. The result was that their practice of democracy was acceptable and positive in the field of justice, equality and democratic values, while it was lower in the field of freedom of opinion and expression, decision-making and participation. In another study in Kuwait by the same researchers, Al-Azmi & Al-Otaibi (2014) on the degree of practice of democracy, among faculty members with students from the point of view of the members themselves, the results showed that their practice of democracy was high in the field of freedom of opinion and expression, and high and medium in the field of democratic values. The result in the field of participation and decision-making was at varying degrees between high, medium and low, and in the field of justice and equality it was medium and low. In a study in Egypt (Mahgoub, 2014), on university students' perceptions of faculty members' democratic practices, the result was that their practice of democracy was at an average level in the field of justice, equality, and freedom of expression. In another study in Egypt (Qandeel, 2020) on the role of the university faculty members, promoting democratic practice among students, from the point of view of students and members, the results were high from the point of view of faculty members and students regarding democratic practices in the field of achieving equality among students. A study in Jordan was conducted on the degree to which faculty members applied democratic methods to their students, from the point of view of their students. The results showed that the faculty members' application of democratic methods was high (Al-Kalidy). In another study in Jordan on the degree to which faculty members practiced democratic principles from the point of view of students (Al-Sharafat, 2019), the result was that their practice of democratic principles was at an average level in the field of justice and equality and at a low level in the field of freedom, and in general it was closer to a low level. Also, in a study in Jordan (Hazaemh et al., 2022), on the degree to which faculty members practice democratic principles at the university from the students' point of view, the result was average. In a study in Palestine (Al-Hajjar, 2003) on the reality of democratic practices for education at the university from the students' point of view, the result was that the level of democratic practice was average. Lastly, in a study on the level of democratic educational practices among faculty members at a Saudi university in 2016 from the students' point of view, the result was that their democratic practices were at an average level.

Methodological procedures of the research:

Research method:

The descriptive (survey) method was followed; as it represents the most appropriate scientific method for the nature of the research, and Al-Assaf (2012) defined it as: "That type of research that is carried out by questioning all members of the research community or a large sample of them, with the aim of describing the phenomenon being studied in terms of its nature and degree of existence only, without going beyond that to studying the relationship or inferring the causes, for example" (p. 11).

Research population:

Obeidat and others (2007) indicate that the study community is "all individuals, persons or things that are the subject of the research problem" (p. 99). Melhim (2002) defined it as "all the components of the phenomenon that the researcher is studying." (p. 247). The current research population consists of all faculty members at three government universities in Riyadh region, Saudi Arabia, numbering (12880) with different academic degrees.

Research sample:

The research sample was selected based on the American Association's method to determine the research sample size according to the following equation (Al-Sayyad, 1989, 137):

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

S = sample size

N = research population size

P = population ratio, and Krejcie and Morgan (1970) suggested that it be equal to (0.5) because that would give the largest possible sample size.

D = degree of accuracy as reflected by the permissible error, and Kirjesi and Morgan suggested that it be equal to (0.05).

X = value of choosing the chi-square at one degree of freedom and confidence level (0.095), which is equal to (3.841).

Accordingly, the current research sample is (374), and the researcher sent the electronic questionnaire using the random method from the total research community until she obtained a number of (380) electronic responses. The following are the characteristics of the research sample according to their functional variables.

Table No. (1)

Distribution of research participants according to the gender variable

Gender	Repetition	Ratio
Male	184	48,4
Female	196	51,6

Total	380	100%
-------	-----	------

It is clear from the previous table that (196) of the research participants represent (51.6%) of the females, which is the largest category in the research participants, while (184) of the research participants represent (48.4%) of the males, which is the smallest category in the research sample.

Table No. (2)

Distribution of research participants according to the variable of academic level

Academic level	Repetition	Ratio
Professor	35	9.2
Associate professor	69	18.2
Assistant professor	136	35.8
Lecture	103	27.1
Teaching assistant	37	9.7
Total	380	100%

It is clear from the previous table that (136) of the research participants represent (35.8%) of the assistant professors, which is the largest category in the research participants, while (35) of the research participants represent (9.2%) of the professors, which is the smallest category in the research sample.

Table No. (3)

Distribution of participants research according to the variable of years of experience

Years of experience	Repetition	Ratio
Less than 5 years	72	18.9
5 to less than 10 years	87	22.9
From 10 years and more	221	58.2
Total	380	100%

The previous table shows that (221) of the research participants represent (58.2%), with experience of 10 years or more, and they are the largest group in the research participants, while (72) of the research participants represent (18.9%) with experience of less than 5 years, and they are the smallest group in the research sample.

Research tool:

The research tool or data collection tool means "the means by which the data collection process is carried out with the aim of testing the study hypotheses, or answering its questions" (Al-Qahtani, Al-Amri, Al-Mazhab, and Al-Omar, 2004: p. 287).

