

Academic Freedom of Kuwait University Faculty Members as Related to Arabic Islamic Heritage

Dr. Saleh Ahmad Al - Rashid *

Dr. Bassamah Al- Musallam*

Abstract

This study attempts to find out whether there is a provision of a margin of academic freedom practiced by Kuwait University faculty members in relation to Arabic Islamic heritage in teaching and research, in discussing and criticizing objectively heritage issues in the colleges of human sciences. The main question addressed in this study can be formulated as follows: what is the extent of practicing / exercising of the Kuwait University faculty members to their academic freedom when dealing with their Arabic Islamic Heritage in teaching and researching?

A descriptive analytical method was used in order to answer the questions of the study to see whether faculties of Kuwait Universities have academic freedom when it comes to discussing issues related to the subject of Islamic and Arabic heritage. A questionnaire was constructed for this study. It is constituted of two part: One part is concerned with personal background information, and the second part is constituted of (16) statements that are meant to measure academic freedom.

A wide range of conclusions were drawn with respect to the study variables, and an analytical interpretations as well as explanations were given, bearing in mind the overall uniqueness of the social and cultural context of Kuwaiti Society.

Key words: academic freedom - university education - Islamic heritage.

الحرية الأكاديمية لدى أعضاء هيئة التدريس بجامعة الكويت، وعلاقتها بالثقافة العربية الإسلامية د. صالح أحمد الراشد د. بسامة خالد المسلم المستخلص

هدفت الدراسة التعرف على هامش الحرية الأكاديمية الذي يمارسه أعضاء هيئة التدريس بجامعة الكويت حين يتعلق بقضايا التراث العربي الإسلامي، سواء في ممارساتهم التدريسية، أو البحثية وما يتمتعون به من موضوعية في مناقشة، ونقد قضايا التراث في كليات العلوم الإنسانية. وعليه جرى تحديد السؤال الرئيس للدراسة كما يلي: إلى أي مدى يمارس أعضاء هيئة التدريس الحرية الأكاديمية في تناولهم لقضايا التراث العربي الإسلامي، سواء في تدريس المساقات التي تتضمن تلك القضايا، أو في ممارساتهم البحثية المتعلقة بهذه القضايا؟ ووفقاً لطبيعة المشكلة؛ تبنت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي التحليلي، وتم بناء استبانة مكونة من جزئين: تضمن الجزء الأول التعرف على البيانات والمعلومات الرئيسة الخاصة بأعضاء هيئة التدريس في سبع كليات هي: الآداب، والعلوم الاجتماعية، والتربية، والشريعة والدراسات الإسلامية، والقانون، وإدارة الأعمال، وكليات البنات. وبلغ إجمالي مجتمع الدراسة 505 عضواً بتلك الكليات في حين تضمن الجزء الثاني محتوى الاستبانة المكون من 16 بنداً، جرى توزيع الاستبانة على كل مجتمع الدراسة ولم تتلقى إلا 147 إستجابة صحيحة. كما جرت مراجعة الأدبيات المتاحة باللغتين الإنجليزية، والعربية للتأصيل النظري للمشكلة. وعقب تطبيق أداة الدراسة جرت المعالجة الإحصائية المناسبة تبعاً لمتغيرات الدراسة، ومن ثم تحليل النتائج، ومناقشتها، وصولاً إلى تقديم الخلاصة التي أسفرت عنها الدراسة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحرية الأكاديمية - التعليم الجامعي - التراث الإسلامي.

♦College of Education - Foundations of Education Department - Kuwait University.

♦College of Education - Foundations of Education Department - Kuwait University.

Introduction:

This study attempts to find out whether there is a provision of a margin of academic freedom practiced by Kuwait University faculty members in relation to Arabic Islamic heritage in teaching and research, in discussing and criticizing objectively heritage issues in the colleges of human sciences.

Most faculty members feel reluctant to deal with or approach heritage subjects in both research and teaching. In addition, critical studies on Islamic heritage issues are scarce although a great number of Muslim scholars, like Alqardawi, note that our predecessors used to approach their predecessors with criticism and approval or disapproval. It should be stressed here however, that a number of Muslim scholars claim that although the companions of the prophet are not fallible or immune from any criticism, they all agree that they reached the highest rank in matters of piety, religion, and morality, and therefore they have enjoyed a status which prevents them from exposure to criticisms (AL Khaleefa, 2004; Al-Bati, 2005; Ibn-Alarabi, 2004).

One notices that, not only that critical studies of the heritage is little, but even those who are bold enough to express views on controversial issues and criticize their heritage even if their criticisms are objective, they are encountered with battles and sometimes they are described as infidels.

Discussing controversial issues is avoided by researchers and teachers alike despite the fact that students need to know about the nature of the controversial issues and why are they controversial so that they can take the right position with convictions. So the question which has to be addressed in this present study is: what prevents faculty members from approaching subjects related to heritage and religion in one hand and to our contemporary social world from another hand, especially that religious matters are not but social lively matters.

The Statement of the Problem:

In light of the above introduction the problem addressed in this study is whether there is or there is not a margin of academic freedom which allows or prevents researchers and teachers from approaching issues articulated within the sphere of religion, heritage and social life affairs.

