

The Economic Factor's Impact on the Preference of Political Science Students in the Jordanian Universities for the Form of the Political System: Democratic and Dictatorial Regimes as a model

Mohammad Saleh Bani Issa¹, Sayel Zaki Khataybeh²

Abstract

The study aimed to show how the economic factor is controlling on the behavior of humans. The main question is related to what impact the economic factor on the preferences of students for forms of democratic and dictatorial regimes based on assumption is there a correlation between acceptance of the nature of the ruling regime and the economic satisfaction among all segments of a society. The survey research method through a questionnaire of (180) respondents have used, whom selected randomly, and (88) of them were retrieved with it. The lack interest of political science students in such studies was found, even female were more evident than of males. The absolute well-being of the individuals with a good economic nature was what they think regardless of regime's nature, as both democratic and dictatorial regimes have advantages and disadvantages as well, therefore, the totalitarian regime for the study sample was the best. Accordingly, the study recommends; the political and academic decision-makers should work aside to increase the interest of the political science students with gaining knowledge of political affairs and participating in political process, including consistent with the aspirations of the leadership towards political, economic and administrative modernization in Jordan.

Keywords: the regime, democratic regime, dictatorial regime, political science students, Jordan.

1. Introduction

The global economy has recently witnessed a strong blow as a result of the difficult preventive measures taken by the countries of the

¹ Associated Prof, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Law, Jadara University – Jordan, m.baniissa@jadara.edu.jo

² Assistant Prof, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Law, Jadara University – Jordan, sayel.k@jadara.edu.jo

world to limit the rapid spread of the Corona virus, which caused a global economic recession during the year 2020. Although the economic crisis caused by Corona is “unparalleled” according to the International Monetary Fund, it is not the first, as the world witnessed a number of crises that struck the global economy, the most prominent of which are but not limited to: First: The Great Depression of 1929, which is considered the worst economic crisis the world witnessed in the twentieth century, began with the collapse of the “Wall Street” stock exchange in the United States, as the recession continued for about Ten years later, its effects spread to the rest of the world, causing huge losses of income, record unemployment rates, and loss of production, especially in industrialized countries. Where the crisis reached its climax in the year 1933, and nearly half of the American banks declared bankruptcy, while the number of unemployed people in the United States alone reached about 15 million people. Second: The oil price shock of 1973, according to which the Arab countries in the Organization of “OPEC” decided to stop exporting oil to the countries that support Israel, and they mainly included the United States and its allies, which led to an economic crisis in a number of developed countries. The term “stagflation” was given to this period, due to the sharp inflation caused by the rise in energy prices, in addition to the stagnation caused by the economic crisis. The “oil price shock” contributed to a collapse in the stock market, high inflation and high unemployment, which eventually led to the fall of the UK government headed by Ted Heath in 1974. Third: East Asian markets 1997. This crisis originated in Thailand in 1997, and soon spread to the rest of the countries in East Asia, which were witnessing a surge of optimism due to their growth rates. The crisis resulted after the countries of East Asia overextended credit and accumulated a lot of debt to the “Asian Tigers” group (Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong and South Korea), and the Thai government was forced to abandon its fixed exchange rate against the US dollar, due to a lack of foreign exchange resources. A wave of panic swept the Asian financial markets, and this was widely reflected in foreign investments in those countries, in addition to a global fear of an imminent financial collapse. Fourth: The 2008 Mortgage, which is considered the most severe financial crisis since the Great Depression, and caused the collapse of one of the largest investment banks in the world (Lehman Brothers). The crisis began in the United States due to the sudden rise in real estate prices, which caused the bankruptcy of American and European banks and their complete closure, due to their stumbling and their inability to bear the financial burdens of the mortgaged real estate. The crisis caused an increase in the unemployment rate in many countries of the world and a decrease in their domestic product, especially in the United States. It also caused an imbalance in the movement of exports and imports

