RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented in table form in the following order:

1- General sociodemographic characteristics of the sample included in the study.
2- Students' perception of the proposed injunctional situations.
3- Students' perception of the proposed permissional situations.
4- Students' perception of the two actual/ real situations (injunctions or permissions) of their experience with their teachers.
5- The relationship between the students' sociodemographic characteristics and their perception of the proposed injunctional and permissional situations.

Table (1): - Sociodemographic data of the study subject

Sociodemographic data	No	%
Age (year)		
≤22	179	89.9
>22	20	10.1
Religion		
Muslim	196	98.5
Christian	3	1.5
Marital status		
Married	8	4.0
Single	191	96.0
Residence		
Rural	133	66.8
Urban	66	33.2
Faculty years		
≤ 4	142	71.4
> 4	57	28.6
Father education		
Secondary and higher	71	35.7
Basic	36	18.1
Below basic	92	46.2
Mother education		
Secondary and higher	26	13.1
Basic	32	16.1
Below basic	141	70.8
Mother work		
Working	28	14.1
Not working	171	85.9
Father work		
Not working	23	11.6
Clerical	41	20.6
Farmer / Technical	56	28.1
Professional	19	9.5
Others	23	11.6
Dead	37	18.6
Number of family members		
3-	26	13.0
6-	152	76.4
9-	21	10.6
Students' rank		
First	62	31.2
Middle	114	57.3
Last	23	11.5
Type of family		
Extended	50	25.1
Nuclear	149	74.9

Table (1) shows the sociodemographic data of the students. Out of the total sample of the study 199 students, the majority of them shared some general characteristics. Around two thirds of the sample 66.8% were rurals, 89.9% were aging 22 years or less, 98.5% were Muslims, 96% were singles and 71.4% spent 4 years or less as students at the faculty.

As regards the students' family aspects, the same table shows that the education of students' fathers and mothers was below the basic education level for 46.2% and 70.8%, respectively. Concerning the students' mothers' and fathers' work, 85.9% of mothers were not working while only 9.5% of the fathers were professionals. The rest were either farmers/ technicals 28.1%, clericals 20.6%, or not working at all 11.6%. Speaking of students' family size, 76.4% had a family size ranging between 6-8 members. Most of these families 74.9% were nuclear families and in 57.3% of cases the student was ranked "the middle".

Table (2) Students' perception of the proposed situations as appropriate or inappropriate.

Students' total perception of the proposed situations	No	%
a) Appropriate perception	109	54.8
b) Inappropriate perception of:		
- One situation.	60	30.2
- Two situations.	14	7.0
- Three situations.	11	5.5
- Four situations.	5	2.5

Table (2) presents the students' perception of the proposed situations as appropriate or inappropriate. It is obvious from this table that more than half of the students 54.8% showed an appropriate perception of the proposed situations, while 30.2% of the students showed an inappropriate perception of one situation, 7% of two situations, 5.5% of three situations and 2.5% showed inappropriate perception of four situations.

Table (3) Students' perception of injunctional and permissional situations as appropriate or inappropriate.

Students' perception of the proposed injuctional situations	**No**	**%**
a) Appropriate perception	117	58.8
b) Inappropriate perception of:		
- One situation.	56	28.1
- Two situations.	12	6.0
- Three situations.	10	5.0
- Four situations.	4	2.0
Students' perception of the proposed permissional situations		
a) Appropriate perception	188	94.5
b) Inappropriate perception of:		
- One situation.	9	4.5
- Two situations.	1	0.5
- Four situations.	1	0.5

Table (3) shows students' perception of injunctional and permissional situations as appropriate or inappropriate. Regarding the students' perception of the proposed five injunctional situations, more than half of the study sample 58.8% showed an appropriate perception of all the situations, while 28.1% of students showed an inappropriate perception of one situation, 6% of two situations, 5% of three situations and only 2% of them showed an inappropriate perception of four situations.

Concerning students' perception of the proposed five permissional situations, the majority of them 94.5% showed an appropriate perception of all the five situations, while 4.5% of students showed an inappropriate perception of one situation. 0.5% of two situations and another 0.5% of four situations.