If the social reaction towards criticizing the heritage is like what has been indicated above, then what is the position of the academic researchers and teachers?, how do they deal with these issues when they

are compelled to carry out such issues in the context of their academic life? Is it a problem for them? Do they feel that they are fettered when they deal with the heritage or with modern problems when they want to look at them in the light of the heritage? Are they free academically to approach these problems?

The Question of the Study:

The main question addressed in this study can be formulated as follows: what is the extent of practicing / exercising of the Kuwait University faculty members to their academic freedom when dealing with their Arabic Islamic Heritage in teaching and researching?

Sub- Questions:

- a. Where does the faculty member find himself unable to deal with the Islamic heritage while teaching or doing research in a critical manner?
- b. How do the faculty members differ when dealing with this heritage according to the following variables: Gender, nationality, academic position, years of work and area of specialization?
- c. Do these variables affect the ability of the faculty members in their dealing with the heritage: in criticizing, or discussing it?

The Significance of the Study:

The significance of the study lies within the study of the extent of the provision of a margin of academic freedom for faculty members of Kuwait University in teaching or carrying out research related to issues on heritage and social affairs.

Also, the significance of the study lies within the significance of the critical study of our heritage which helps us find solution to many problems so that the nation would move and progress forward in keeping pace with new development of knowledge.

Finally, academic freedom may not exist because of socialization process based on indoctrination which leads to hampering thinking instead of helping us to think as Ben Spieker & Roger Strughan (1991) indicated in their book "Freedom and Indoctrination in Education".

If this is what happened in our religious education, then we will become unable to discuss and progress and therefore in this case, what should we do to the counter productive methods and replace them of methods conducive to the production of the new knowledge and its transmission .

Review of the Literature:

There are a lot of studies carried out on the subject of academic freedom in Arabic and in English. In Arabic related literature, a great number of studies conducted on Egyptian Universities and Gulfian Universities are available.

Arabic Literature:

A seminar held in Kuwait University in June 1984 has well documented the issue of Academic freedom. The seminar concluded that there is no absolute academic freedom in Arab Universities which are not autonomous, and therefore while they rely on governments for their finance, they tend to follow their political orientations in both teaching and research.

In 1994 a conference was held in Kuwait University about "Arabic Higher Education and the Challenges of the Beginning of 21st century". A research paper on "academic freedom in higher education and the challenges of the beginning of 21st century". Presented by Ali (1994) discussed academic freedom of both faculty members and students. He provided a historical account on the topic and stressed its presence in the early Islamic civilization era, where the students had more freedom selecting their professors and fields of studies according to their needs.

However Qomber (2001) claims that there was no such academic freedom in the Islamic heritage. Ali (1994) also criticized Arabic contemporary education as being inculcative, always representing the authority be it religious, or political where the students play the recipient role and cannot react to whatever they are exposed to for fear of the authoritarian atmosphere. He concluded that teaching based on this method hampers the mind from thinking on innovating new thoughts and ideas. Finally Ali (1994) reiterated the absence of academic freedom especially where it is related to religion and politics.

In 2001 another conference was held in Kuwait University about "Democracy and Education in the Arabic world", Qomber (2001) presented a study on "academic freedom in Arabic University: An analytical, critical comparative study" in which he argues that there is no academic freedom in the Arabic world universities whether at present time or in the past. He gives lots of examples: old and new, which proves that there is no academic freedom especially if it is related to Arabic Islamic

heritage even if it is not related to dogma or worshipping, but it is related to controversial or dialectical issues like the physical existence of the Jin, and the materialistic effect of the envious eye. Not only that, but Qomber argues about the prevalence and the power of the common people in burying the free thoughts and this has historical roots.

Hamada (1989) conducted a study on Kuwait University in which he discussed the significance of academic freedom of university education. The results of this investigation indicated that the faculty members at Kuwait University enjoyed much freedom their teaching and research.

Al Sawee (1992) studied academic freedom and issues that are related to it on a sample of Egyptian and Gulfian universities. The results showed that the participants in the study enjoyed academic freedom on issues related to cultural and educational factors.

Saad (1989) studied the academic freedom of faculty members in colleges of education and its effect on their scientific production. He found that it is related to their scientific production which could be related to academic atmosphere, or could be related to college's leaders.

Sacran (1989) carried out a study about the academic freedom of the students of the Egyptian universities. While this study was about students and not about faculty members, it is relevant to our present study. He dealt with so many issues similar to what we are searching in our present study, such as criticizing beliefs or adopting theories which might be contrary to our values and beliefs of the society. He also discussed the criticized information and thoughts that is offered to them, in addition to the criticized attitudes, philosophies, customs and beliefs of the society within the different powers which have influence on the society. The results indicated that these are the most challenging factors to academic freedom.

English Literature:

The English literature relevant to academic freedom in studies carried out in U.S.A. is mostly related to what happened in September 11th, 2001, because that event and the war on terrorism launched after, have curtailed academic freedom to a great extent. The American government declared a war on terror and at the same time issued rules affecting academic freedom. Such rules had many different reactions in the world of academia. Many educational institutions tried to defend their academic freedom: such as "The American Library Association Council"

(Jan. 2003), "The National Council of American Studies" (Nov. 2002), "The Journal Editors and Author Group" (Jan. 2003), and "American Association of University Professors" was from the most defenders of academic freedom against that law (knight, J. 2003). Also some university presidents did that, such as president Atkinson, president Judd, president Celest, president Broad (See Academe 26th of April 2005).