between countries, and a lack of financing. Fifth: European debt 2009, also known as the “eurozone” crisis, which is one of the results of the financial crisis that occurred in 2008, and reached its peak between 2010 and 2012. The crisis began when European countries announced their inability to pay or refinance their government debts or rescue their beleaguered banks, without the help of external financial institutions. It included countries in the south of the European region, such as Portugal, Greece, and Cyprus, before it included Spain and Italy in a less severe way, and put the entire region on the brink of economic collapse. Sixth: Corona Crisis 2019: The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant and clear impact on global economic development, and despite the many warnings issued by scholars that the economy would face great difficulties if a global epidemic appeared, politicians found it difficult to believe this matter, and invest money in addressing future possibilities. a global epidemic. Political responses continued to mitigate the spread of the global epidemic around the world, and governments and commercial interests pressed to create exceptions to face the global economic danger, and despite that, the epidemic swept the world and affected the economy greatly, and many regions and countries needed large subsidies, and to obtain rescue operations, and large aid . The pandemic has left a heavy burden, and the countries of the world are still suffering from the consequences of this pandemic, represented by the decline in economic activity and the increase in the number of unemployment as a result of stagnation, stagnation, inflation and bankruptcy, which negatively affected the thinking, behavior, trends and orientations of countries, societies and individuals (<https://www.alhurra.com/business>).

2. The General Framework of the Study:

2.1. Problem of Study:

Through what was referred to in the introduction above, the idea of the study came, and due to the importance of the topic, the problem was reduced by highlighting the most important societal group related to thinking, behavior, attitudes, and orientations, which are students of political science in Jordanian universities, who are confused about the process of preference between regimes, democracy and dictatorship rule.

2.2. Hypothesis of Study:

The study starts from the hypothesis that: There is a correlation between acceptance of the nature of the ruling regime and economic satisfaction among all segments of society in countries.

2.3. Questions of Study:

The study attempts to answer the main question: What is the impact of the economic factor on the preferences of political science students in Jordanian universities for the forms of democratic and dictatorial regimes? To answer this question, the study will examine three sub-questions: What is the concept of both the democratic and dictatorial systems? What is the relationship between the democratic system and the dictatorial system in the life of the individual? What is the degree of preference of political science students in the Jordanian universities for both the democratic system and the dictatorial system?

2.4. Objectives of Study:

The study seeks, through questions, to achieve the following objectives: To clarify the nature of the ruling both democratic and dictatorial systems; Determining the relationship of both the democratic and the dictatorial systems to the life of the individual; Measuring the degree of preference of political science students in Jordanian universities for both the democratic and the dictatorial systems as well.

2.5. Significance of Study:

It is important and necessary to show the stakeholders the scientific and practical importance of this study. The scientific importance of this study lies in the fact that it will benefit researchers, scholars and students in knowing more about these systems and using this knowledge in their future studies and research. While the practical importance of this study lies in the fact that it will benefit politicians and decision-makers in Jordan and countries similar to the Jordanian state in how to draw up relevant policies. Thinking, behavior, attitudes, and orientations specifically related to youth.

2.6. Methodology of Study:

The study used the survey research method through a questionnaire designed to collect data, including asking a question to the study sample, as the questionnaire included four paragraphs. The first paragraph to specify the gender (male, female); The second paragraph defines the type ruling system (democratic, dictatorial); And the third paragraph to determine the degrees of preference (yes, no, neutral) when answering the main question, which reads: What is the impact of the economic factor on the preferences of political science students in the Jordanian universities for the forms of democratic and dictatorial regimes? By asking the student the following question: "Do you prefer to live under a dictatorial rule with well-being, or live under a democratic rule with poverty?"; And the fourth paragraph to justify the reason for choosing the degree. The analytical method was used

to analyze the data collected from the study sample, for the purpose of answering the study questions and testing its hypothesis. Where the study sample consisted of political science students who are enrolment in the political science departments at the Jordanian universities. The number of questionnaires distributed is (180), and the number of questionnaires collected and analyzed is (88).