Table (4): - The relationship between the sociodemographic data of the students and their perception of the proposed injunctional and permissional messages.

Characteristics	Injunction	Permission	Total
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age			
≤ 22	4.42 ± 0.90	4.92 ± 0.39	9.35 ± 0.96
>22	3.85 ± 1.18	4.95 ± 0.22	8.80 ± 1.20
Mann Whitney Z (P)	2.552* (0.0107)	0.1189 (0.9053)	2.291* (0.0220)
Residence			
Rural	4.40 ± 0.94	4.92 ± 0.43	9.32 ± 1.01
Urban	4.30 ± 0.98	4.94 ± 0.24	9.24 ± 0.96
Z Test (P)	0.621 (0.5346)	0.204 (0.8378)	0.794 (0.4271)
Mother work			
Working	4.07 ± 1.15	4.86 ± 0.45	8.93 ± 1.18
Not working	4.42 ± 0.91	4.94 ± 0.36	9.35 ± 0.95
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.627 (0.1036)	1.309 (0.1912)	1.993*(0.0463)
Father work			
Not working	4.35 ± 1.11	4.91 ± 0.29	9.26 ± 1.10
Clerical	4.34 ± 0.99	4.88 ± 0.64	9.22 ± 1.11
Farmer/ Technical	4.32 ± 1.05	4.95 ± 0.23	9.27 ± 1.05
Professional	4.63 ± 0.76	4.95 ± 0.23	9.58 ± 0.77
Others	4.57 ± 0.73	5.00 ± 0.00	9.57 ± 0.73
Dead	4.22 ± 0.85	4.89 ± 0.39	9.11 ± 0.94
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	5.958 (0.3103)	2.275 (0.8098)	6.399 (0.2693)
Child rank			
First	4.35 ± 0.94	4.96 ± 0.22	9.31 ± 0.95
Middle	4.36 ± 0.94	4.92 ± 0.44	9.28 ± 1.02
Last	4.43 ± 1.04	4.87 ± 0.34	9.30 ± 1.02
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.644 (0.7244)	2.710 (0.2579)	0.0086 (0.9957)
Family type			
Extended	4.38 ± 0.88	4.86 ± 0.64	9.24 ± 1.04
Nuclear	4.36 ± 0.97	4.95 ± 0.23	9.31 ± 0.98
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.2774 (0.7815)	0.225 (0.8214)	0.442 (0.6584)
Father education			
Secondary and higher	4.41 ± 0.89	4.87 ± 0.53	9.28 ± 0.96
Basic	4.22 ± 1.05	5.00 ± 0.00	9.22 ± 1.05
Below basic	4.39 ± 0.96	4.94 ± 0.29	9.33 ± 1.01
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	1.231 (0.5404)	3.252 (0.1968)	0.785 (0.676)
Mother education			
Secondary and higher	4.38 ± 0.80	4.96 ± 0.20	9.35 ± 0.80
Basic	4.09 ± 1.06	4.87 ± 0.71	8.97 ± 1.18
Below basic	4.43 ± 0.94	4.93 ± 0.28	9.35 ± 0.97
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	3.713 (0.1562)	0.637 (0.7271)	3.539 (0.1704)

	r	P	r	P	r	P
Faculty years (correlation coefficient)	-0.0226	(0.752)	0.0381	(0.593)	0.0011	(0.987)
Family members (correlation coefficient)	0.0134	(0.851)	0.0099	(0.593)	0.234	(0.743)

*****Significant, P<0.05

Table (4) displays the relationship between the sociodemographic data of the students' and their perception of the proposed injunctional and permissional situations' messages. The only two factors that made a real significant differences were the students' age and their mothers' work. Students aging 22 years or less tended to perceive the injunctional messages as they are with a mean score of 4.42 ± 0.90 as compared to the older group who scored a mean of 3.85 ± 1.18. A statistical significant difference was evident (Z = 2.552, P = 0.0107). This age group also showed a more tendency to perceive most of injunctional and permissional messages as they are with a total mean score of 9.35 ± 0.96 as compared to the older group who scored a mean of 8.80 ± 1.20. The statistical significant difference is evident (Z = 2.291, P= 0.0220).