The most affected area from such law was Middle Eastern Studies as Scott J. (2002) said, and Rand E. (2005), also see Post, R. and Morison, M.T. (26th april2005). Applebaum, B (2003) and O' Neil, R.M. (26th April 2005). Also Rajagopool B. (2003 and 2005) considered it human rights. In general the academic freedom was considered to be linked with the economical and financial status (Allport, 2000). Kreiser, (1992) discussed the role of United States Intelligence Agencies, arguing that the academic freedom might be curtailed if the national security is at stake. Also, he speaks of the secrecy of some research if such research is associated with some financiers who may refuse to publish such research before they use it for some of their benefits (Shattuck, 1992).

Gasman, (1999) discussed another factor that may affect the academic freedom namely affiliation of the person to a stream of thought such as Marxists during world war II (See also Wilcox, 1993). The reason to curtail academic freedom is not always political or social; however it could be moral or religious (Blair, 1996; Hens, 1998).

This gets us closer to our area of investigation. Stegmayer, (2000) discussed academic freedom in schools. However, he discussed it when the subject matter at question is controversial and thorny. This is what we are discussing in our research however at different educational levels.

Grimes, (1996) discussed religion from another point view where the Red Indians Native Americans see that anybody who does not belong to their religion should not teach their religion. Others think that this is academic freedom. Although our present discusses religion and academic freedom however we are not conversing whether Islam should or should not be taught by non Muslims , rather we search if social and cultural issues that are related to Islam (religion) can be discussed, investigated, scrutinized or not.

The above brief survey of the literature shows how academic freedom was always subjected to pressure since 1917 during the World War I passing through 1946- 1956 during the sensitivity against the

Marxist ideology during the cold war until the event of September 11th 2001 related to the attack on World Trade Centre at the heart of N.Y. City and what followed of war on terror and academic freedom is curtailed.

While Galileo was tried because of his bold thoughts about physical matters he observed in nature, today academic freedom of research is curtailed because of fear that some people will learn about such research and manage to exploit it against America, whether it is research on physics, chemistry, engineering or teaching thoughts that are against the U.S.A.

Finally, to close this section we note how little the relevant literature to our subject of research is, and hence the significance of this kind of investigation in contributing to this field of research.

Methodology:

A descriptive analytical method was used in order to answer the questions of the study to see whether faculties of Kuwait Universities have academic freedom when it comes to discussing issues related to the subject of Islamic and Arabic heritage.

The study considered the percentages of the responses of the sample to have a general view of degree of academic freedom to the entire sample. Also the study considered the differences between males and females, nationality of faculty members, and finally years of work and area of specialization as represented by the different colleges.

The Instrument of the Study:

A questionnaire was constructed for this study. It is constituted of two part: One part is concerned with personal background information, and the second part is constituted of (16) statements that are meant to measure academic freedom.

Validity:

The questionnaire was reviewed by five faculty members from the foundation of Education Department. Also, it was reviewed by five faculty members of other colleges. Finally it was reviewed by five Faculty members of the Sharri'a's college. Their comments, their opinions and questions were taken into consideration when finalizing the questionnaire.

Reliability Co-efficient of the Questionnaire:

Cronbach Alpha was used to get Reliability of the questionnaire and it was found to be .82 which is excellent.

The sample:

The sample of the present study included all the Faculty member of colleges of human sciences. They are constituted of (7) colleges, the total number of faculty members of these colleges is (505) and the distribution of the faculty members according to college is as follows:

Arts (143), Social Sciences (83), Education (95), Shari'a and Islamic Studies (74), Law (53), Business administration (43) and Colleges for women (14).

Description of the sample

While the questionnaire was handed out to every professor in the (6) colleges, we got only (147) responses. They were distributed as shown in (Table 1).

Table (1)
Description of the sample according gender, nationality, position, college and years of work

Variables	Classifications	Frequencies	Percentage
Gender	Males	116	78.9
	Females	31	21.1
Nationality	Kuwaiti	115	78.8
	Non- Kuwaiti	31	21.2
	Missing value	1	
Position	Full professors	28	19.3
	Associate Professors	35	24.1
	Assistant Professors	82	56.6
	Missing value	82	56.6
	Missing value	2	
Colleges*	Art & Social Sciences	55	37.4
	Education	48	32.7
	Shari'a & Law	21	14.3
	Business Administration & College for Women	23	15.6
Years of work	(1-4 years)	52	35.4
	(5-9 years)	31	21.1
	(10 years and above)	64	43.5

Procedure:

The different Colleges were approached by telephone to provide us with the numbers of their faculty members. Some simply replied, some asked for an official letter from the dean of our college to be addressed to the dean of their college. We simply did the routine they asked for, and they sent us the statistics in a formal letter.