3. The Study Axes: Assumptions and Perceptions from an Analytical Perspective:

The study deals with three axes; the first axis talks about the concepts of the democratic system and the dictatorial system; the second axis discusses the relationship of both the democratic system and the dictatorial system to the life of the individual. The third axis measures the degree of preference of political science students in Jordanian universities for both the democratic system and the dictatorial system. The study concludes with the results and recommendations.

3.1. The first axis: the concepts of the democratic system and the dictatorial system:

The first axis is divided into two sections; the first section discusses the concept of the democratic system, while the second section discusses the concept of the dictatorial system in brief as follows:

First: the concept of the democratic system:

Democracy is considered a form of government, in which all qualified individuals in society or what is known as the political community participate in drawing the features of this form without exception, and this is done by electing their representatives, in order to develop, propose or create laws, and therefore democracy includes all political, cultural, social and economic conditions that enable the individual to exercise equal and free political self-determination. Democracy is a word derived from Greek origins, and it means the rule of the people for themselves. Democracy is a distinct social system that society follows and believes in. Democracy refers to a specific moral and political culture, in which a number of concepts related to the necessity of rotating power in a regular and peaceful manner are manifested (Hamdawi, 2019).

Democracy is one of the core values of the United Nations. The United Nations supports democracy by promoting human rights, development, peace and security, and in the 75 years since the signing of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations has done more to support democracy around the world than any other global organization. The UN promotes good governance, monitors elections,

supports civil society to strengthen democratic institutions, guarantees self-determination in countries where colonialism has ended, and helps draft new constitutions in countries emerging from conflict (<https://www.un.org/ar/global -issues/democracy>).

It is known that democracy is the rule of the majority, but there is a common type of it, which is liberal democracy, which means providing protection for the rights of individuals and minorities by enacting and establishing laws in this regard, but we rarely find a country or society that has fully and undiminishedly adopted all concepts, as some these concepts are considered the basis of disagreement on which experienced democracy advocates do not find consensus.

Democracy is also principles and concepts, designed to enable the majority to prevent minorities from paralyzing the application of laws in the state and trying to disable them, with the aim of enabling the state to apply stability and effective governance, in addition to obtaining peace inside and outside the state, and these principles are: majority rule, division of powers and separation Authorities, election and representation, the concept of opposition, the rule of law, decentralization, and the peaceful transfer of powers (<https://www.informationsverige.se/ar/>).

Democracy is based mainly on the principle of the sovereignty of the nation, in the sense that the people and the nation as a whole constitute a moral entity independent of individuals, exercising the authorities by themselves, or through their representatives, as they are the sovereign. Sovereignty is the basis of the democratic principle, as it is a supreme, commanding authority that has no equal. It has two aspects: the first aspect, which is an external aspect, deals with the sovereignty of the state in regulating its relationship with other states, without the direction or influence of anyone. As for the second aspect, it is an internal aspect, which deals with the state's organization of its internal affairs with orders and decisions that are binding on individuals in the state. Every authority that exercises its role and is not based on the principle of the sovereignty of the nation is considered an illegitimate authority (https://www.coe.int/ar_JO/web/compass/democracy).

The principle of the nation's sovereignty is based on the theory of the social contract, as the nation precedes its existence and its rights over the authority, and the group is the one that created the authority, based on a contract between it and the authority, according to which the nation waived some of its rights in order to establish this authority, provided that the nation is the owner of sovereignty, Accordingly, the state, according to this contract, enjoys only the extent that the nation (individuals) waived, in order to protect the rights and freedoms that they did not waive. The state is obligated to respect the rights and

freedoms that preceded their existence, and which were originally created to protect them. The sovereignty of the nation is distinguished in that it is one that does not accept fragmentation or disposition of it. There is only one supreme authority in the state that commands one authority, which has one administration, which is indivisible, and it is not permissible to dispose of it in whole or in part, in the sense that the sovereign nation has no right to dispose of it, so it gives up in whole or in part, and therefore it is always entitled, as the sovereign, to modify or change the form of the political, social and economic system within the state. This sovereignty is neither forfeited nor acquired by statute of limitations; in the sense that the nation's failure to use the principle of sovereignty does not lead to its downfall, and if it is usurped, usurpation is not considered legitimate over time.

