The University Environment and Its Relationship to Raising the Level of Ambition and Increasing Academic Self-Motivation among Graduate Students in Jordanian Universities

Diala Ahmad Hasan Altarawneh
Jordan – Amman
Email ID: dyala.tarawneh@yahoo.com

Abstract
The current study aimed to identify the university environment and its relationship to raising the level of ambition and increasing academic self-motivation among graduate students in Jordanian universities, according to the variables of gender, specialization and academic year. The study sample consisted of (700) male and female students who were chosen by the stratified random sampling method. Three scales were applied to them: the university environment scale, the level of ambition scale, and the academic self-motivation scale. The study concluded: There is a positive and significant relationship between the dimensions of the university environment and each of the level of ambition and academic self-motivation among the study sample, and the results did not show the presence of significant differences in the level of the university environment and its dimensions due to the gender variable, or to specialization, as indicated that there are differences in the two dimensions (Educational courses, university activities and programs) and in favor of scientific disciplines, as well as the absence of significant differences for the three dimensions of the university environment (university activities and programs, societal values, satisfaction with faculty members) due to the academic year. There were differences in the total degree and the three dimensions (educational courses, university activities and programs, students) in favor of doctoral students in the fourth year. It deals with the relationship between the university environment and other psychological and cognitive variables.
Keywords: level of ambition, academic self-motivation, university environment.
DOI: 10.7176/JEP/13-18-04
Publication date: June 30th 2022

INTRODUCTION
The university is one of the important social interaction environments for students, as it plays a key role in shaping their personalities and determining their future. To adapt to the university environment with all its components. Both developed and developing countries have been keen to provide a university environment that improves and develops the cognitive, social and emotional aspects of university students, to reflect positively on academic performance and personal traits and characteristics, in an effort to prepare a generation capable of giving and production, as they are the inexhaustible oil of the state.

Higher education and its institutions have received wide attention as one of the pillars of the educational system, not only because of its position and position that occupies the highest ranks of the educational pyramid, but also because it represents the final stage in the preparation of qualified and highly trained manpower in terms of knowledge and methodology to lead community development in its holistic sense, and this was confirmed Aliyah (Avenish et al., 2002).

The level of ambition has an important role in the life of the individual, and it is one of the variables of great influence, as it plays an important role in the activity of the individual, and perhaps many of the achievements of individuals are due to the availability of the appropriate amount of the level of ambition, in addition to the availability of other factors that help in this Achievement and progress, such as: the surrounding environment, and self-efficacy because of their role in that, and this is what the study will try to discover and research in. The level of ambition is also an important sign of morale for the individual, and represents the most important dimensions of the human personality. Hobby (1930), referred to in (Abdul-Fattah, 1984), is considered the first to know the level of ambition when he made a study on the relationship of success and failure to the level of ambition, where he defined it: "It is the personal goals or objectives or what is expected of him to do in a particular task."

Self-efficacy is one of the concepts related to human achievement in various fields of life (Hamdi and Daoud, 2006). Therefore, it contributes to the achievement of the individual's goals. Through the individual's personal beliefs about his self-efficacy, he can achieve the goals he seeks to achieve, and if the individual believes that he cannot achieve his desired goals that would achieve what he seeks. He will have a greater ability to persevere, endurance and perseverance to accomplish tasks, if he enjoys high efficiency, which will make him a more tense and more self-confident individual to reach his goals (Al-Maaytah, 2000).

THE STUDY PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

The university is one of the environments that greatly affect the abilities and aspirations of students, as it plays a key role in shaping their personality and determining their future. The university is not only a place where knowledge is obtained, but is an effective educational and social institution to develop students' skills and increase their confidence in their academic abilities. On the one hand, and works to raise their level of ambition, on the other hand, through the programs and activities it offers; Because the university environment is related to achieving the ultimate goals that the university aspires to by providing the community with what it needs from qualified, experienced and skilled individuals.

Hence, this study came to reveal the relationship of the university environment in raising the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy, and therefore the problem of the study is determined by answering the following questions:

1.   Is there a statistically significant relationship at the significance level (α ≤ 0.05) for the dimensions of the university environment in the level of ambition among graduate students at the University of Jordan?

2.   Is there a statistically significant relationship at the significance level (α ≤ 0.05) for the dimensions of the university environment in the academic self-efficacy of graduate students at the University of Jordan?

3.   Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level (α ≤ 0.05) in the university environment variable due to gender, college (scientific, humanitarian) and school year?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to know the university environment and its relationship to raising the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy among graduate students at the University of Jordan, through achieving the following objectives:

1.   Identifying the relationship of the dimensions of the university environment in raising the level of ambition among graduate students at the University of Jordan.