The research assistants delivered the questionnaire according to the corresponding number of each college and gave them a month to respond. Some responded with enthusiasm and some formulated different comments, lots of the faculty members, however, did not respond. The various departments whom their faculty members did not respond were encouraged to answer, and in case if they did not receive the questionnaire, it was sent to them again. Some departments were approached by telephone to encourage their faculty members for participation in this study. Only few faculty members returned the filled out questionnaire. Some of those who did returned them unanswered said that the questionnaires do not apply to what they teach, a large number refused to answer based on a principle that they should not search or help to search the subject matter of the study. Some of the respondents tried to answer but they replied to some items of the questionnaire that are inapplicable. Some simply wrote a note indicating that it does not apply of what they teach.

* Although, we counted 7 colleges as participants, the respondents of each college were too little for statistical concerns, so we combined some of the colleges that can be merged by virtue of their specialization.

Statistical treatment:

To analyze the data collected for this study Chronbach Alpha was extracted for the whole questionnaire, frequencies and percentages were extracted to have a general view of the respondent's answers. T. tests were calculated to see the differences of a statistically significant answer of gender, and nationality. Chi squares were calculated to find the differences of statistically significant answers between different positions, colleges and years of work.

Findings:

To get an overall idea on the findings of the present study, perhaps it might be interested to look at those salient responses regarding the answers of the respondents to the items of the questionnaire according to yes - no, or- undecided- answer type. Item 6 received 20.5% as yes-answer and 65,1% as no-answer , item 13 received 25,2% as yes answer and 49.0% as no-answer . It should be noted here hat both items 6 & 13 were about the Sahaba . On the other hand the items that received the most undecided answer are items 15 (25.9%), 13 (25.9%) and item 9 (24.1%) , item 12 (14.5%) and finally item 10 (20.0%).

Question 13 is about criticizing the Sahaba objectively and item 15 setting up criteria for criticizing the Arabic Islamic heritage. Item 9 is about expressing oneself openly when understanding Qur'an through mind and logic and finding that there are discrepancies between practiced habits and customs in the society in one hand and the Qur'an in the other hand.

These responses mean that: the sample in general feels uncomfortable to criticize the Sahaba even if it is an objective criticism. And it is not resolved whether they can set a criterion to criticize the Islamic Arabic heritage, and to express a view that they think it is right in explaining the Qur'an but there are discrepancies between it and between practiced habits and customs. This shows us that these items are the most items that faculty members feel they have no academic freedom when it is related to them. However because it is hard to decide at this point of analysis whether this result is due to social pressure or to psychological pressure or a pressure related to religion and fear of Allah , and only further analysis will shed some light on the nature of this result.

To find out the differences between genders to the same questionnaire between faculty members one has to look at (Table2).

Table no (2)

Differences between faculty members to T.test according to gender

Item #	Male			Female			T.test Value	D.f	Significance
	N.	Mean	Standard Deviation	N.	Mean	Standard Deviation			
1	116	1.30	0.675	31	1.55	0.888	-1.684	145	0.094
2	115	1.50	0.788	30	1.50	0.861	-0.026	143	0.979
3	115	1.42	0.737	30	1.57	0.858	-0.954	143	0.342
4	114	1.39	0.672	31	1.65	0.839	-1.802	143	0.074
5	112	1.48	0.735	31	1.65	0.877	-1.047	141	0.297
6	116	1.92	0.621	30	2.00	0.455	-0.641	144	0.523
7	114	1.51	0.812	31	1.90	0.831	-2.387	143	0.018*
8	114	1.34	0.727	30	1.37	0.765	-0.163	142	0.871
9	113	1.80	0.825	28	1.54	0.793	1.508	139	0.134
10	115	1.72	0.779	30	1.80	0.761	-0.493	143	0.623
11	111	1.68	0.738	30	1.87	0.860	-0.155	139	0.250
12	113	1.83	0.767	30	1.97	0.850	-0.837	141	0.404
13	113	1.98	0.681	30	2.10	0.845	-0.798	141	0.426
14	115	1.29	0.604	29	1.17	0.468	0.951	142	0.343
15	114	1.75	0.837	29	1.93	0.799	-1.024	141	0.308
16	113	1.50	0.696	29	1.55	0.783	-0.318	140	0.751
Over Academic freedom	101	25.6535	6.33314	25	26.2400	5.93914	-0.420	124	0.676

From looking at (Table 2) we find that there is one factor that has statically significant difference between males and females at the (0.25) level or less: i.e. item (7) which say: " I can clarify that there are errors in the Arabic Islamic heritage". Looking at the mean of this statement shows that it is for females (1.90) is higher than it is for males (1.51) which means that women are inclined to answer : no, to such an item and males are more inclined to say yes which means that males with relation to this statement feel that they have more academic freedom.