Accordingly, individual freedoms in the light of this view are sacred rights that are inviolable, neither by the state nor by individuals, and if any assault occurs on these rights and freedoms, the state is obligated to defend and protect them. Therefore, societal democracy is very important in life, as man is an end in himself, as it provides respect, appreciation and assistance for a decent life for him. And since the cause of development, prosperity, and urbanization in countries and societies is centered on the axis of human freedom and reasonable well-being, it is not the freedom of those in power and the rich, but the freedom of all segments of society.

Second: The concept of the dictatorial system:

Dictatorship is a political term, and it is against the term democracy; Dictatorship has been known for a long time, and you may even find that most historians of all walks of life agree that dictatorship appears before democracy in societies. Dictatorship, in the simplest definitions, means the rule of the individual or the minority for all, and therefore you see this type of rule as a pariah among all political activists in the world, and despite what is attached to this system of governance from the negatives, we find that it is still widespread and in a large way, especially (power-hungry) in the third World countries (<https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki>).

Dictatorship regimes depend on the person or party of the strong in the state controlling the reins of government, so that everyone is subordinate to a strong authoritarian party, and therefore you do not find in those regimes ceilings of freedoms as high as you see in democratic countries (Abdul Karim, 1982).

In our modern era, we do not find a 100% democratic state, or a 100% dictatorial state. You can imagine the matter as if it were a 100-degree ruler, on the right of which, for example, is democracy, and on the left is dictatorship. Therefore, there are some international organizations

that are always looking into that field, and they classify countries according to a ruler similar to what we referred to above, so they put a list of all countries in the world, so that at the top of the list are the most democratic countries and the least dictatorial, and at the bottom of the list are the most dictatorial and least democratic countries. (<https://political-encyclopedia.org/dictionary/>).

Dictatorship as a style of government may take two forms. The first form is the form of totalitarian government: it is the one that imposes on society a certain ideology in terms of society, economy, and the way of government. The second form is the form of authoritarian rule: it may not have special theories, but is based on violence in imposing its policies. And power in a dictatorial regime is based more on a fait accompli than on texts, and if texts exist, they are applied in a way that contradicts the content, and may not be applied at all. Just as there were many democratic regimes, so there were many dictatorial regimes too, some of which were ideological or military dictatorships, some based on one party, some with conservative, reactionary directives, and others progressive and revolutionary. The dictatorial power may be exercised by an individual or a body, but the main feature that distinguishes it is its authoritarian essence. What distinguishes dictatorship from tyrannical regimes is that it is an organized tyranny that has its own constitution and laws (Qasim, 1988).

3.2. The second axis: the relationship of democratic and dictatorial rule with the life of the individual:

If we look at the models of governance around us in this vast world, we will find that there are countries adopting democratic rule and others adopting dictatorial rule. For example, country (X) is one of the largest countries adopting democratic rule, and in contrast, country ((Y) is one of the largest countries adopting dictatorial rule. If we take the elements of security, poverty, education, and personal freedom as criteria to measure the degree of comparison between the two democratic models in country (X) and the dictatorial in the state ((Y), we will notice that there is a discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between them.

For example, the element of security in the dictatorial model (Y) is more disciplined than in the democratic model (X), which witnesses large areas of crime. Also, the element of poverty has a wide area in the democratic model (X), while it is hardly mentioned in the dictatorial model (Y).