2.   Identifying the relationship of the university environment to the academic self-efficacy of postgraduate students at the University of Jordan.

3.   Identifying the differences in the university environment according to the variables of gender, college and academic year.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The importance of the study stems from the theoretical (scientific) and practical (practical) importance, and in light of the following:

FIRST: THEORETICAL IMPORTANCE:

The importance of the study comes from the importance of its subject, and the scarcity of studies on that subject, which deal with the university environment and its relationship to raising the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy among students of the University of Jordan, and given the important role that the university plays in developing the aspects of personality among students, who are the most important segment in the society that is placed on It bears the responsibility of advancing society as a whole, and therefore the study is expected to contribute to supporting an important aspect of educational and psychological studies and research. In enriching Jordanian libraries with information.

SECOND: THE PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE:

The university stage requires that the student be in a university environment that raises the level of his ambition, and develops the individual's positive beliefs towards his potentials and capabilities, and their repercussions in achieving his goals. Therefore, the importance of this study emerges in identifying and developing the positive aspects, and identifying and addressing negative aspects in the university environment. Knowing the elements of the model university environment that must be provided, which works to raise the level of students' ambition, increase their self-confidence and their ability to perform various academic duties successfully. .

CONCEPTUAL AND PROCEDURAL TERMS

- UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT: "It is the set of circumstances surrounding the educational process at the university. It includes human and inhuman dimensions, and human dimensions include the relationships between students with each other, and between them and teachers and administrators. Non-human dimensions include curricula and courses, educational aids, and systems and regulations, buildings, lectures, scientific trips, rewards and incentives" (Al-Salih, 2004).

THE RESEARCHER DEFINES IT PROCEDURALLY: it is the degree to which the individual obtains the tool used in this study to achieve its objectives.

The level of ambition: "It is a relatively stable feature that distinguishes between individuals in reaching a certain level of achievement consistent with their psychological formation, and its frame of reference is determined according to the experiences of success and failure that they go through" (Abdel-Fattah, 2007).

And the researcher defines it procedurally: it is the degree that the individual obtains on the scale of ambition level used in this study.

-SELF-EFFICACY: is the individual's judgments and expectations about the possibility of his performance of

effective behavior in situations characterized as ambiguous and unclear, and these expectations are reflected on the individual's choice of the activities included in the performance, the efforts made, facing obstacles, and achieving the behavior. (Bandura, 1977)

-ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY: the individual's awareness of his abilities to carry out educational tasks at desirable levels (Al-Badarin and Ghaith, 2012).

And the researcher defines it procedurally: it is the degree that the individual obtains on the academic self-efficacy scale used in this study.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is defined as follows:

1. Human limits: determined by postgraduate students at the University of Jordan who are registered for the second semester of 2021/2022.
2. Time limits: the second semester of 2021/2022 AD.
3. Spatial boundaries: University of Jordan.
4. Objective limits: the study tools used (the university environment scale, the level of ambition scale, the academic self-efficacy scale).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREVIOUS STUDIES

This chapter includes a presentation of the theoretical literature related to the subject of the university environment and its relations to the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy. It also includes a presentation of previous studies that dealt with the subject of the study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREVIOUS STUDIES

UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT: The university environment has a very important role, as it helps in achieving the goals of the educational process with the least time and effort and to the fullest extent, and it has a clear impact on the students' ambition and academic abilities.

There are many definitions of the university environment by researchers, including:

Al-Miqdad, Al-Sarhan and Akharchideh (2013) define it as "the university climate in which students live and interact, and are influenced by it throughout their studies in thought and behavior, and generate positive or negative impressions and attitudes towards the educational institution to which they belong in particular, and towards society and public policy on the other hand. The university environment is shaped by the material components are represented by university buildings and modern technologies, while the human components are represented by management, activities, programs, curricula and all the means that guide students' thought and behavior to serve the objectives of the educational process and the development of thought and behavior.

ELEMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT:

There are many elements of the university environment, and these elements are:

FIRST: FOR THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION:

University administration is of great importance in the success of higher education institutions, as it is considered one of the most important elements of the university environment. There are universities that have the human capacity and sufficient funding, but they have not achieved success in overcoming the problems related to internal and external efficiency. Some universities may be the reason for the unemployment of graduates, or the university applies old regulations that do not fit with the modern era and its requirements, and thus management is a reason in the accumulation of problems rather than helping to solve them. And if the university administration represented by the departments, deanships of colleges, university councils, the university president and his assistants seeks to achieve the university's goals of teaching, scientific research and community service, they are all entrusted with managing the university and achieving its goals and promoting and developing it (Sayegh, 2007).