The researcher used the questionnaire as a tool to collect the data necessary for the research, which is defined as "a means of collecting data

from a group of individuals by answering a set of written questions about a specific topic without the researcher's assistance or presence while they are answering them" (Al-Qahtani, Al-Amri, Al-Mazhab, and Al-Omar, 2004: 288).

Steps to build the research tool:

After reviewing previous studies and what they contained in terms of theoretical framework and data, the questionnaire was prepared in its initial form as a tool to collect the necessary data for the research. The researcher relied on the closed form (Closed Questionnaire) in preparing it, which determines the possible responses to each statement. When formulating the questionnaire statements, the following was taken into account:

1. Clarity of the statement and its belonging to the dimension.
2. The statement should not include more than one idea or meaning.
3. Avoiding words that have more than one meaning.
4. Clarity of the words of the statements and their avoidance of ambiguity.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts as follows:

Part One: It includes the demographic data of the research participants, namely the variables of gender, education level and years of experience.

Part Two: Consists of (25) statements that measure the research variables, and are divided into five dimensions as follows:

Dimension One: Enhancing participation and expressing opinions and includes (5) statements.

Dimension Two: Consultation and participation in decision-making and includes (5) statements.

Dimension Three: Enhancing mutual respect and cooperation and includes (5) statements.

Dimension Four: Stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility and includes (5) statements.

Dimension Five: Transparency and fairness in evaluation and includes (5) statements.

The questionnaire statements were formulated according to a five-point scale as follows: (Strongly agree / Agree / Moderate / Disagree / Strongly disagree).

Validity and Reliability:

Validity of the tool:

The researcher verified the validity of the research tool in two ways:

First: The apparent validity of the tool:

After preparing the questionnaire in its initial form, it was presented to a group of arbitrators within the universities of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to express their opinions on the clarity of the phrases, their belonging to the dimension, and the correctness of their formulation. The number of arbitrators was (5) from Saudi university professors; The questionnaire was modified based on their comments, then the questionnaire was put in its final form and became valid for measuring what it was designed for.

Second: Validity of internal consistency:

The researcher calculated the internal consistency of the paragraphs of the research tool by calculating Pearson correlation coefficients between each paragraph and the dimension to which the paragraph belongs, as well as the correlation coefficient between each paragraph and the questionnaire as a whole, which is shown in the following tables:

Table No. (4)

Correlation coefficients of the items of the research dimension with the dimension to which it belongs and with the questionnaire as a whole

N	Items	Dimension correlation coefficient	Correlation coefficient with clarity
The first dimension: enhancing participation and expression of opinions			
1	I encourage students to express their opinions freely without fear of evaluation or criticism	0.847**	0.747**
2	I accept the students' point of view even if it contradicts my point of view and I support the diversity of points of view	0.791**	0.627**
3	Students had the opportunity to express their criticism constructively	0.873**	0.761**
4	I respond positively to students' opinions and suggestions and discuss them with them	0.803**	0.607**
5	Make sure students feel confident in giving their opinions during lectures	0.875**	0.703**
Second Theme: Consultation and Participation in Decision Making			
1	I engage students in making class decisions related to study activities	0.776**	0.568**
2	Make sure to involve students in evaluating the educational methods used	0.833**	0.637**
3	Engage students in prioritizing topics to be covered in the course	0.665**	0.356**
4	I provide students with opportunities to choose research projects or assignments that align with their academic interests	0.561**	0.377**
5	Students were given the freedom to choose work groups and how to distribute work among them.	0.378**	0.363**
Third Theme: Promoting mutual respect and cooperation			
1	I am keen to create a learning environment that encourages students to collaborate and work together	0.734**	0.624**
2	I promote mutual respect between me and students by listening to their opinions and appreciating their contributions.	0.733**	0.627**
3	I set clear classroom rules that promote respect and positive interaction among all students	0.850**	0.665**

4	I provide a role model in treating all students with respect, regardless of their background or opinions	0.776**	0.651**
5	I manage group activities in a way that encourages students to support each other academically and personally	0.771**	0.580**
Fourth Theme: Stimulating Critical Thinking and Self-Responsibility			
1	I encourage students to think critically, ask critical questions and challenge ideas	0.830**	0.725**
2	Students were able to ask the right questions and search for answers based on logical evidence	0.765**	0.609**
3	I motivate students to be more responsible in making their own decisions	0.855**	0.740**
4	I encourage students to actively participate in class discussions	0.804**	0.683**
5	I work to enhance students' analyzing, interpretation and evaluation skills from different angles	0.882**	0.730**
Fifth Theme: Transparency and Fairness in Evaluation			
1	I ensure that academic assessments are fair and based on clear criteria	0.742**	0.394**
2	I work to promote transparency in how students evaluate performance	0.869**	0.576**
3	I consider that the assessment should take into account students' efforts in learning	0.765**	0.564**
4	I ensure that the evaluation is based on objective and consistent foundations	0.864**	0.521**
5	I work to ensure that students feel fair in the evaluation process	0.850**	0.558**

**Significant statements at level 0.01 or less.

From the previous table, it is clear that all statements are significant at level (0.01), and some of them are significant at level (0.05), which shows that all paragraphs that make up the questionnaire enjoy a high degree of validity, making them suitable for field application.