As for the education element; it is certain that the dictatorial model (Y) precedes the democratic model (X) in this field, but the dictatorial model (Y) lags far behind in the element of personal freedom than the

democratic model (X). It is noted that there is no absolute democratic or dictatorial system of government. The relativism in democracy regime is the same in dictatorship regime, and this is what is known as the totalitarian regime, which combines democracy and dictatorship at the same time (the Authors, 2022).

Accordingly, according to the relationship of democratic rule and dictatorial rule to the life of the individual as was indicated above, it is certain that the nature of most people will prefer to live a secure life, economic well-being, good education and freedom, and this is what the totalitarian system provides them with, as it will of course be their favorite, through which they get on their political participation and their well-being, and through it they find themselves.

3.3. The third axis: the degree of preference of political science students in Jordanian universities for the democratic and dictatorial systems:

Returning to the main question that was asked to political science students in Jordanian universities to measure their degree of preference between the democratic system and the dictatorial system, which reads: "Do you prefer living under a dictatorial rule with well-being or living under a democratic rule with poverty?"; For the purposes of measuring the degree of preference, the study used the analytical approach to analyze the data collected from the study sample.

4. Method and procedures:

The study procedures were achieved through a number of steps represented in identifying the study sample, collecting data, analyzing the data and writing the final report of the study. In this study, the main question was relied upon, which reads: "Do you prefer living under a dictatorial rule with well-being, or living under a democratic rule with poverty?" to obtain data on the subject of the study. To obtain the data of the subject of the study through statistical analysis; The answers of the study sample were analyzed by dividing the process of statistical analysis into six groups: the distribution of the study sample according to gender, the answers of the sample members according to the preference for the ruling system, the relationship between gender and the preference for the ruling system, the reasons for the preference for the democratic system of government, and the reasons for the preference for the dictatorial system of government, and the reasons for not favoring either of the two ruling systems, as follows:

- The first group: the distribution of the study sample according to gender:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the distribution of the study sample by gender, the following table No. (1) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (1) Distribution of the study sample according to gender (n=88)

Gender	No.	Percentage %
Male	39	44.3%
Female	49	55.7%
Total	88	100.0%

It is clear from Table (1) that the percentage of female representation is the highest with (49) respondents constituting (55.7%), compared to (44.3%) for males.

- The second group: the answers of the respondents according to the preference of the ruling system:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the answers of the respondents according to the system's preference, the following table No. (2) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (2) The answers of the respondents according to the preference of the ruling system (n=88)

preference of the ruling system	No.	Percentage %
Preference of democratic system	31	35.2%
Preference of dictatorial system	28	31.8%
Neutral	29	33.0%
Total	88	100.0%

The data of Table (2) shows the sample's preferences of the ruling system. It is noted that the highest percentage of those who prefer the democratic system reached (35.2%), and the percentage of those who prefer the dictatorial system reached (31.8%), while (33.0%) of the study respondents have no opinion in preference for any of the two ruling system.

- The third group: the relationship between gender and preference for the ruling system:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the relationship between gender and the preference for the ruling system, the following table No. (3) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (3) The relationship between gender and regime preference (n=88)

Preference of the ruling system		Gender		Total
		male	female	
Preference of democratic system	No.	15	16	31
	percentage	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
Preference of dictatorial system	No.	12	16	28
	percentage	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
Neutral	No.	12	17	29
	percentage	41.4%	58.6%	100.0%
Total	No.	39	49	88
	percentage	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%

- The chi-square value was (0.334) and the statistical significance was (0.846) at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (2).

The data of Table (3) shows the relationship between the gender of the respondent and the preferred ruling system. It is noted that the percentage of females who prefer the democratic ruling system is slightly more than the percentage of males out of the total number of those who prefer the democratic ruling system, as the percentage of female preference was (51.6%) compared to (48.4%) for males. This result was repeated in favoring the dictatorial regime, which reached (57.1%) for females compared to (42.9%) for males. The same applies to the lack of preference for any of the two ruling systems, as the percentage of females reached (58.6%) compared to (41.4%) for males.