SECOND: THE STUDENTS

Students are the center of the educational process, and they constitute one of the important inputs to the university education system, and it depends on what skills and competencies they have on the effectiveness and efficiency of the university education system (Al-Khatib, 2001).

(Al-Ta'i, Hajim, Muhammad and Al-Abadi, 2008) identified a set of principles that must be provided in the student in order to be able to interact with the rest of the elements of the educational process to achieve the desired goals. These principles are: focus and attention, response to absorb information, class interaction, evaluation and self-evaluation, commitment In the academic and behavioral system, the comprehensiveness of the assessment and evaluation process for the student, the appropriate number of students for faculty members in one division, the availability of services provided to the student, the enhancement of students' motivation and willingness to learn, and the strengthening of the student's connection with the library.

THIRD: UNIVERSITY FACILITIES (EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND THEIR EQUIPMENT)

Typical buildings and equipment are among the important components of the university environment to create situations that call for attention to order and cleanliness, and make the student community a happy, organized life, as well as prepare the student psychologically and educationally to comprehend the curriculum, courses and

university activities in an optimal manner (Brekett, Al-Hamiri, and Al-Hazmi, 2009).

It is an effective tool for achieving quality in education, in which interaction takes place between a group of its elements, as educational buildings with their physical and moral components such as halls, ventilation, lighting, seats, sound, student clubs, gardens, and other components affect the quality of education and its outputs, and whenever they are improved The learning halls were completed, which in turn affected the students' abilities (Al-Hariri, 2010).

FOURTH: FACULTY MEMBERS : They are one of the main elements in the educational process. Their numbers and their continuous abilities to keep pace with and catch up with the latest developments in science, technology and thought constitute a main entrance to the potentials of developing university education (Kamal, 2009).

LEVEL OF ASPIRATION: The word "aspiration" is an inaccurate term used by many people, until the research of Levin and his disciples came to define the concept of ambition and conducted a lot of empirical studies and ended up defining it with the term level of aspiration. One of the dimensions of ambition (Abdel-Fattah, 2007).

The origin of the use of the term concept of ambition goes back to Levin and his theory of personality, which was known as field theory, which gives it importance in the life of the individual and society as a characteristic of personality, and ambition is linked to three main aspects: expectation, performance, and goal (Muftah, 2003).

Levin's studies showed that the level of ambition appears in the child in the early stages of life by trying to overcome difficulties, and he considered this as a sign of the level of ambition, and he says that the child's desire to do anything without the help of anyone is a stage that precedes the level of successful ambition (Abdul-Fattah, 2007).

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN AMBITIOUS INDIVIDUAL: The ambitious individual is characterized by a set of characteristics and traits that are related to his personality, and among these characteristics, as identified by (Shabeer, 2005):

• He is not content with a little, is not satisfied with his current level, and always works to advance it, that is, he does not see that his present situation is the best he can reach.

• He does not believe in luck, and does not believe that the future of man is specific and cannot be changed, and he does not leave matters to circumstances.

• He is not afraid of adventure, competition, responsibility, failure, or the unknown.

• He is not afraid, if the results of his efforts do not appear quickly.

• He endures difficulties in order to reach his goal, and believes that effort and perseverance are enough to overcome difficulties.

• Optimistic view of life, tendency towards excellence, tendency towards struggle, setting goals and plans, assuming responsibility, self-reliance, and perseverance.

Theories explaining the level of ambition:

There are many and varied theories that dealt with and explained the level of ambition, and the following is a review of some of these theories:

FIRST: LEVIN'S THEORY. Kert Levin is considered the first to explain the level of ambition and its relationship to human behavior in general, and he is the only one who was exposed to the interpretation of the level of ambition directly in field theory.).

SECOND: ADLER'S THEORY. Alfred Adler is from the Analytic School and one of Freud's disciples, but he broke away from him, and he and those with him created what is known as Neo-Analytic is. Adler considers man as a social being who is motivated by social motives in life. He has goals in his life that he seeks to achieve, bearing in mind the appreciation of societies and his various considerations. , 2004).

THIRD: ESCALONA THEORY.

Escalon presented the theory of the intrinsic value of the goal, and believes that on the basis of the intrinsic value of the goal, the choice is decided, in addition to the expected probabilities of success and failure, and the individual sets his expectations within the limits of his abilities, and this theory is based on three facts: There is a tendency among individuals to search for the level of ambition Relatively high, the tendency to make the level of ambition reach a certain limit, and the tendency to put the ambition away from the area that is too difficult and too easy (Ben Al-Tawani, 2014).

SELF-EFFICIENCY

The concept of self-efficacy is not an old concept, but rather a relatively modern concept, as it is closely related to human achievement in various fields of life. and David, 2006).