Questionnaire reliability:

Table (5)

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the research dimensions

Research dimensions	Number of items	Cronbach' alpha reliability coefficient
First dimension	5	0.893
Second dimension	5	0.762
Third dimension	5	0.830
Fourth dimension	5	0.887
Fifth dimension	5	0.876
Overall reliability coefficient	25	0.920

From the results shown above, it is clear that the stability of all research dimensions is high; as the stability coefficients ranged between (0.762) and (0.893), and the total stability coefficient for all research dimensions reached (0.920), which are all high stability values that demonstrate the validity of the research tool for field application.

Interpretation of the results:

To facilitate the interpretation of the results, the researcher used the following method to determine the level of response to the tool items; where weight was given to the alternatives shown in the following table to be processed statistically as follows:

Table No. (6):
research tool correction:

Response	Strongly agree	agree	Moderate	disagree	Strongly disagree
Degree	5	4	3	2	1

Then, these answers were classified into five levels of equal range using the following equation:

Category length = (highest value - lowest value) ÷ number of tool alternatives = (5-1) ÷ 5 = 0.80

To obtain the following classification:

Table (7):

Distribution of categories according to the gradation used in the research tool

Description	Range of average
Strongly agree	4.21-5.00
agree	3.41- less than 4.21
Moderate	2.61- less than 3.41
Disagree	1.81- less than 2.61
Strongly disagree	1.00- less than 1.81

Data analysis methods:

The researcher used the following statistical methods to identify the characteristics of the research participants, calculated the validity and reliability of the tools, and answered the research questions:

- 1- Frequency and percentages, to identify the characteristics of the research sample.
- 2- Arithmetic mean (Mean) to know the extent of the increase or decrease in the opinions of the research participants about each statement of the research variables along with the main dimensions, as well as to arrange the statements in terms of the degree of response according to the highest arithmetic mean.
- 3- Standard deviation (SD) to identify the extent of deviation of the opinions of the research participants for each statement of the research variables and for each of the main dimensions from its arithmetic mean, as the standard deviation shows the dispersion in the opinions of the research participants for each statement of the research variables along with the main dimensions, the closer its value is to zero, the more concentrated the opinions are and the less dispersion between the scale, as well as to arrange the statements according to the arithmetic mean in favor of the least dispersion when the arithmetic mean is equal.
- 4- Cronbach Alpha coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) to extract the stability of the research tools.
- 5- Calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient values to calculate the internal consistency validity of the research tool.
- 6- The Independent Sample T-Test was used to determine the statistically significant differences in the responses of the research participants according to their variables, which are divided into two categories.
- 7- One Way ANOVA was used to clarify the significance of the differences in the responses of the research participants towards its

dimensions according to their functional variables, which are divided into more than two categories.

- 8- The Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was used to determine the validity of the differences in the responses of the research participants according to their personal and functional variables, which are divided into more than two categories, in the event that differences were found through the One Way ANOVA test.

Discussion of the results:

The first question: What is the degree to which faculty members practice democratic leadership from their point of view?

To identify the degree to which faculty members practice democratic leadership from their point of view, the researcher calculated the arithmetic means and standard deviations for the phrases of the dimensions of the degree to which faculty members practice democratic leadership from their point of view, and the results came as shown in the following tables:

First dimension: Enhancing participation and expressing opinion

Table No. (8):

Responses of research participants to the phrases of the dimension of enhancing participation and expressing opinion, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Item	Average calculation	SD	Degree of approval	Rank
1	I encourage students to express their opinions freely without fear of evaluation or criticism	4.46	0.745	Strongly agree	1
5	Make sure students feel confident in giving their opinions during lectures	4.45	0.666	Strongly agree	2
4	I respond positively to students' opinions and suggestions and discuss them with them	4.36	0.736	Strongly agree	3
2	I accept the students' point of view even if it contradicts my point of view and I support the diversity of points of view	4.34	0.644	Strongly agree	4
3	Students had the opportunity to express their criticism constructively	4.31	0.702	Strongly agree	5
General average		4.38	0.586	Strongly agree	

*Arithmetic mean of. (500)

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of enhancing participation and expressing opinion as one of the practices of democratic leadership came at a very high degree from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (4.38 out of 5.00), which is the mean that falls in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the choice of the research participants' agreement on the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of enhancing participation and expressing opinion as one of the practices of democratic leadership indicates (strongly agree) in the research tool. The research also indicated that the averages of the research participants' responses to the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of enhancing participation and expressing opinion as one of the practices of democratic leadership ranged between (4.31 to 4.46), which are averages that fall in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which indicate (strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that statement No. (1), which is (I encourage students to express their opinions freely without fear of

evaluation or criticism), came in first place, with an average agreement of (4.46 out of 5.00). Statement No. (5), which is (I make sure that students feel confident in expressing their opinions during lectures), came in second place with an average approval of (4.45 out of 5.00). While statement No. (4), which is (I respond positively to students' opinions and suggestions and discuss them with them), came in third place with an average approval of (4.36 out of 5.00).