To test the relationship between gender and the preference for the ruling system, the chi-square test was used, as the value of the chi-square coefficient was (0.334) with a statistical significance of (0.846), which is not statistically significant at the level of significance (0.05), meaning that there is no relationship between gender and the preference for the ruling system.

- The fourth group: the reasons for preference of the ruling democratic system:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the reasons for preference of the ruling democratic system, the following table No. (4) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (4) Reasons for preference of the ruling democratic system (n=31)

Reasons for preference of the ruling democratic system	No.	Percentage %
Participation in decision-making	5	16.1%
Participation in decision-making and well-being	1	3.2%
Achieving absolute well-being for the individual	19	61.3%
Achieving Freedom	2	6.5%
Achieving prosperity and freedom	4	12.9%
Total	31	100.0%

The data of Table (4) shows the reasons for the reasons for preference of the ruling democratic system. It is noted that the most frequent reason is "achieving absolute well-being for the individual" with a representation rate of (61.3%), then participation in decision-making by (16.1%), and in the third degree achieving prosperity and freedom with a percentage of (12.9%).

- The fifth group: the reasons for preference of the ruling dictatorial system:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the reasons for preference of the ruling dictatorial system, the following table No. (5) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (5) Reasons for preferring dictatorship (n=28)

Reasons for preference of the ruling dictatorial system	No.	Percentage %
Security and stability	2	7.1%
Achieving absolute well-being	23	82.1%

Achieving absolute well-being, security and stability	3	10.7%
Total	28	100.0%

Table (5) data shows the Reasons for preference of the ruling dictatorial system. It is noted that the most frequent reason is “achieving absolute well-being” with a representation rate of (82.1%), then achieving absolute well-being, security and stability by (10.7%), and in the third degree achieving security and stability with a percentage (7.1%).

- The sixth group: the reasons for not preference of any of the two ruling systems:

For the purposes of deriving the percentage according to the reasons for not preferring either of the two systems, the following table No. (6) Shows the percentage as follows:

Table No. (6) Reasons for not preference of any of the two systems (n=29)

Reasons for not preference of any of the two systems	No.	Percentage %
The most important is economic growth regardless of the system	1	3.4%
Mixed system is the best	1	3.4%
The absence of a real democratic system	1	3.4%
No opinion	3	10.3%
It is not possible to achieve prosperity or freedom in both systems	3	10.3%
Both systems have advantages and disadvantages	16	55.2%
The two systems have the same result	4	13.8%
Total	29	100.0%

Table (6) data shows the reasons for not preference of any of the two systems (democratic and dictatorial). It is noted that the most frequent reason is “each has pros and cons” with a representation rate of (55.2%), then the two systems have the same result with a rate of (13.8%), and in the third degree No opinion, it is not possible to achieve well-being or freedom in both systems by (103%).

5. Discussing the analyzing responses results of the sample:

- It is noted through the percentage outputs in the distribution of the study sample by gender in Table No. (1), that the percentage of females is the highest in the study sample and this indicates the extent of female response and interaction with such studies and the desire of females to study political science more than males in Jordanian universities. It is also noted through the percentage outputs in the respondents' answers according to the preference for the ruling system in Table No. (2), that the percentage (preferring the democratic system) between males and females in the study sample was the highest, although it is not far from the percentage (neutral), which it come in the second rank, while the percentage of (preferring the dictatorial system) come in the third rank; they are all close together; this indicates a lack of sufficient awareness among political science students of the concepts of any of the ruling systems, especially since (33.0%) of the study responses have no opinion in preferring any of the two ruling systems.