Regards students' mothers' work, those whose mothers were not working showed more tendency to perceive most of the injunctional and permissional messages as they are with a mean score of 9.35 ± 0.95 as compared to those whose mothers were working who scored a mean of 8.93 ± 1.18. A statistical significant difference is evident (Z = 1.993, P = 0.0463).

Otherwise, no other sociodemographic characteristic has proved to be significantly correlated to the students' perception of both the injunctional and permissional messages.

Table (5): Students' perception of the proposed injunctional situations.

Student response	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4		Situation 5		Total (n = 995)*
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Perception of message											
- Permission	27	13.6	20	10.1	23	11.6	8	4.0	48	24.1	126(12.7%)
- Injunction	172	86.4	179	89.9	176	88.4	191	96.0	151	75.9	869(87.3%)
Decision related to self											
- I am OK	142	71.4	157	78.9	142	71.4	114	57.3	125	62.8	680(68.3%)
- I am not OK	57	28.6	42	21.1	57	28.6	85	42.7	74	37.2	315(31.7%)
Decision related to teacher											
- She is OK	23	11.6	51	25.6	9	4.5	34	17.1	39	19.6	156(15.7%)
- She is not OK	176	88.4	148	74.4	190	95.5	165	82.9	160	80.4	839(84.3%)
Existential position											
- I am OK – she is OK	17	8.5	39	19.6	7	3.5	22	11.1	37	18.6	122(12.3%)
- I am not OK – she is OK	6	3.0	12	6.0	2	1.0	12	6.0	2	1.0	34 (3.4%)
- I am OK – she is not OK	125	62.8	118	59.3	135	67.8	92	46.2	88	44.2	558(56.1%)
- I am not OK – she is not OK	51	25.6	30	15.1	55	27.6	73	36.7	72	36.2	281(28.2%)

* n = 199 student x 5 situations = 995

Table (5) presents the students' perception of the proposed injunctional situations and their existential positions (decisions related to self and decisions related to teachers). As regard to students' perception of the messages, the majority of students 87.3% perceived them appropriately as injunctional messages, while a few number of students 12.7% perceived them in a inappropriately as permissions.

Regarding the students' decisions related to themselves, around two thirds of students 68.3% took the decision, "I'm ok", while around one third of students 31.7% took the decision "I'm not ok". On the same line, students' decisions related to their teachers were found to be; the majority of students 84.3% took the decision "she is not ok", while 15.7% took the decision "she is ok".

Consequently, students' existential positions were as follows: more than half of students' 56.1% took the position "I'm ok-she is not ok", 28.2% of students took the position "I'm not ok-she is not ok", 12.3% took the position "I'm ok-she is ok", while a very small number of students 3.4% took the position "I'm not ok-she is ok".

Table (6): Students' perception of the proposed permissional situations.

Student response	Situation 1		Situation 2		Situation 3		Situation 4		Situation 5		Total (n = 995)*
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Perception of message											
- Permission	195	98.0	197	99.0	196	98.5	198	99.5	194	97.5	980(98.5%)
- Injunction	4	2.0	2	1.0	3	1.5	1	0.5	5	2.5	15 (1.5%)
Decision related to self											
- I am OK	194	97.5	196	98.5	197	99.0	197	99.0	196	98.5	980(98.5%)
- I am not OK	5	2.5	3	1.5	2	1.0	2	1.0	3	1.5	15 (1.5%)
Decision related to teacher											
- She is OK	196	98.5	197	99.5	197	99.0	199	100.0	197	99.0	986(99.1%)
- She is not OK	3	1.5	2	1.0	2	1.0	0	0.0	2	1.0	9 (0.9%)
Existential position											
- I am OK – she is OK	192	96.5	195	98.0	195	98.0	197	99.0	195	98.0	974(97.9%)
- I am not OK – she is OK	4	2.0	2	1.0	2	1.0	2	1.0	2	1.0	12 (1.2%)
- I am OK – she is not OK	2	1.0	1	0.5	2	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	6 (0.6%)
- I am not OK – she is not OK	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	3 (0.30%)

* n = 199 student x 5 situations = 995

Table (6) presents students' perception of the proposed permissional situations and their existential positions (decisions related to self and decision related to teachers). With regard to students' perception of the messages, the majority of students 98.5% perceived them appropriately as permissional situations, while a very few number of students 1.5% perceived them inappropriately as injunctions.