The second dimension: Consultation and participation in decision-making

Table No. (9):

Responses of research participants to the statements of the dimension of enhancing consultation and participation in decision-making, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Item	Average calculation	SD	Degree of approval	Rank
5	Students were given the freedom to choose working groups and how to distribute work among them.	4.21	0.752	Strongly agree	1
1	I engage students in making class decisions related to study activities	3.96	0.892	Agree	2
4	I provide students with opportunities to choose research projects or assignments that align with their academic interests	3.84	0.858	Agree	3
2	Make sure to involve students in evaluating the educational methods used	3.69	1.000	Agree	4
3	Engage students in prioritizing topics to be covered in the course	2.78	1.064	Moderate	5
General average		3.70	0.600	Agree	

*Arithmetic mean of (5.00).

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of consultation and participation in decision-making as one of the practices of democratic leadership came at a very high degree from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (3.70 out of 5.00), which is the mean that falls in the fourth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the choice of the research participants' agreement on the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of consultation and participation in decision-making as one of the practices of democratic leadership indicates (agree) in the research tool. The research also indicated that the averages of the research participants' responses to the statements of the dimension of the degree of

faculty members' practice of consultation and participation in decision-making as one of the practices of democratic leadership ranged between (2.78 to 4.21), which are averages that fall in the third, fourth and fifth categories of the five-point scale categories, which indicate (Moderate/agree/strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that statement No. (5), which is (I give students the freedom to choose work groups and how to distribute work among them) came in first place, with an average agreement of (4.21 out of 5.00). Statement No. (1), which is (I work to involve students in making class decisions related to academic activities), came in second place with an average agreement of (3.96 out of 5.00). While statement No. (4), which is (I provide students with opportunities to choose projects or research tasks that match their academic interests), came in third place with an average agreement of (3.84 out of 5.00).

The third dimension: Enhancing mutual respect and cooperation

Table No. (10):

Responses of research participants to the statements of the dimension of enhancing mutual respect and cooperation, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Item	Mean	SD	Degree of approval	Rank
2	I promote mutual respect between me and students by listening to their opinions and appreciating their contributions.	4.56	0.571	Strongly agree	1
3	I set clear classroom rules that promote respect and positive interaction among all students	4.49	0.610	Strongly agree	2
4	I provide a role model in treating all students with respect, regardless of their background or opinions	4.44	0.688	Strongly agree	3
1	I am keen to create a learning environment that encourages students to collaborate and work together	4.42	0.601	Strongly agree	4
5	I manage group activities in a way that encourages students to support each other academically and personally	4.34	0.679	Strongly agree	5
General average		4.45	0.487	Strongly agree	

*Arithmetic mean of. (5.00)

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of promoting mutual respect and cooperation as one of the practices of democratic leadership came at a very high degree from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (4.45 out of 5.00), which is the mean that falls in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the choice of the research participants' agreement on the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of promoting mutual respect and cooperation as one of the practices of democratic leadership indicates (strongly agree) in the research tool.

The research also indicated that the averages of the research participants' responses to the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of promoting mutual respect and cooperation as one of the practices of democratic leadership ranged between (4.34 to 4.56), which are averages that fall in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which indicate (strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that statement No. (2), which is (I work to promote mutual respect between me and the students by listening to their opinions and appreciating their contributions), came in first place, with an average agreement of (4.56 out of 5.00).

Statement No. (3), which is (I set clear classroom rules that promote respect and positive interaction among all students), came in second place with an average agreement of (4.49 out of 5.00). While statement No. (4), which is (I provide a role model in dealing respectfully with all students, regardless of their backgrounds or opinions), came in third place with an average agreement of (4.44 out of 5.00).

Fourth dimensions: Stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility

Table No. (11):

Responses of research participants to the statements of the dimension of stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Item	Arith metic mean *	SD	Degree of approv al	Ra nk
1	I encourage students to actively participate in class discussions	4.45	0.670	Strongl y agree	4
2	I motivate students to be more responsible in making their own decisions.	4.41	0.726	Strongl y agree	3
3	I work to enhance students' analyzing, interpretation and evaluation skills from different angles	4.34	0.736	Strongl y agree	5
4	I encourage students to think critically, ask critical questions and challenge ideas	4.24	0.659	Strongl y agree	1
5	Students were able to ask the right questions and search for answers based on logical evidence	4.21	0.725	Strongl y agree	2
General average		4.33	٠,٥٨٢	Strongly agree	

*Arithmetic mean of. (5.00)

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility as one of the practices of democratic leadership came at a very high degree from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (4.33 out of 5.00), which is the mean that falls in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the choice of the research participants' agreement on the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility as one of the practices of democratic leadership indicates (strongly agree) in the research tool.