Bandura between (1977-1986) developed the concept of self-efficacy and linked it to the concept of self-control of behavior through social learning theory. issued by individuals in terms of the level and content of this behavior (Bandura, 1986).

DIMENSIONS OF SELF-EFFICACY:

Bandura (1977) identified three dimensions according to which self-efficacy changes:

1. **MAGNITUDE:** It varies according to the nature or difficulty of the situation, and the amount of effectiveness becomes clearer when the tasks are arranged according to the level of difficulty and the differences between individuals in the expectations of effectiveness, and it can be identified with similar simple tasks, and medium difficulty, but they require a hard level of performance in most of them.

2. GENERALITY : By it, we mean the transfer of expectations of effectiveness to similar situations, that is, the individual's impressions of a feeling of effectiveness are more generalized to situations similar to the situation to which the individual was previously exposed. Expectations also differ according to a number of dimensions, such as: degrees of similarity and the ways in which they express behavioral, cognitive, and emotional capabilities or abilities, and through descriptive explanations of situations, and the characteristics of a person related to directed behavior.

3. STRENGTH: It is determined in light of the individual's experience and its suitability for the situation, and that the individual who has high expectations can persevere in work, and make more effort in the face of previous experiences.

FACTORS AFFECTING SELF-EFFICACY:
The factors affecting self-efficacy have been categorized into three groups:

THE FIRST GROUP: PERSONAL EFFECTS: The awareness of self-efficacy among students in this group depends on four personal influences, which were mentioned (Salem, 2008) as follows:

a. Acquired knowledge: according to the psychological field of each of them.

B. Metacognition: It is what determines the self-regulation of learners.

C. Objectives: Students who rely on long-term goals or use metacognitive stress processes were said to rely on their self-efficacy awareness, influences, and self-organized knowledge.

D. Subjective influences: These include the individual's anxiety, motivation, level of ambition, and personal goals.

THE SECOND GROUP: BEHAVIORAL INFLUENCES AND INCLUDES THREE STAGES:

a. Self-observation: The individual's observation of himself may provide him with information about his progress towards achieving a goal.

B. Self-judgment: It means the students' response that includes a systematic comparison of their performance with the goals to be achieved, and this depends on the self-efficacy and the structure of the goal.

c. The self-reaction that contains three responses are:

1. Behavioral reactions, in which a qualitative educational response is sought.

2. Personal self-reactions, in which they seek to raise their strategy during the learning process.

3. Environmental subjective reactions, in which students search for the most appropriate conditions for the learning process.

PREVIOUS STUDIES
This part includes a presentation of previous studies related to the subject and variables of the study that were reached after referring to various sources of knowledge such as refereed journals, master's and doctoral theses, research and scientific studies. The following is a presentation of the previous studies according to the chronology of the studies:

Bain Al-Aswad (2019) in a study aimed at identifying the role of the university in developing the academic ambition of its students towards excellence, as well as identifying the essential differences attributed to the university variable, gender, academic level, and academic specialization. The study sample consisted of (272) male and female students from Al-Azhar University and Al-Quds Open University in Gaza, and the researcher used a questionnaire about the role of the university in developing the academic ambition of its students towards excellence. Statistically significant differences in academic compatibility for both sexes, in favor of females, while the study confirmed the absence of significant differences in the role of the university in developing the academic ambition of its students towards excellence due to each of the variables: academic level and academic specialization.

As for the Al-Shadhouh study (2020), which aimed to identify the degree of satisfaction of Jerash University students with the university environment available there, within three areas: faculty member, library, admission and registration. In this study, a questionnaire consisting of (33) items were used, divided into (3) fields, and the study sample consisted of (150) male and female students distributed in the humanities and scientific faculties, and who are enrolled in the study for the first semester of the academic year 2010/2011. The results of the study showed the degree of satisfaction of Jerash University students with the study sample about the university environment available in it was moderate, and the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of Jerash University students' satisfaction with the university environment available in it due to the variable of sex. The results of the study also showed the presence of statistically significant differences The satisfaction of Jerash University students with the university environment available in it is due to the college variable (humanity, science) and in favor of the humanities colleges.

In the study (Al-Miqdad, Al-Sarhan and AkhuErsheeda, 2020), which aimed to demonstrate the impact of

the university environment on the thought and behavior of students in universities. To achieve this, the researchers built a questionnaire and distributed it to the sample, and its number was (866) male and female students. The results showed that there are statistically significant differences in most aspects that affect the students' thinking and behavior, related to the humanities faculties. In general, the results were positive, but they were higher for students of the University of Jordan compared to Al al-Bayt University. The study also proved the hypothesis on which it was based on the existence of a positive relationship in the scientific means and the general conditions employed by universities - as educational institutions - and between the development of students' civic culture and the ability, therefore, for their community interaction.