Regarding the students' decisions related to themselves, the majority of students 98.5% took the decision "I'm ok". The same was true for the students' decisions about their teachers. The majority of students 99.1% took the decision "She is ok".

As regard to the students' existential positions, the majority of students 97.9% took the position "I'm ok-she is ok", while only a few number of students took the other three positions, "I'm not ok-she is ok", "I'm ok-she is not ok", and "I'm not ok-she is not ok" presented as 1.2%, 0.6% and 0.3% respectively.

Table (7): Students' perception of two actual situations (injunction or permission)

Student response	Permission (n = 144)		Injunction (n = 195)	
	No	%	No	%
Decision related to self				
- I am OK	144	100.0	146	74.9
- I am not OK	0	0.0	49	25.1
Decision related to teacher				
- She is OK	143	99.3	4	2.05
- She is not OK	1	0.69	191	97.9
Existential position				
- I am OK – she is OK	143	99.3	3	1.6
- I am not OK – she is OK	0	0.0	1	0.5
- I am OK – she is not OK	1	0.69	143	73.3
- I am not OK – she is not OK	0	0.0	48	24.6

Table (7) shows students' perception of two actual situations (injunctions or permissions). As regards to the actual permissional situations, students formulated 144 permissional situations from their experience with their teachers. In relation to their decisions about themselves, all students 100% took the decision "I'm ok". As well, in relation to their decisions about their teachers, the majority of students 99.3% took the decision "she is ok". Considering their existential positions, the majority of students, 99.3% took the position "I'm ok-she is ok", and only one student 0.69% took the position "I'm ok-she is not ok". None of the students took the other two positions, "I'm not ok-she is ok" or "I'm not ok-she is not ok".

Speaking of the actual injunctional situations, students formulated 195 injunctional situations from their experience with their teachers. Concerning their decisions about themselves around three-quarters of students 74.9% took the decision "I'm ok" and more than one-quarter of them 25.1% took the decision "I'm not ok". Considering students' decisions about their teachers, the majority of them, 97.9% took the decision "she is not ok", while a few number 2.05% took the decision "she is ok". In relation to their existential positions 73.3% took the position, "I'm ok-she is not ok" and 24.6% took the position "I'm not ok-she is not ok". Few number of students 1.6% and 0.5% took the other two positions, "I'm ok-she is ok" and, "I'm not ok-she is ok", respectively.

Table (8): The relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students' decisions about themselves in the proposed injunctional situations.

Characteristics	I'm ok	I'm not ok
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age		
≤22	3.45 ± 1.46	1.55 ± 1.46
>22	3.10 ± 1.55	1.90 ± 1.55
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.110(0.2670)	1.110(0.2670)
Residence		
Rural	3.5 ± 1.43	1.50 ± 1.43
Urban	3.24 ± 1.55	1.76 ± 1.55
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.175(0.2401)	1.175(0.2401)
Mother work		
Working	3.0 ± 1.66	2.00 ± 1.66
Not working	3.49 ± 1.43	1.51 ± 1.43
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.466(0.1426)	1.466(0.1426)
Father work		
Not working	3.00 ± 1.60	2.00 ± 1.60
Clerical	3.59 ± 1.07	1.41 ± 1.07
Farmer/ Technical	3.30 ±1.48	1.70 ±1.48
Professional	3.95 ±1.58	1.05 ±1.58
Others	3.48 ± 1.59	1.52 ± 1.59
Dead	3.35 ± 1.62	1.65 ± 1.62
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	7.103(0.213)	7.103(0.213)
Student's rank		
First	3.31 ± 1.36	1.69 ± 1.36
Middle	3.57 ± 1.49	1.43 ± 1.49
Last	2.96 ± 1.58	2.04 ± 1.58
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	5.489(0.0643)	5.489(0.0643)
Type of family		
Extended	3.42 ± 1.37	1.58 ± 1.37
Nuclear	3.42 ± 1.51	1.58 ± 1.51
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.343(0.7316)	0.343(0.7316)
Father education		
Secondary and higher	3.48 ± 1.40	1.52 ± 1.40
Basic	3.42 ± 1.57	1.58 ± 1.57
Below basic	3.37 ± 1.50	1.63 ± 1.50
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.169 (0.9188)	0.169 (0.9188)
Mother education		
Secondary and higher	3.42 ± 1.47	1.58 ± 1.47
Basic	3.41 ±1.29	1.59 ±1.29
Below basic	3.42 ±1.52	1.58 ±1.52
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.261(0.8778)	0.261(0.8778)