The research also indicated that the averages of the research participants' responses to the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility as one of the practices of democratic leadership ranged between (4.21 to 4.45), which are averages that fall in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which indicate (strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that statement No. (4), which is (I am keen to encourage students to participate effectively in class discussions), came

in first place, with an average agreement of (4.45 out of 5.00). Statement No. (3), which is (I work to motivate students to be more responsible in making their own decisions), came in second place with an average approval of (4.41 out of 5.00). While statement No. (5), which is (I work to enhance students' skills of analysis, interpretation and evaluation from different angles) came in third place with an average approval of (4.34 out of 5.00).

Fifth dimension: Transparency and fairness in evaluation

Table No. (12):

Responses of research participants to the statements of the dimension of transparency and fairness in evaluation, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Item	Arith metic mean *	SD	Degree of approv al	Ra nk
1	I work to ensure that students feel fair in the evaluation process	4.70	0.599	Strongl y agree	5
2	I ensure that academic assessments are fair and based on clear criteria	4.65	0.550	Strongl y agree	1
3	I ensure that the evaluation is based on objective and consistent foundations	4.59	0.603	Strongl y agree	4
4	I work to promote transparency in how students evaluate performance	4.58	0.630	Strongl y agree	2
5	I consider that the assessment should take into account students' efforts in learning	4.51	0.656	Strongl y agree	3
General average		4.61	0,497	Strongly agree	

*Arithmetic mean of (5.00)

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of transparency and justice in evaluation as one of the practices of democratic leadership came at a very high degree from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (4.61 out of 5.00), which is the mean that falls in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the choice of the research participants' agreement on the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of transparency and justice in evaluation as one of the practices of democratic leadership indicates (strongly agree) in the research tool. The research also indicated that the averages of the research participants' responses to the statements of the dimension of the degree of faculty members' practice of transparency and justice in evaluation as one

of the practices of democratic leadership ranged between (4.51 to 4.70), which are averages that fall in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which indicate (strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that statement No. (5), which is (I work to make students feel justice in the evaluation process), came in first place, with an average agreement of (4.70 out of 5.00). Statement No. (1), which is (I am keen that academic evaluations are fair and based on clear standards), came in second place with an average approval of (4.65 out of 5.00). While statement No. (2), which is (I am keen to involve students in evaluating the educational methods used), came in third place with an average approval of (3.69 out of 5.00).

The researcher also arranged all dimensions of the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership from their point of view, and the results came as shown in the following table:

Table No. (13):

Responses of research participants to all dimensions of the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership from their point of view, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic mean

N	Dimension	Arith metic mean *	SD	Degree of approva l	Ra nk
1	Promote participation and expression	4.38	0.586	Strongl y agree	3
2	Consultation and participation in decision-making	3.70	0.600	Agree	5
3	Promote mutual respect and cooperation	4.45	0.478	Strongl y agree	2
4	Stimulate critical thinking and self-responsibility	4.33	0.582	Strongl y agree	4
5	Transparency and fairness in evaluation	4.61	0.497	Strongl y agree	1
General average		4.29	0.422	Strongly agree	

*Arithmetic mean of. (5.00)

It is clear from the previous table that the degree of faculty members' practice of all dimensions of democratic leadership came in a very high degree in general from their point of view, with a general arithmetic mean of (4.29 out of 5.00), which is the average that falls in the fifth category of the five-point scale categories, which shows that the option of the research participants' agreement on the degree of faculty

members' practice of all dimensions of democratic leadership indicates (strongly agree) in the research tool. It also showed that the degree of practicing transparency and justice in evaluation came in first place, with an average approval of (4.61 out of 5.00), and a very high degree of practice. The degree of practicing promoting mutual respect and cooperation came in second place with an average approval of (4.45 out of 5.00), and a very high degree of practice. While the degree of practicing promoting participation and expressing opinions came in third place with an average approval of (4.38 out of 5.00), and a very high degree of practice. The fourth place went to the degree of practicing stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility with an arithmetic mean of (4.33 out of 5.00), and a very high degree of practice. While the degree of practicing consultation and participation in decision-making came in fifth and last place, with an arithmetic mean of (3.70 out of 5.00), and a high degree of practice.

It is clear from the above that the research participants from the faculty members practice democratic leadership to a very high degree in general at all its levels, which clarifies the importance of these practices and their positive role in enhancing the concepts of cooperation, participation and the prevalence of team spirit in the work environment, and enhances the values of creativity and innovation in the work environment.