- It is noted through the percentage outputs in the relationship between gender and the preference for the ruling system in Table No. (3), that the percentage of females who prefer the ruling democratic system is slightly more than the percentage of males out of the total number of those who prefer the ruling democratic system, and this result was repeated in the preference for the ruling dictatorial system as well in not favoring either ruling of the two systems; this indicates the interest of females more than the interest of males in interacting with such studies. However, all percentages were close, and this indicates the inability to establish the reality of these systems, especially since the percentage of non-preference for any of the two ruling systems rated to (58.6%) for females and (41.4%) for males.

- It is noted through the percentage outputs regarding the reasons for preferring the ruling democratic system in Table No. (4), that the achievement of absolute well-being for the individual come in the first place, then participation in decision-making come in the second place, and in the third place the achievement of well-being and freedom, and this indicates that the absolute well-being to the individual of a good

economic nature is what the individual thinks about in his life at this stage, regardless of the nature of the system, whether democratic or dictatorial is, and that political participation and even freedom do not mean more to the individual than economic well-being. As it is noted through the percentage outputs regarding the reasons for preferring the dictatorial system in Table No. (5), that the achievement of absolute well-being come in the first place as well, then the achievement of absolute well-being, security and stability come in the second place, and in the third place come the achievement of security and stability; this indicates that the absolute well-being of the individual of a good economic nature is also what the individual thinks about in his life at this stage, regardless of the nature of the ruling system and without ignoring the importance of security and stability. And according to the belief of the individual, if absolute economic prosperity is achieved in the state, this will inevitably be reflected in the establishment of security and stability.

- It is also noted through the percentage outputs regarding the reasons for not preferring both ruling systems (democratic and dictatorial) in Table No. (6), that each of the two systems has advantages and disadvantages that come in the first place, then the same result for the two systems come in the second place, and in the third place come the inability to achieve prosperity or freedom in either system; This indicates the individual's lack of confidence in both systems in achieving prosperity or freedom, because each of the two systems seeks to achieve its own interest first. The absolute democratic system, from the point of view of the study sample, may achieve freedom for the individual, but it does not achieve economic well-being, security and stability as it is in the dictatorial system, while the dictatorial system may achieve economic well-being, security and stability, but it does not achieve freedom, accordingly, the totalitarian system is the best for the study sample.

6. Conclusion:

By discussing and reviewing the results of analyzing the responses of the study sample, it can be said that the study was able to answer the questions and test the hypothesis according to the methodology that was used for the purposes of achieving the objective of the study. Where the study was able to answer the first question by showing what each of the democratic system of government and the dictatorial system of government are for political science students in Jordanian universities; And the answer to the second question by defining the relationship of both the democratic system of government and the dictatorial system of government to the life of the individual for political science students in Jordanian universities; And the answer to

the third question by measuring the degree of preference of political science students in Jordanian universities for both the democratic regime and the dictatorial regime. With regard to testing the hypothesis, the study finds that the process of preferring the nature of the ruling system is related to the extent of economic satisfaction for the individual, and this is consistent with the results of the analysis of the responses of the students' answers.

7. Results and Recommendations:

7.1. The Results:

Among the findings of the study, based on what was reviewed in terms of tracking, analysis and evaluation are summarized as follows:

- The study found, through the number of questionnaires that were distributed and the number of questionnaires that were collected and analyzed, that the percentage of questionnaires that were answered by the study sample does not exceed 50% of the total questionnaires, and this is an indication of the lack of interest of political science students specifically in such important studies for the decision maker in the Jordanian state.
- The study found, through the questionnaires that were answered by the study sample, that the percentage of females was 55.7%, and this indicates that the number of female students studying political science in Jordanian universities is more than the number of male students, and that the interest of female students and their interaction with such studies is more of male students as well.
- The study found, through the results of the analysis of the questionnaires, that females prefer the democratic system more than males, and this result was repeated in the preference for the dictatorial system of government, as well as in not preferring any of the two systems of government; This indicates the interest of females more than males in interacting with such important studies.
- The study found, through the results of the analysis of the questionnaires, that the achievement of absolute well-being for the individual came in the first place, then participation in decision-making came in the second place, and in the third place the achievement of well-being and freedom, and this indicates that the absolute well-being of the individual with a good economic nature is what he thinks about The individual in his life at this stage, regardless of the nature of the regime.
- The study found, through the results of the analysis of the questionnaires, that each of the two systems has negatives and

positives, and this indicates the lack of confidence of the individual in both systems in achieving well-being or freedom because each of them seeks to achieve its own interest first.