	r	P	r	P
Faculty years (correlation coefficient)	0.036	(0.610)	-0.036	(0.610)
Family members (correlation coefficient)	0.048	(0.503)	-0.048	(0.503)

Table (8) displays the relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students' decisions about themselves in the proposed injunctional situations. Although none of the sociodemographic characteristics proved to be statistically of significant impact on the students' decisions about themselves, some tendencies were noted. Younger students who were 22 years or less, those who are residing in rural areas, those whose mothers are not working, those whose fathers are professionals, and those who are ranked the middle among siblings tended to have more tendency to feel "ok" about themselves with mean scores of 3.45 ± 1.46 , 3.5 ± 1.43, 3.49 ± 1.43, 3.95 ± 1.58 and 3.57 ± 1.49, respectively.

Regarding students' rank, it was noticed that students who are ranked the middle among siblings showed the highest tendency to take the decision "I'm ok", with a mean score, 3.57 ± 1.49. While those who are ranked the last showed more tendency to take the decision. "I'm not ok", with a mean score of 2.04 ± 1.58, and with almost near to significant difference ($X^2 = 5.489$, $P = 0.0643$).

Table (9): The relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students'decisions about their teachers in the proposed injunctional situations.

Characteristics	She is ok	She is not ok
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age		
≤22	0.72 ± 0.91	4.28 ± 0.91
>22	1.4 ± 0.94	3.60 ± 0.94
Mann Whitney Z (P)	3.3209*(0.009)	3.3209*(0.009)
Residence		
Rural	0.71 ± 0.91	4.29 ± 0.91
Urban	0.92 ± 0.97	4.08 ± 0.97
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.686(0.0918)	1.686(0.0918)
Mother work		
Working	1.14 ± 1.15	3.86 ± 1.15
Not working	0.73 ± 0.88	4.27 ± 0.88
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.846(0.0649)	1.846(0.0649)
Father work		
Not working	0.91 ± 1.12	4.09 ± 1.12
Clerical	0.68 ± 1.01	4.32 ± 1.01
Farmer/ Technical	0.66 ± 0.75	4.34 ± 0.75
Professional	0.68 ± 1.00	4.32 ± 1.00
Others	0.65 ± 0.78	4.35 ± 0.78
Dead	1.14 ± 0.98	3.86 ± 0.98
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	8.669(0.1230)	8.669(0.1230)
Student rank		
First	0.79 ± 0.94	4.21 ± 0.94
Middle	0.79 ± 0.91	4.21 ± 0.91
Last	0.74 ± 1.05	4.26 ± 1.05
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.295(90.863)	0.295(90.863)
Type of family		
Extended	0.88 ± 0.92	4.12 ± 0.92
Nuclear	0.75 ± 0.94	4.25 ± 0.94
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.117 (0.2639)	1.117 (0.2639)
Father education		
Secondary and higher	0.85 ± 0.99	4.15 ± 0.99
Basic	0.86 ± 1.02	4.14 ± 1.02
Below basic	0.71 ± 0.85	4.29 ± 0.85
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.709(0.7015)	0.709 (0.7015)
Mother education		
Secondary and higher	1.0 ± 1.13	4.00 ± 1.13
Basic	1.06 ±1.01	3.94 ±1.01
Below basic	0.68 ± 0.86	4.32 ± 0.86
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	5.347 (0.0690)	5.347 (0.0690)

	r	P	r	P
Faculty years (correlation coefficient)	0.1092	(0.125)	-0.1092	(0.125)
Family members (correlation coefficient)	0.0159	(0.823)	-0.0159	(0.823)