Democratic leadership also contributes to the university members expressing their ideas with great freedom, which helps team members to reach creative solutions and innovations that can benefit the university work environment in general and enrich it with more innovations and creative solutions to the problems that may face the work environment. Working together to discuss issues and solve problems clearly enhances transparency in the university work environment, and democratic leadership encourages everyone to meet and participate on an equal footing. This focus on cooperation and partnership builds a strong team that cooperates effectively in the decisions that are made.

This result is consistent with what Al-Kalidy (2019) stated, which stated that democratic education is important in universities because of its importance in consolidating values and trends on which many meanings are based to understand the level of awareness of the concept of democracy and methods of its application in universities. It also agrees with what Hazaemh and others (2022) stated that educational practices in their various manifestations in any educational institution are considered its cornerstone, and the university as an educational institution constitutes a system that performs various functions, and therefore democratic

practices within universities in their various forms work to develop intelligence among their students and enhance in them the values of achievement and striving for self-realization. It also agreed with the study of Al-Musawi (2008), which indicated that democratic practice in university education is based on open and free dialogue that develops social responsibility.

The second question: Are there statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership from their point of view according to the variables (gender, academic level, years of experience)?

First: Differences according to the gender variable:

To identify the extent of the existence of statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership attributed to the gender variable, the researcher used the (T) test for independent samples (Independent Sample T-Test) and the results came as shown in the following table:

Table No. (14)

(T) test (Independent Sample T-Test) for differences in the opinions of the research sample according to the gender variable

Research dimensions	Gender	N	Arithmetic average	SD	T value	Degree of freedom	Significance level
Promote participation and expression	Male	184	4.3946	0.60070	0.385	378	0.701 Not significant
	Female	196	4.3714	0.57218			
Consultation and participation in decision-making	Male	184	3.6761	0.61161	0.620	378	0.536 Not significant
	Female	196	3.7143	0.58948			
Promote mutual respect and cooperation	Male	184	4.4598	0.44613	0.399	378	0.690 Not significant
	Female	196	4.4398	0.52374			
Stimulate critical thinking and self-responsibility	Male	184	4.3380	0.58194	0.329	378	0.742 Not significant
	Female	196	4.3184	0.58342			
Transparency and fairness in evaluation	Male	184	4.5652	0.52738	1.564	378	0.119 Not significant
	Female	196	4.6449	0.46545			
Total degree of democratic leadership practice	Male	184	4.2867	0.43393	0.254	378	0.800 Not significant
	Female	196	4.2978	0.41217			

The previous table shows that there are no statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership attributed to the gender variable, as the significance level value is greater than (0.05), and is not statistically significant, which indicates that there is no statistically significant effect of the gender variable on the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership.

Second: Differences according to the variable of academic level:

To identify the existence of statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership, attributed to the variable of academic rank, the researcher used the "One Way ANOVA" test, and the results came as shown in the following table:

Table (15)

shows the results of the "One Way ANOVA" for the differences in the responses of the research sample according to the variable of academic level

Research dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Statical significance
---------------------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------	--------------	---------	-----------------------

Research dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Statistical significance
Promote participation and expression	Between groups	9.304	4	2.326	7.231	0.000* Significant
	Inside groups	120.621	375	0.322		
	Total	129.925	379			
Consultation and participation in decision-making	Between groups	13.429	4	3.357	10.241	0.000* Significant
	Inside groups	122.925	375	0.328		
	Total	136.353	379			
Promote mutual respect and cooperation	Between groups	1.126	4	0.282	1.189	0.315 Not significant
	Inside groups	88.824	375	0.237		
	Total	89.950	379			
Stimulate critical thinking and self-responsibility	Between groups	11.604	4	2.901	9.316	*, Significant
	Inside groups	116.780	375	0.311		
	Total	128.384	379			
Transparency and fairness in evaluation	Between groups	1.529	4	0.328	1.554	0.186 Not significant
	Inside groups	92.216	375	0.246		
	Total	93.745	379			
Total degree of democratic leadership practice	Between groups	5.501	4	1.375	8.306	0.000* Significant
	Inside group	62.094	375	0.166		
	Total	67.596	379			

*Significant differences at the level of. ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

The previous table shows that there are no statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of promoting mutual respect and cooperation, as well as transparency and fairness in evaluation, attributed to the variable of academic rank, as the value of the significance level is greater than (0.05), which is an insignificant value, which indicates that there is no significant effect of the variable of academic level on the degree of practicing promoting mutual respect and cooperation, as well as transparency and fairness in evaluation.