COMMENTING ON PREVIOUS STUDIES

It is clear from the review of previous studies that the current study is distinguished from previous studies by the following:

1. It is the only study that examined the university environment and its implications for raising the level of academic ambition and self-efficacy among graduate students at the University of Jordan.

2. The current study was distinguished from previous studies in its attempt to investigate the relationship of the dimensions of the university environment (educational courses, activities, university programs, educational climate, and finally the student dimension) with the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy among graduate students at the University of Jordan, as none of the previous studies were exposed to Such a relationship, specifically with its association with the level of ambition and academic self-efficacy.

3. Also, the current study is distinguished from previous studies in its treatment of gender, academic level and college as a variable in the study.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter deals with a description of the procedures followed by the researcher in carrying out this research, including the definition of the study's curriculum, description of the study population, identification of the study sample, and study tools used for all data and to ensure its validity and reliability, and a statement of the study's procedures, and statistical methods that were used in treating the results, as follows:

STUDY APPROACH

The survey descriptive research method was used, where the desk survey was conducted and the theoretical and field studies and research were reviewed, in order to crystallize the foundations and premises on which the subject of the study is based, as well as review the previous studies, which formed a mainstay for the study and its axes and dimensions. As for the field research, the exploratory survey was conducted, and all the data obtained through the study tools were analyzed.

STUDY COMMUNITY

The study population consisted of all postgraduate students at the University of Jordan, who numbered (2156) male and female, including (914) male and (1242) female students, according to the university admission and registration statistics for the academic year 2021/2022, and table (1) shows the distribution of the study population according to Gender and specialization. The analytical descriptive research method was used.

TABLE (1): DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY COMMUNITY MEMBERS ACCORDING TO GENDER AND SPECIALIZATION.

Variable	Variable Level	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	914	%43
	Female	1242	%57
Total		2156	%100
Specialization	Scientific	643	%30
	Humanity	1513	%70
Total		2156	%100

THE STUDY SAMPLE

The sample was selected using a stratified cluster random sampling method from the study population according to specialization and gender, where (700) copies of the scales were distributed, which constituted (32%) of the study population, and (685) copies were retrieved from them with a loss of (15) copies, and it was found that there were (7) copies.) Copies are not valid for analysis, and thus the number of members of the studied sample became (678) male and female students, and Table (2) shows the distribution of the study sample members by gender and specialization:

TABLE (2): DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY COMMUNITY MEMBERS BY GENDER AND SPECIALIZATION.

Variable	Variable Level	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	320	%47
	Female	340	%53
Total		700	%100
Specialization	Scientific	270	%40
	Humanity	410	%60
Total		700	%100

STUDY TOOLS

To collect data to answer the study questions, the following tools were used:

FIRST: THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE: The scale was developed by reviewing the theoretical literature, previous studies and a number of scales (Al-Kreeb, 2012; Al-Kharsha, 2014; Al-Miqdad, Al-Sarhan and Brother Ersheida, 2020). The scale consists of (43) items distributed over six dimensions:

1- Educational courses: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (1-5).

2- University activities and programs: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (6-11).

3- The educational climate: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (12-19).

4- The student: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (20-26).

5- Societal values: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (27-31).

6- Satisfaction with the faculty members: represented by the paragraphs with numbers (32-43).

THE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE WERE VERIFIED

THE VALIDITY OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

The significance of the scale's validity was verified in two ways: the first was by using the arbitrators' sincerity, by presenting the scale to (10) professors of Jordanian universities specializing in educational sciences. Two paragraphs with numbers (4, 12, 29, 44) were deleted. It became composed of (43) paragraphs. As for the second method, the validity of the scale was verified using the internal consistency validity by calculating the correlation between the degree of the paragraph and the degree on the dimension to which it belongs and the overall dimension, where The scale was applied to an exploratory sample consisting of (79) male and female students who were randomly selected from two divisions of the university's divisions, one for science and the other for humanity, from outside the study sample and from within its community. Table (3) shows this:

TABLE (3): THE VALIDITY OF THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE.

Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient
1	.699**	12	.685**	23	.792**	34	.796**
2	.619**	13	.717**	24	.738**	35	.716**
3	.647**	14	.737**	25	.567**	36	.489**
4	.693**	15	.604**	26	.636**	37	.638**
5	.729**	16	.732**	27	.626**	38	.538**
6	.790**	17	.642**	28	.606**	39	.605**
7	.616**	18	.736**	29	.721**	40	.469**
8	.728**	19	.740**	30	.794**	41	.350**
9	.764**	20	.616**	31	.577**	42	.386**
10	.733**	21	.608**	32	.605**	43	.304**
11	.541**	22	.710**	33	.631**		

** Means a function at the level ($\alpha \leq 0.01$).

It is evident from Table (3) that the university environment scale achieved suitable construction validity coefficients, which ranged between (0.304-0.794).