- Finally, the study concluded, through the results of the analysis of the questionnaires, that the totalitarian regime is the best for the study sample.

7.2. the Recommendations:

Based on the above results, the study discussed the results and recommends the following:

- The Jordanian political decision-maker should work to increase the interest of Jordanian university students in general and political science students in particular in gaining knowledge of political affairs and also participating in the political process through relevant meetings, seminars and workshops in order to deepen the students' political culture.

- The Jordanian political decision-maker should work to increase women's political empowerment by assuming them leadership positions in the state, as well as should work to increase the interest of male students and their interaction with such studies, given that they are future leaders in the Jordanian state.

- The Jordanian political decision-maker should work to provide operational job opportunities in order to combat the problem of poverty and unemployment, which today affects the Jordanian youth's thinking about the future.

- The Jordanian political decision-maker should work to spread the culture of the importance of security and stability within the state, as long as the majority of young people think about the economic situation at the expense of other things in their lives.

- The Jordanian political decision-maker should work to restore the youth's confidence in the state and its institutions by activating legislation and laws related to political modernization in a serious and effective manner, so that the youth can see the tangible change in this field on the ground.

- Finally, both the Jordanian political and academic decision-makers should work and re-review educational courses related to political systems, which would enable students to better distinguish between democratic, dictatorial and totalitarian political systems as well.

Bibliography

- Abdul Hakim, Ahmed (1982): Contemporary Governance Systems, Arab Publishing House, third edition, Cairo, Egypt.
- Ahmed, Shereen, "The Concept of Democracy and Its Meaning", Mawdoo3.com website, last updated January 9, 2017, The Concept of Democracy and its Meaning - Mawdoo3.com.
- Diamond, Larry, Marc F. Plattner, and Daniel Brumberg, eds. Islam and Democracy in the Middle East (2003).
- Gabardi, Wayne. "Contemporary Models of Democracy," Polity 33#4 (2001) pp 547.
- Hamdawi, Jamil (2019): Education and Democracy. Diwan al-Arab: <http://www.diwanalarab.com/spip.php?article17646> "Archived copy", archived from the original on March 28, 2019, accessed on January 8, 2020.
- John Dunn, The Story of Democracy, translated by Abdullah Al-Luh, Obeikan Library, Saudi Arabia, 2005, p. 13-15.
- Paula Becker, Jean Raveloson (9-2008), WHAT IS DEMOCRACY ?, Victor Kiprop (3-4-2018), "The Different Forms Of Government By Democratic Attributes", www.worldatlas.com,
- Qasim, Muhammad (1988): Dictatorship, Concept and Manifestations, Egyptian Universities House, second edition, Alexandria, Egypt.
- Sen, Amartya K. "Democracy as a Universal Value", Journal of Democracy (1999) 10 (3): 3-17
- <https://www.alhurra.com/business/2020/03/10/>
- <https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki>
- https://www.coe.int/ar_JO/web/compass/democracy
- <https://www.informationsverige.se/ar/omsverige/att-paverka-i-sverige/vad-ar-demokrati/>
- https://www.moppa.gov.jo/EBV4.0/Root_Storage/AR/EB_Info_Page/Civic_Education_toolkits_merged.pdf
- <https://www.ohchr.org/ar/about-democracy-and-human-rights>
- <https://political-encyclopedia.org/dictionary>
- <https://www.un.org/ar/global-issues/democracy>