Table (3)
T-test analysis for statistical differences according to nationality

Item #	Male			Female			T.test Value	D.f	Significance
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation			
1	115	1.38	0.756	31	1.23	0.617	1.062	144	0.290
2	113	1.53	0.814	31	1.35	0.755	1.084	142	0.280
3	113	1.44	0.755	31	1.45	0.810	-0.059	142	0.953
4	114	1.45	0.730	31	1.42	0.672	0.93	143	0.848
5	111	1.52	0.773	31	1.48	0.769	0.246	140	0.806
6	114	1.89	0.615	31	2.10	0.473	-1.696	143	0.092
7	113	1.57	0.811	31	1.65	0.877	-0.471	142	0.639
8	112	1.38	0.773	31	1.19	0.477	1.242	141	0.216
9	110	1.69	0.821	30	1.93	0.828	-1.431	138	0.155
10	113	1.68	0.735	31	1.94	0.892	-1.625	142	0.106
11	112	1.64	0.746	28	2.04	0.793	-2.462	138	0.015*
12	112	1.83	0.781	30	1.97	0.809	-0.842	140	0.401
13	111	2.01	0.720	31	2.00	0.730	0.061	140	0.951
14	112	1.19	0.512	31	1.55	0.723	-3.157	141	0.002*
15	112	1.78	0.835	30	1.80	0.805	-0.136	140	0.892
16	110	1.49	0.714	31	1.61	0.715	-0.840	139	0.402
Overall Academic freedom	99	25.3434	5.86787	27	27.3333	7.35370	-1.476	124	0.142

Looking at table no (3) which is concerned with T. test according to nationality, it appears that there are two items which show that the differences are statistically significant between Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis (T.Test values at the level (0.05) and less in item (no.11 and no.14).

1. Going back to the tool it appears that item (no.11) states " I can treat controversially religious matters with a critical look with my students in the class room" looking back at the means of this statement shows that more Kuwaitis inclined to say yes (1.64) than non Kuwaitis (2.04) in responding to such statement, which means that Kuwaitis are enjoying more academic freedom than non-Kuwaitis.

2. Item (no.14) states: "I can freely criticize prevailing habits and customs in the society ". Going back to the table to see the means, it shows that the mean of the responses of Kuwaitis is less (1.19) than the mean of the responses of the non- Kuwaitis (1.55) which means that Kuwaitis are inclined than the non-Kuwaitis to respond yes to this statement which means that they have more academic freedom.

To interpret these two responses to this statement it might be because the Kuwaitis understand better the nature of the society and the

tradition and the habits than the non-Kuwaitis. The non-Kuwaitis may be more afraid to go beyond what the society allows with this respect. Kuwaitis by the fact that they are Kuwaitis are more prone to accept to criticize their own habits and customs than the non- Kuwaitis.

Table (4)
ANOVA between the three different positions of the faculty members as related to their academic freedom

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Item 1	Between Groups	0.100	2	0.050	0.092	0.912
	Within	77.252	142	0.544		
Item 2	Between Groups	2.254	2	1.127	1.763	0.175
	Within Groups	89.495	140	0.639		
Item 3	Between Groups	0.239	2	0.119	0.201	0.818
	Within Groups	83.216	140	0.594		
Item 4	Between Groups	0.943	2	0.471	0.913	0.404
	Within Group	72.302	140	0.516		
Item 5	Between Groups	0.949	2	0.475	0.796	0.453
	Within Groups	82.285	138	0.596		
Item 6	Between Groups	0.604	2	0.302	0.875	0.419
	Within Groups	48.701	141	0.345		
Item 7	Between Group	2.647	2	1.324	1.938	0.148
	Within Groups	95.633	140	0.683		
Item 8	Between Groups	1.288	2	0.644	1.192	0.307
	Within Groups	75.106	139	0.540		
Item 9	Between Groups	0.326	2	0.163	0.239	0.788
	Within Groups	92.825	136	0.683		
Item 10	Between Groups	0.733	2	0.367	0.603	0.549
	Within Groups	85.169	140	0.608		
Item 11	Between Groups	04.18	2	0.209	0.348	0.707
	Within Groups	81.640	136	0.600		
Item 12	Between Groups	0.126	2	0.063	0.102	0.903
	Within Groups	85.576	138	0.620		
Item 13	Between Groups	0.454	2	0.227	0.438	0.646
	Within Groups	71.517	138	0.518		
Item 14	Between Groups	0.243	2	0.122	0.359	0.669
	Within Groups	47.116	139	0.339		
Item 15	Between Groups	0.847	2	0.423	0.611	0.544
	Within Groups	95.593	138	0.693		
Item 16	Between Groups	1.291	2	0.646	1.306	0.274
	Within Groups	67.709	137	0.494		
Total overall about Arabic Islamic heritage	Between Groups	0.180	2	0.090	0.002	0.998
	Within Groups	4854.941	121	40.123		

Since there is no significant difference from Item (1 to Item 16) so we need not to carry out any further analysis by means of Post Hoc test.