* Significant, P<0.05

Table (9) presents the relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students' decisions about their teachers in the proposed injunctional situations. As regard to the age, younger students who were 22 years or less showed more tendency to take the decision, "she is not ok" with a mean score of 4.28 ± 0.91, while those who were older than 22 years old showed more tendency to take the decision, "she is ok" with a mean score of 1.4 ± 0.94. The difference is statistically significant (Z = 3.3209 , P = 0.009).

The rest of the sociodemographic characteristics didn't show any significant impact on the students' decisions about their teachers. However, some tendencies were observed. Students whose mothers were not working showed more tendency to take the decision, "she is not ok", with a mean score of 4.27 ± 0.88, while students whose mothers were working showed more tendency to take the decision "she is ok" with a mean score of 1.14 ± 1.15, and with nearly almost significant difference (Z = 1.846, P = 0.0649). Similarly students whose mothers had below basic education showed more tendency to take the decision "she is not ok", with a mean score of 4.32 ± 0.86, while those whose mothers had basic education or higher showed more tendency to take the decision "she is ok", with mean scores 1.06 ± 1.01 and 1.0 ± 1.13, respectively, and with nearly almost statistically significant difference (X^2=5.347, P=0.0690). In relation to students' fathers education, students whose fathers had below basic education showed more tendency to take the decision, "she is not ok" with a mean score of 4.29 ± 0.85. While those whose fathers had basic education showed more tendency to take the decision "she is ok", with a mean score of 0.86 ± 1.02 and with no statistically significant difference (X^2 = 0.709, P = 0.7015).

Table (10): The relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students' decisions about themselves in the proposed permissional situations.

Characteristics	I'm ok	I'm not ok
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age		
≤22	4.92 ± 0.56	0.08 ± 0.56
>22	4.95 ± 0.22	0.05 ± 0.22
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.5252(0.5995)	0.5252(0.5995)
Residence		
Rural	4.94 ± 0.47	0.06 ± 0.47
Urban	4.89 ± 0.64	0.11 ± 0.64
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.878(0.3799)	0.878(0.3799)
Mother work		
Working	4.71 ± 1.01	0.29 ± 1.01
Not working	4.96 ± 0.40	0.04 ± 0.40
Mann Whitney Z (P)	2.575*(0.010)	2.575*(0.010)
Father work		
Not working	4.78 ± 1.04	0.22 ± 1.04
Clerical	4.85 ± 0.79	0.15 ± 0.79
Farmer/ Technical	4.98 ± 0.13	0.02 ± 0.13
Professional	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Others	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Dead	4.92 ± 0.36	0.08 ± 0.36
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	2.951(0.7076)	2.951(0.7076)
Student rank		
First	4.98 ± 0.13	0.02 ± 0.13
Middle	4.93 ± 0.51	0.07 ± 0.51
Last	4.74 ± 1.05	0.26 ± 1.05
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	3.028(0.2201)	3.028(0.2201)
Type of family		
Extended	4.84 ± 0.77	0.16 ± 0.77
Nuclear	4.95 ± 0.42	0.05 ± 0.42
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.432(0.1521)	1.432(0.1521)
Father education		
Secondary and higher	4.89 ± 0.62	0.11 ± 0.62
Basic	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Below basic	4.92 ± 0.56	0.08 ± 0.56
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	2.932 (0.2308)	2.932(0.2308)
Mother education		
Secondary and higher	4.96 ± 0.20	0.04 ± 0.20
Basic	4.81 ± 0.90	0.19 ± 0.90
Below basic	4.94 ± 0.46	0.06 ± 0.46
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	1.575 (0.4550)	1.575 (0.4550)

	r	P	r	P
Faculty years (correlation coefficient)	0.0612	(0.391)	-0.0612	(0.391)
Family members (correlation coefficient)	-0.0068	(0.924)	0.0068	(0.924)