THE STABILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

The significance of the scale's stability was verified in two ways: the first was by using the Test Retest, the scale was applied to the exploratory sample (n = 79), and the students' scores were monitored on it, then it was re-applied to the same exploratory sample members after (16) days of application First, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the students' scores on the scale between the two times of application, and the scale's stability was also calculated using the Cronbach's alpha equation for internal consistency on the same exploratory sample, and Table (4) shows the reliability coefficients:

TABLE (4): STABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

The dimension	Replay	Cronbach Alpha
educational courses	0.77	0.76
University activities and programs	0.75	0.79
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	0.83	0.85
Student	0.77	0.79
societal values	0.81	0.80
Satisfaction with the faculty	0.74	0.79
Total	0.90	0.93

It is evident from Table (4) that suitable stability coefficients were achieved for the university environment scale, where the repetition stability coefficient reached (0.90) for the total and the dimensions ranged between (0.75-0.83). Also, Cronbach's alpha coefficient reached (0.93) for the kidneys and the dimensions ranged between (0.76-0.85).

SECOND: AMBITION LEVEL SCALE:

The researcher developed a tool to measure the level of ambition after referring to a number of standards that dealt with measuring the level of ambition (Al-Shaqour, 2012; Al-Khatatna, 2012). Some items were selected from each scale after being modified and reformulated to suit the objectives of this study, and the scale in its final form may consist of (28) items.

AMBITION LEVEL SCALE

The significance of the scale's validity was verified in two ways: the first was by using the arbitrators' sincerity, by presenting the scale to (10) professors of Jordanian universities specializing in educational sciences. The scale was modified in the light of their suggestions and opinions, and the scale was modified in the light of their suggestions and opinions. In its final form, it consisted of (28) items. As for the second method, the validity of the scale was verified using the internal consistency validity by calculating the correlation between the paragraph's degree and the total score on the scale on an exploratory sample of (79) male and female students who were chosen randomly from within the community and from outside the study sample, and Table (5) shows the correlation coefficients:

TABLE (5): THE VALIDITY OF THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE LEVEL OF AMBITION SCALE

Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient
1	.313**	8	.664**	15	.417**	22	.570**
2	.318**	9	.566**	16	.373**	23	.612**
3	.344**	10	.714**	17	.564**	24	.383**
4	.555**	11	.573**	18	.446**	25	.574**
5	.665**	12	.640**	19	.471**	26	.482**
6	-.333**	13	-.397**	20	-.338**	27	.344**
7	.673**	14	.662**	21	.429**	28	-.363**

** Means a function at ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) level.

It is evident from Table (5) that suitable construction validity coefficients were achieved for the level of ambition scale, which ranged between (0.313-0.714).

THE STABILITY OF THE LEVEL OF AMBITION SCALE

The significance of the scale's stability was verified in two ways: the first was by using the Test Retest, where the scale was applied to the exploratory sample (n = 79), then the students' scores were monitored on it, and then it was re-applied to the same exploratory sample members after (16) days of application First, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the students' scores on the scale between the two times of the application, and it amounted to (0.81), and the stability of the scale was also calculated using the Cronbach's alpha equation for internal consistency on the exploratory sample, and the stability coefficient calculated in this way was (0.83).

THIRD: ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY MEASURE

The academic self-efficacy scale was used to measure the academic self-efficacy of Mutah University students, which was developed by (Al-Badarin and Ghaith, 2012) with reference to the previous literature related to the subject of academic self-efficacy, where the scale consisted of (33) items, which were presented to a panel of arbitrators. From the teaching staff at the University of Jordan and the Hashemite University in order to ensure the relevance and comprehensiveness of the paragraphs to measure the academic self-efficacy of the students of the Hashemite University in a sound and easy language that expresses what was designed to be measured by the arbitrators.

To verify the scale's stability, it was applied to a survey sample consisting of (45) male and female students from

the community and from outside the study sample. The tool was applied to the same sample two weeks later, then according to the correlation coefficient between the two applications, which amounted to (0.85) and this ratio was considered acceptable for the purposes of those the study.