Table (5)

ANOVA between the three different groups according to years of work of the faculty members as related to their academic freedom

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Item 1	Between Groups	1.732	2	0.866	1.644	0.197
	Within	75.873	144	0.527		
Item 2	Between Groups	4.321	2	2.160	3.489	0.033
	Within Groups	87.927	142	0.619		
Item 3	Between Groups	1.724	2	0.862	1.490	0.229
	Within Groups	82.138	142	0.578		
Item 4	Between Groups	3.539	2	1.769	3.579	0.030
	Within Group	70.213	142	0.494		
Item 5	Between Groups	1.098	2	0.549	0.930	
	Within Groups	82.609	140	0.590		
Item 6	Between Groups	0.355	2	0.178	0.507	0.603
	Within Groups	50.090	143	0.350		
Item 7	Between Group	1.542	2	0.771	1.123	0.328
	Within Groups	97.451	142	0.686		
Item 8	Between Groups	1.624	2	0.812	1.527	0.221
	Within Groups	75.015	141	0.532		
Item 9	Between Groups	1.031	2	0.515	0.759	0.470
	Within Groups	93.778	138	0.680		
Item 10	Between Groups	0.237	2	0.118	0.196	0.822
	Within Groups	85.805	142	0.604		
Item 11	Between Groups	0.249	2	0.125	0.210	0.811
	Within Groups	81.964	138	0.594		
Item 12	Between Groups	0.850	2	0.425	0.689	0.504
	Within Groups	86.353	140	0.617		
Item 13	Between Groups	2.705	2	1.352	2.964	0.071
	Within Groups	70.288	140	0.502		
Item 14	Between Groups	0.602	2	0.301	0.896	0.410
	Within Groups	47.370	141	0.336		
Item 15	Between Groups	0.240	2	0.120	0.172	0.842
	Within Groups	97.466	140	0.696		
Item 16	Between Groups	0.404	2	0.202	0.395	0.674
	Within Groups	71.068	139	0.511		
Total overall about Arabic Islamic heritage	Between Groups	112.360	2	56.180	1.454	0.238
	Within Groups	4751.965	123	38.634		

Looking at (Table 5) one notices that there are two items (2 and 4) that have statically significant differences at the level (0.05) and less between the different groups of years of work of the faculty members in

relation with their academic freedom. In order to know the differences are between which groups and to the interest of whom, one has to look for Multiple Comparison using Schaffe. When doing so one notices that although ANOVA shows that there are two items that have significant differences (items 2 and 4) with respect to years of work, but using multiple comparison test using Schaffe one notices only one item (2) differs significantly with respect to years of work and the differences are between (1 to 4 years of work) and (10 years and more of years of work). Looking at the means of these two groups one notices that 1 to 4 years of work has a bigger mean (1.70) than 10 years and more of years of work (1.31). This means that the first group tends to answer no which means that they feel less free to recommend students to read books that are scientifically and objectively critical of Arabic Islamic heritage, than the second group. This can be explained by that the more years of work one have the more freedom we have.

Table 6
ANOVA between the four groups of colleges

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Item 1	Between Groups	1.829	3	0.610	1.151	0.331
	Within	75.776	143	0.530		
Item 2	Between Groups	3.451	3	1.150	1.827	0.145
	Within Groups	88.797	141	0.630		
Item 3	Between Groups	3.923	3	1.308	2.306	0.079
	Within Groups	79.939	141	0.567		
Item 4	Between Groups	1.263	3	0.421	0.819	0.486
	Within Group	72.489	141	0.514		
Item 5	Between Groups	2.754	3	0.918	1.576	0.198
	Within Groups	80.953	139	0.582		
Item 6	Between Groups	0.122	3	0.041	0.115	0.951
	Within Groups	50.323	142	0.354		
Item 7	Between Group	4.233	3	1.411	2.099	0.103
	Within Groups	94.760	141	0.672		
Item 8	Between Groups	0.822	3	0.274	0.506	0.679
	Within Groups	75.817	140	0.542		
Item 9	Between Groups	2.561	3	0.854	1.268	0.288
	Within Groups	92.248	137	0.673		
Item 10	Between Groups	7.600	3	2.533	4.554	0.004
	Within Groups	78.441	141	0.556		
Item 11	Between Groups	6.979	3	2.326	4.236	0.007
	Within Groups	75.234	137	0.549		
Item 12	Between Groups	7.438	3	2.479	4.320	0.006
	Within Groups	79.765	139	0.574		

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Item 13	Between Groups	2.986	3	0.995	1.976	0.120
	Within Groups	70.007	139	0.504		
Item 14	Between Groups	4.627	3	1.542	4.982	0.003
	Within Groups	43.345	140	0.310		
Item 15	Between Groups	2.465	3	0.822	1.199	0.313
	Within Groups	95.242	139	0.685		
Item 16	Between Groups	3.510	3	1.170	2.376	0.073
	Within Groups	67.962	138	0.492		
Total overall about Arabic Islamic heritage	Between Groups	562.981	3	187.660	5.323	0.002
	Within Groups	4301.345	122	35.257		

Looking at (table 6) it shows that there are statistically significant differences between colleges at (0.05) level and less for items 10, 11, 12, and 14 and the total overall to the whole questionnaire, thus one has to look at multiple comparison using Scheffe to know the differences between which colleges.

Looking at multiple comparisons using Scheffe we find the differences for item (10) is between Shari'a and law colleges in one hand and Business Administration and college for women in the other. To know the nature of the responses of the colleges. The mean of Shari'a and Law is less (1.38) than the mean of Business Administration and college for women (2.17) which means that they tend to give a "no" answer to item 10 which says: "I can freely write about socio- religious controversial and thorny issues". This means that they feel less free than colleges of Shari'a and Law to write in such matters. Thus, this might be because they know more about religion than other colleges.