***** Significant, P<0.05

Table (10) demonstrates the relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics of the study sample and their decisions about themselves in the proposed permissional situations. As regard to mothers work, students whose mothers were not working showed more tendency to take the decision "I'm ok" with a mean score 4.96±0.40, while students whose mothers were working showed more tendency to take the decision "I'm not ok" with a mean score 0.29±1.01. The difference is statistically significant (Z = 2.575 , P = 0.010).

Other sociodemographic dimensions didn't show any statistically significant relation to the students' decisions about themselves in the proposed permissional situations.

Table (11): The relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics and the students' decisions about their teachers in the proposed permissional situations.

Characteristics	She is ok	She is not ok
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
Age		
≤22	4.96 ± 0.023	0.04 ± 0.23
>22	4.95±0.22	0.05±0.22
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.2286(0.819)	0.2286(0.819)
Residence		
Rural	4.94 ± 0.27	0.06 ± 0.27
Urbans	4.98 ± 0.12	0.02 ± 0.12
Mann Whitney Z (P)	1.268(0.2049)	1.268(0.2049)
Mother work		
Working	4.93 ± 0.38	0.07 ± 0.38
Not working	4.96 ± 0.20	0.04 ± 0.20
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.093(0.9254)	0.093(0.9254)
Father work		
Not working	4.91 ± 0.29	0.09 ± 0.29
Clerical	4.95 ± 0.22	0.05 ± 0.22
Farmer/ Technical	4.95 ± 0.23	0.05 ± 0.23
Professional	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Others	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Dead	4.95 ± 0.33	0.05 ± 0.33
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	3.486(0.6255)	3.486(0.6255)
Student rank		
First	4.98 ± 0.13	0.02 ± 0.13
Middle	4.94 ± 0.28	0.06 ± 0.28
Last	4.96 ± 0.21	0.04 ± 0.21
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	1.399(0.4969)	1.399(0.4969)
Type of family		
Extended	4.94 ± 0.31	0.06 ± 0.31
Nuclear	4.96 ± 0.20	0.04 ± 0.20
Mann Whitney Z (P)	0.0167(0.9867)	0.0167(0.9867)
Father education		
Secondary and higher	4.96 ± 0.20	0.04 ± 0.20
Basic	4.97 ± 0.17	0.03 ± 0.17
Below basic	4.95 ± 0.27	0.05 ± 0.27
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	0.182 (0.9132)	0.182(0.9132)
Mother education		
Secondary and higher	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Basic	5.0 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00
Below basic	4.94 ± 0.27	0.06 ± 0.27
Kruskall ANOVA X^2 (P)	3.411 (0.1817)	3.411 (0.1817)

	r	P	r	P
Faculty years (correlation coefficient)	0.0648	0.363	-0.0648	0.363
Family members (correlation coefficient)	-0.1641*	(0.021)	0.1641*	(0.021)

* Significant, P<0.05

Table (11) shows the relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics of the study sample and their decisions about their teachers in the proposed permissional situations. As regards to the academic faculty years, it was observed that there was a negative correlation though not significant between the students' decision about their teachers, "she is not ok" and the number of academic years they spent in the faculty (r = -0.0648, P = 0.365), while there was a positive correlation but not significant between the decision "she is ok" and the number of academic years students spent in the faculty (r = 0.0648, P = 0.363).

Regarding the number of family members, it was observed that there was a positive statistically significant correlation between the students' decision about their teachers "she is not ok" and the number of their family members. While there was a negative statistically significant correlation between the decision "she is ok" and the number of family members.

However, for the rest of the socidemographic characteristics, no statistically significant relation were detected in relation to the students' decisions about their teachers in the proposed permissional situations.