The previous table also shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of $(0.05 \geq \alpha)$ in the degree of faculty members' practice of participation and expression of opinion, as well as consultation and participation in decision-making, stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility, as well as the total degree of democratic leadership attributed to the variable of academic rank. To determine the validity of the differences between each category of academic rank, the researcher used the "LSD" test, and the results were as follows:

Table No. (16)

Results of the "LSD" test for differences between income categories Academic rank

Research dimensions	Academic level	ن	Mean	Professor	Associate professor	Assistant professor	TA	Lecture
Promote participation and expression	Professor	35	4.5829	-				*
	Associate professor	69	4.5652		-			*
	Assistant professor	136	4.5250			-		*
	TA	37	4.2243				-	
	Lecture	103	4.1573					-
To consult and participate in decision-making	Professor	35	4.0343	-				*
	Associate professor	69	3.9594		-			*
	Assistant professor	136	3.8544			-		*
	TA	37	3.4730				-	
	Lecture	103	3.4029					-
Stimulate critical thinking and self-responsibility	Professor	35	4.6629	-				*
	Associate professor	69	4.4928		-			*
	Assistant professor	136	4.4559			-		*
	TA	37	4.0378				-	
	Lecture	103	4.0990					-
Total degree of democratic leadership practice	Professor	35	4.6211	-				*
	Associate professor	69	4.4226		-			*
	Assistant professor	136	4.3953			-		*
	TA	37	4.0508				-	
	Lecture	103	4.0386					-

*Significant differences at the level of 0.05 or less

The previous table shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance $(0.05 \geq \alpha)$ between the research

participants of professors, associate professors and assistants on the one hand and the research participants of teaching assistants and lecturers on the other hand in the degree of faculty members' practice of participation and expression of opinion, as well as consultation and participation in decision-making, stimulating critical thinking and self-responsibility, as well as the overall degree of democratic leadership in favor of the research participants of professors, associate professors and assistant professors. This result is consistent with what Al-Otaibi and Al-Azmi's study found (2014), that there are statically significant differences in the total score for measuring the degree of democratic practices among faculty according to academic level.

Third: Differences according to the variable of years of experience:

To identify the extent of the existence of statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership attributable to the variable of years of experience, the researcher used the "One Way ANOVA" test, and the results came as shown in the following table:

Table (16)

shows the results of the "One Way ANOVA" for the differences in the responses of the research sample according to the variable of years of experience

Research dimensions	The source of revelation	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Statistical significance
Promote participation and expression	Between groups	0.930	2	0.465	1.359	0.258 Not significant
	Inside groups	128.995	377	0.342		
	Total	129.925	379			
Consultation and participation in decision-making	Between groups	4.199	2	2.100	5.989	0.073 Not significant
	Inside groups	132.154	377	0.351		
	Total	136.353	379			
Promote mutual respect and cooperation	Between groups	0.616	2	0.308	1.300	0.274 Not significant
	Inside groups	89.334	377	0.237		
	Total	89.950	379			
Stimulate critical thinking and self-responsibility	Between groups	0.443	2	0.222	0.653	0.251 Not significant
	Inside groups	127.941	377	0.339		
	Total	128.348	379			
Transparency and fairness in evaluation	Between groups	2.612	2	1.306	5.403	0.065 Not significant
	Inside groups	91.133	377	0.242		
	total	93.745	379			
Total degree of democratic leadership practice	Between groups	0.654	2	0.327	1.842	0.230 Not significant
	Inside groups	66.942	377	0.178		
	Total	67.596	379			

The previous table shows that there are no statistically significant differences in the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership attributed to the variable of years of experience, as the significance level value is greater than (0.05), and is not statistically significant, which indicates that there is no statistically significant effect of the variable of years of experience on the degree of faculty members' practice of democratic leadership.

Research recommendations:

- The need to intensify awareness programs on the importance of democratic practices in leadership behavior.
- Providing the necessary material and moral incentive programs to encourage leaders to practice democratic leadership.
- Exchanging scientific meetings and scientific seminars in the field of democratic practices in the university environment and benefiting from them in exchanging experiences and knowledge in that field.
- Working to provide the necessary capabilities and technologies that help in adopting democratic practices in university work.
- Attracting human competencies and expertise in the field of democratic leadership.
- Strengthening the principle of transparency and clarity in the decisions that are taken.
- Encouraging the participation of all university members in decision-making and benefiting from their opinions and suggestions.

References:

- 1- Al-Ahmad, A. A. & Zidane, A. (2006). The role of the College of Basic Education in developing awareness and democratic practice among its students during their preparation period (a field study). *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Alexandria University*, Vol. 16, No.3, 118-190.
- 2- Al-Assaf, S. (2012). *Introduction to Research in Behavioral Sciences*. Al-Obeikan Library, Riyadh.
- 3- Al-Azmi A. R. & Al-Otaibi, M. A. (2013). Democratic Practices at Kuwait University from the Students' Point of View - A Field Study. *Journal of the College of Education*. Vol.23, No.2, 259-339.
- 4- Al-Feel, W. S. (2008). Opinions of teachers and students of the teacher training institutes on teaching democracy. *Scientific Journal: Dirasat Mosiliya* Vol.7, No.19, 89-115.
- 5- Al-Hajjar, R. H. (2003). Status of Democratic Practices for Education from Students' Perspectives at Al-Aqsa University- Gaza. *IUG Journal of Humanities Research*. Vol.11, Issue 2, 277-331.
- 6- Al-Hubaydah, U. F. M. (2019). The Reality of the School Parliament and its Role in Democratic Education in the Private Secondary Schools at the university District. *IUG Journal of Educational & Psychological Studies*. Vol. 27, No (4), 280–300.
- 7- Al Kalidy, M. A. (2019). The Degree of Implementation of Faculty Members of Jordanian Universities for The Democratic Methods of their Students from Viewpoint of Students Themselves. *College of Education Journal, Alexandria University*. Vol.29, No.2, 195-208.
- 8- Al-Moumani, M. S. & Al-Sharman, M. M. (2020). Practice Degree for Democrat Behaviors among Secondary School Teachers at Irbid Governorate from School Principal and Educational Supervisors Point of View. *IUG Journal of Educational and Psychology Sciences (Islamic University of Gaza)*. Vol 28, No 3,290-315.
- 9- Al-Musawi, N. M. (2008). Construct validity of the Arabic Version of the democratic teacher beliefs scale. *Journal of Educational and Phycological Science, Bahrain*. Vol.9, No.1, 55-71.
- 10- Al-Otaibi, M. A. & Al-Azmi A. R. (2014). The Degree of Democratic Practices among Faculty Members at Kuwait University. *Journal of Reading and Knowledge*. No.153, 167-243.
- 11- Al-Rumedi, K. (2010). Democratic Educational Practices in Kuwaiti Schools: The views of a sample of fourth-grade students in the state of Kuwait. *Damascus University Journal*. Vol.26, No.4, 155-213.
- 12- Alrwaili, S. R. (2016). Level of democratic educational practices among health faculty from students' perspective in northern boarder university. *International Journal for Research in Education*. Vol.40, No.1, 246-267.
- 13- Al-Salim, B. T. & Abu Ali, A. S. (2024). A suggested Educational Model for Public Schools Directors to Promote Democratic Culture Among

- Students in Jordan. Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Educational & Psychological Research & Studies. No-(45), 68-87.
- 14- Al-Sayyad, A. (1989). Tables for Determining Sample Sizes in Behavioral Research. Cairo: Association of Modern Education, No.1.
 - 15- Al-Sharafat, S. S. (2019). The degree of practice of democratic principles by faculty members in Jordanian universities and the role of universities in promoting this practice from the point of view of students of faculties of educational sciences. Dirasat: Educational Sciences. Vol. 46, No,1, Sup.1.
 - 16- Beni Irshaid, M. & Bani Nasur, N. (2012). The Degree of Faculty Staff at the Balqa Applied University Practices of Some Democratic Aspects from University Student Perspectives. Journal of the Faculty of Education - Aswan University. No. 26.163-189
 - 17- Hazaemh, A. H., Olimat, S. N. & Kanan. E. M. (2022). The Practice Degree of Yarmouk University Faculty Members of Democracy Principles inside Classrooms and their Relation to the Development of Leadership Personality of Students from the Point of View of Students. Jordanian Society for Educational Sciences, Jordanian Educational Journal. Vol.7, No. 3, Sup. (1).
 - 18- Hussein, M. G., Khalil, A. A. & Montaser M. A. (2018). Democratic practices of secondary school teachers in Egypt (reality and future aspirations). Journal of Educational Sciences - Faculty of Education, Hurghada, Vol.1, No.2, 405-459.
 - 19- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.
 - 20- Louglaiithi, M. & Hasni, H. (2023). The practice of secondary education teachers of democratic values during class interaction- A field study at Bousaada High school. *Cahiers du laboratoire, Biskra*. Vol.18, No 2, 11-30.
 - 21- Mahgoub, E. J. (2014). General Diploma Students' Perceptions of Democratic Practices of Faculty Members at Al-Azhar University. Alkhalil University Journal of Research -B. Vol. (9) No.1, 113-141.
 - 22- Marzouk, F. A. (2019). Democratic Practices in Public Education Schools in Egypt: Field Study. Faculty of Education Journal Alexandria University. Vol.29, No.1, 245-276.
 - 23- Melhim, S. (2002). Research Methods in Education and Psychology. Amman. Dar Al-Masirah for Publishing and Distribution.
 - 24- Obeidat, T., Adas, A. & Abdul Haq, K. (2007). Scientific Research: Its Concept, Tool & Methods. Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution House. Amman.
 - 25- Qandeel, M. M. (2020). The role of the university faculty member in promoting democratic practice among students and mechanisms for

developing it from the perspective of community service. Journal of Studies in Social Work and Humanities. Vol. 49, Vol.2, 303-346.

- 26-Zubaidi, S. H. (2022). The Role of a University Professor in the Development of Democracy with the Contents of a University Student in the Light of a Democratic Society. Journal of Educational and Psychological Research. Vol.19, No. 72, 335-367.