Item (11) says; "I can treat controversially religious matters with a critical look with my students in the class room". Looking at multiple comparisons using Scheffe with regard to item (11) one notices that the differences are between Education and Business Administration college for women. Looking at the mean of the responses of each collage to know the nature of such responses one notices that Education's mean (1.59) is lower than the mean of Business Administration and college for women (2.13) which means that the latter to give more no response, which means that they feel less free to tackle such issues than College of Education.

The Shari'a and Law College were also compared by Scheffe with Business Administration College for woman. Looking at the means of each show that the Shari'a and Law is (1.40) which means that they tend to respond (yes) even more than Education, which means that they feel more freedom than College of Education.

Item (12) says; "I can assign my students to write research on thorny issues in our heritage". Looking at multiple comparison using Scheffe, one notices that the differences are between Arts and Social Sciences colleges in one hand and Business Administration and college for women in the other hand, looking at the means of the responses of each college one notices that the Administrative and college for woman has a bigger mean (2.30) than the Arts and Social Sciences (1.66) which means that the responses of the Business Administration and college for women tend to give a no answer while in Arts and Social Sciences tend give a yes answer which means the Arts and Social Sciences Colleges feel more freedom to assign such issues than Business Administration and college for women.

Item (14) says; "I can freely criticize prevailing habits and customs in the society". Looking at multiple comparisons using Scheffe shows that the differences are between colleges of Arts and Social Sciences in one hand and Education in the other. Looking at the means of their responses shows that the means of Arts and Social Sciences (1.38) which are more than the Education mean (1.04) which means that Education tends to have more (yes) answer than the other colleges, which means that they feel more freedom than Arts and Social Sciences to criticize prevailing habits and customs in the society.

Another comparison was made between Education in one hand and Business Administration and college for women. Looking at the means, it appears that Business Administration and College for women have a higher mean (1.52) than Education (1.04) which means that Education responses tend to be (yes) which means that they have more freedom to criticize the prevailing habits and customs in the society than Business Administration and College for women who tend to answer (no) to this item.

Finally, looking at the overall total of the whole questionnaire's multiple comparison using Scheffe, we can see that there are differences between Education in one hand and Business Administration and college for women in another. Also there are differences between Shari'a and Law

in one hand and Business Administration and college for women in the other hand. Looking at the means of the responses of each college one notices that the highest mean is for the Business Administration and college for woman (29.9524), next comes the mean of Education (24.5238) and the least is that of the Shari'a and Law (22.9375) which means that Colleges of Shari'a and Law have the most academic freedom in these issues related to their discussion about Arabic Islamic Heritage as discussed in this paper. This might be because of the fact that they are more equipped by the nature of their specialization to probe into these issues. College of Business Administration and College for women have the least freedom to deal with these issues, because they are not within the range of their field of specialization. The researcher noticed the responses of their questionnaire; they commented on it that it is not relevant to what they teach. College of Education tends to have some freedom at times to discuss such issues.

In a way this conclusion is not a surprising one for both of us. However in another way it is surprising. The reason for this mixed and discrepancy feeling is because when receiving the answered questionnaire and looking at them many of the faculty members of colleges of Business Administration and college for women came with comments such as " this is not applicable to our subject matters of teaching, however, despite these comments lots of these participants tried to answer the items of the questionnaire regardless of whether it is within their area of research or not.

However, what comes surprising in this piece of research is that, the most resistance we had during reviewing the questionnaire as well as the most protesting comments on the items of the questionnaire came from colleges of Shari'a and law. In addition, their criticism was the strongest and hardest. Therefore it was expected for them to be the least or at least feeling less freedom to discuss and criticize and scrutinize these issues.

Further more, the concentration of the comments on the questionnaire in general was noticed to be on items (6 and 13) about the Sahaba -the comparison of the prophet- (p.b.u.h.), therefore it was expected that some of the differences in (Gender, Nationality, Position, Years of Work) will be related to them, however, that did not happen as we have already mentioned.

Finally, it seems that religiosity amongst those who do not know much about religion scientifically make them more fearful to discuss or criticize such matters even if they are not related to religion per se and is related more to the tradition because they are afraid that both social traditions and customs are part and parcel of religion .

References

English References:

1. All one word port, C. (2000), "Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: Life Long Learning and the Implication for University Staff", in *Journal of Higher Education policy and Management*. Vol., 22, no., 1.
2. Applembaum, B. (2003), "social justice, Democratic education and the silencing of words that wound" in *journal moral education*, 32,2
3. Blair, L. (Sep. 1996) "Strategies for Dealing with Censorship in Art Education", *The Journal of the National Art Education Association*, Vol. 49, No., 5.
4. Gasman, M. (winter, 1999) "Scylla and Charybdis: Navigating the Waters of Academic Freedom at Fisk University during Charles S. Johnson's Administration" in *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4.
5. Grimes, R. L. (Summer 1996), "This May be Feud, But is not a war; An Electronic, interdisciplinary Dialogue on Teaching Native Religions", in *American Indian Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (3).
6. Heins, M. (1998), "Academic Freedom and the Internet", in *Academe*. May-June.
7. Knight, J. (2003) "The AAUP'S Censure List" *Academe*, Jan- Feb.
8. Kreiser, B.R. (1992) "AAUP perspectives on Academic Freedom and United states Intelligence Agencies" in *journal of college and university law*. 19, No., 3.
9. Mckouar, H. (1996), " University autonomy and academic freedom in Moracoo: Elements for current debates" in *Higher Education Policy*, vol., 9, No, 4.
10. O'Neil, R. M. (2005) "Academic freedom and National security in Times of crisis" in *Academe* 26 of April.
11. Post R. and Morrison, M. T. (2005) "academic freedom intifada curriculum" in *Academe* 26 of April.
12. Rand, E. (2005) "Hate Group, Big Dykes and other problems in a Academic freedom" in *Academe* 26 of April.
13. Rajagopal, B. (2005). "Academic freedom as a Human rights: an international perspective " in *Academe*. May-June.
14. Scott, J. (2002) "higher education and middle eastern studies following September 11, 2001: for presidents speak out for academic freedom" in *academe*, Nov, Dec and 26/04/2005.