To achieve the purposes of the current study, this scale was used, and the validity and reliability of the scale were also conducted, and the following is an explanation of that:

The validity of the academic self-efficacy measure in the current study

The indications of the validity of the scale were verified in two ways: The first was by using the validity of the arbitrators, by presenting the scale to (10) professors of Jordanian universities specializing in educational sciences. (29, 20, 11, 32, 33) became composed of (28) paragraphs. As for the second method, the validity of the scale was verified using the validity of the internal consistency by calculating the correlation between the degree of the paragraph and the total score on the scale on a survey sample of (79) male and female students who were randomly selected from within the community and from outside the study sample. Table (6) shows the correlation coefficients:

TABLE (6): THE VALIDITY OF THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient
1	.420**	8	.633**	15	.702**	22	.685**
2	.611**	9	.715**	16	.546**	23	.738**
3	.422**	10	.693**	17	.673**	24	.544**
4	.626**	11	.707**	18	.722**	25	.656**
5	.637**	12	.684**	19	.782**	26	.581**
6	.689**	13	.710**	20	.750**	27	.527**
7	.662**	14	.709**	21	.642**	28	.763**

** Means a function at ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) level.

It is evident from Table (6) that the academic self-efficacy scale achieved suitable construction validity coefficients, which ranged between (0.420-0.782).

The stability of the academic self-efficacy scale in the current study

The significance of the scale's stability was verified in two ways: the first was by using the Test Retest, where the scale was applied to the exploratory sample (n = 79), then the students' scores were monitored on it, and then it was re-applied to the same exploratory sample members after (16) days of application First, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the students' scores on the scale between the two times of application, and it amounted to (0.89), and the scale's stability was also calculated using the Cronbach's alpha equation for internal consistency on the same exploratory sample, and the stability coefficient calculated by this method was (0.93).

STUDY APPLICATION PROCEDURES

1.The scales were developed, and their validity and reliability indications were verified.

2.Approvals were obtained to implement the study from the competent authorities.

3.The scales were applied in the study to a sample of students in the form of a people, and in the presence of the researcher to distribute the scales, read the instructions and clarify them, and to answer the students' inquiries regarding the scales items used in the study, and to clarify the purpose of the study and that their answers will be treated with complete confidentiality and that this information will be Use for scientific research purposes only.

4.The data was unloaded on the statistical analysis program (spss) and the results were extracted and discussed to come up with the appropriate recommendations.

STATISTICAL PROCESSORS

The following statistics were used:

1.Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis.

2.Regression analysis.

3.Arithmetic means and standard deviations.

4.(t) test for independent samples.

5.Unilateral (f) test.

STUDY RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the results of the study, its discussion and recommendations.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:

Is there a statistically significant relationship at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) to distance the university environment in the level of ambition among graduate students at the University of Jordan?

To answer the study question, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the students' responses on the university environment scale and their grades on the level of ambition scale, and the table (7) shows that:

TABLE (7): PEARSON'S CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES ON THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND THEIR SCORES ON THE LEVEL OF AMBITION SCALE

Level of ambition	
Educational courses	.394**
University activities and programs	.390**
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	.413**
Student	.393**
Societal values	.403**
Satisfaction with the faculty	.400**

** Means a function at ($\alpha \leq 0.01$) level.

Table (7) shows that there is a positive, statistically significant relationship at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the level of ambition scale, where the value of the highest correlation coefficient was between the dimension (organizational climate (university facilities)). The level of ambition is equal to (0.413), and the lowest correlation coefficient between the dimension (university activities and programs) and the level of ambition has a correlation coefficient of (0.390).

Multiple regression analysis was also used between the students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the ambition level scale, and the table (8) shows that:

TABLE (8): RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES ON THE DIMENSIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND THEIR SCORES ON THE LEVEL OF AMBITION SCALE

The dimension	correlation coefficient	coefficient of determination R2	B	standard error	Beta	Calculated T	T significance level
Constant educational courses	0.507	0.257	1.230	.107		11.509	.000
			.091	.028	.137	3.260	.001
University activities and programs			.070	.031	.100	2.244	.025
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)			.070	.033	.102	2.113	.035
Student			.074	.034	.100	2.198	.028
societal values			.057	.028	.094	2.005	.045
Satisfaction with the faculty			.097	.038	.116	2.523	.012

Table (8) shows that the dimensions of the university environment variable have collectively explained an amount of (25.7%) of the total variance in the variable level of ambition among graduate students at the University of Jordan.

The results indicated the existence of a positive, statistically significant relationship between students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the scale of ambition, as the interest in the elements of the university environment leads to an open university climate, which helps the university to perform its desired mission, and to provide a university environment based on creativity. , which raises the level of students' appreciation of the university, and thus leads them to give and belong to it, which in turn affects the motivation for achievement and raise the level of ambition among students. (Antes, 1972) indicated that there is a positive correlation between the life elements that affect the student's life, including the learning environment and the level of ambition.

RESULTS RELATED TO THE SECOND QUESTION:
IS THERE A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP AT THE SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL (A≤0.05) TO REMOVE THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT IN THE ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY OF POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN?