15. Shattuck, J. (1992), "secrecy on campus" in *journal of college and university law*, 19, Nov,3.
16. Spieker, B. & Straughan, R. (ed. 1991). *Freedom and Indoctrination in Education: International Perspectives*; London, New York (Cassell Education Limited).
17. Stegmayer, W.J. (Nov. Dec. 2000), " protecting Academic freedom in the 21 century in social studies", *the official journal of National council for social studies*, Vol.64, no.7
18. Wilcox, Co. (1993), "world war I and the attack on professors of German at the university of Michigan" in *History of Education quarterly*, Vol. 33, No.1.

Arabic References:

1. Al-Balti, A. (2005) *Identification of Shaba by the MUhaddithin*, Riyadh: Ar -Rashid library.
2. Al-Khaleefa, H. (2004) *Al-Insaf fi ma'a waqaka'a fi Asr AR-Rashid min a AL-khilaf*. Damascus: Dar Alqalam
- 3-Al-Qaradawi, Y. (2001) *How to deal with heritage, sectarianism and differences*. Cairo: Wahba Library
4. Assawi, W. (1992) Academic freedom and related factors to it, in Egyptian and Gulf universities. College of Education: *Centre for scientific research*, Qatar University.
5. Hamada, A. (1989) a field study on Academic freedom in Kuwait University. *Journal of Education* Vol 6 (21).
- 6-Hawana, S. (1984) A dialogue on Academic freedom: Bridging the gap between theory and practice. *Educational Journal* vol 1 (1)
7. Ibn Alrabi, A. (2004) *Al Awa 'seem fi Al qawa 'seem*. Beirut: Dar Alku' tub Al Ilmiya
8. Ismael, S. (1994) Academic freedom In Arab Higher Education: Confronting challenges of the 21st century. *A paper presented at the 3rd conference on Arab Higher Education and the challenges of the 21st century*. College of Education, Kuwait University.
- 9- Qomber, M. (2001) Academic freedom in Arab Universities: Analytical comparative study on democracy and education in the Arab world. *A paper presented at the 3rd conference on Arab Higher Education and the challenges of the 21st century* Kuwait University.

-
10. Saad, A. F. (1989) "Academic freedom of faculty members in colleges of Education and its effects on their scientific production", *unpublished manuscript*.
 11. Sakran, M. (1989) Academic freedom for Egyptian University students: A field study. *Educational Bulletin*, Vol 40th year (4).

Appendix 1

First: personal background information

Please check the appropriate box:

- 1 Gender Male Female
- 2 Nationality Kuwaiti Non-Kuwaiti
- 3 Position Full Prof. Associate prof. Associate
 prof.
- 4 College Arts Social Sciences Education
- Shari'a Business
 Administration Law
- College for Women
- 5 Years of work at the university.

Second: A questionnaire of Opinion:

		Yes	No	undecided
Q1	I can critically think of our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q2	I do not find any harm in recommending my students to read books that are scientifically and objectively critical of our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3	It is possible for me to recommend books deal with issues in our Arabic Islamic heritage in a critical and objective way that differs from the prevailing thoughts in the society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4	I read books that criticize our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q5	I can freely discuss issues on our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q6	It is alright to describe the sahaba (sahaba are companions of the prophet Mohammad (p.b.u.h.); every one who saw the prophet Mohammad (p.b.u.h.) else than the 10 that were announced to go to heaven and the wives of the prophet by inconvenient qualities such as being weak or not objective?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q7	I can clarify that there are errors in our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q8	I can clearly express that studying and developing our Arabic Islamic heritage is a civilized necessity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q9	Even if my understanding of the Qur'an through mind and logic shows discrepancies with habits and customs, I can still express that understanding openly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q10	I can freely write about socio-religious controversial and thorny issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q11	I can treat controversially religious matters with a critical look with my students in the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q12	I can assign my students to write research on thorny issues in our heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q13	I can discuss with my students some of the personalities among the sahaba (sahaba are companions of the prophet Mohammad (p.b.u.h.); every one who saw the prophet Mohammad (p.b.u.h.) else than the 10 that were announced to go to heaven and the wives of the prophet in a critically objective manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q14	I can freely criticize prevailing habits and customs in the society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q15	I can set up criteria for criticizing our Arabic Islamic heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q16	I can provide evidence and proofs of almighty God's existence objectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>