To answer the study question, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the students' responses on the university environment scale and their scores on the academic self-efficacy scale, and the table (9) shows that:

TABLE (9): PEARSON'S CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES ON THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND THEIR SCORES ON THE ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Academic self-efficacy	
Educational courses	.412**
University activities and programs	.443**
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	.539**
Student	.465**
Societal values	.463**
Satisfaction with the faculty	.455**

** Means a function at (α≤0.01) level.

Table (9) shows that there is a positive statistically significant relationship at the significance level (α≤0.05) between the students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the academic self-efficacy scale, where the value of the highest correlation coefficient was between the dimension (organizational climate (university facilities)) and academic self-efficacy equal to (0.539), and the lowest correlation coefficient between the dimension (educational courses) and academic self-efficacy with a correlation coefficient of (0.412).

Multiple regression analysis was also used between the students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the academic self-efficacy scale. Table (10) shows that:

TABLE (10): RESULTS OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN STUDENTS' SCORES ON THE DIMENSIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND THEIR SCORES ON THE ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Table (10) shows that the dimensions of the university environment variable have collectively explained an

The dimension	correlation coefficient	coefficient of determination R2	B	standard error	Beta	Calculated T	T significance level
Constant	0.601	0.364	.538	.136		3.958	.000
educational courses			.070	.035	.078	1.986	.047
University activities and programs			.080	.040	.083	2.002	.046
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)			.249	.042	.264	5.890	.000
requester			.123	.043	.121	2.855	.004
societal values			.089	.036	.107	2.452	.014
Satisfaction with the faculty			.110	.049	.096	2.246	.025

amount of (36.1%) of the total variance in the academic self-efficacy variable among graduate students at the University of Jordan.

The results indicated that there is a positive, statistically significant relationship between students' scores on the dimensions of the university environment scale and their scores on the academic self-efficacy scale. The university, according to Bandura's theory, the view of human function and according to the central role of cognitive and alternative processes, processes of self-regulation and self-reflection, in human adaptation and change; Who views it as self-regulation as an effective and tidy self instead of viewing it as an object that produces reactions to the environmental force that constitutes behavior or the internal tendencies that motivate those reactions. The concept of mutual determinism is formed from personal factors (cognitive, emotional, biological events), behavior and influences, and the nature of the mutual determinants of the environmental function, which interact and produce in the above-mentioned triple reciprocity, where mutual determinism sees that environmental and cognitive events affect each other, and the university environment provides Appropriate and responsive leads to a higher level of self-efficacy. This result is consistent with the study (Al-Miqdad, Al-Sarhan, and Akhou Ersheeda, 2020), which indicated that there is an impact of the university environment on the thought and behavior of students in universities.

RESULTS RELATED TO THE THIRD QUESTION:
ARE THERE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AT THE SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL (A≤0.05) IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT VARIABLE DUE TO GENDER, COLLEGE (SCIENTIFIC, HUMANITARIAN) AND SCHOOL YEAR?
To answer the question, the following was done:
FIRST, WITH REGARD TO GENDER.
The t-test for independent samples was used as shown in Table (11):

TABLE (11): RESULTS OF THE INDEPENDENT T-TEST FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT AND ITS DIMENSIONS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN ACCORDING TO GENDER

The dimension	Gender	Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard Deviation	Freedom degree	T Value	Significance
educational courses	Male	319	3.45	.76		1.434	.152
	Female	359	3.37	.73			
University activities and programs	Male	319	3.53	.75		.958	.338
	Female	359	3.47	.65			
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	Male	319	3.41	.74		1.689	.092
	Female	359	3.32	.69	678		
Student	Male	319	3.20	.67		1.142	.254
	Female	359	3.14	.65			
societal values	Male	319	3.39	.82		.444	.657
	Female	359	3.36	.81			
Satisfaction with the faculty	Male	319	3.34	.63		.495	.621
	Female	359	3.32	.55			
Total	Male	319	3.38	.57		1.280	.201
	Female	359	3.32	.51			

It is evident from Table (11) that the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α≤0.05) in the university environment and its dimensions among Mutah University students due to gender, where the value of (T) for the total = (1.280).

This result indicates that the university has succeeded in providing courses, programs, activities, methods, teaching methods, and facilities for students without prejudice to either sex, as it cares for female students alike. It may also be attributed to the fact that the university climate is the same for male and female students, whether in the academic, administrative or service fields. Students live the same conditions and are provided with the same services and are treated with the same standard in all university departments, where the university considers the student as a student, not the student as male. or female.

This result is consistent with the study of Al-Shadhouh (2020), which showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of Jerash University students' satisfaction with the university environment available in it due to the gender variable.

SECOND, FOR SPECIALIZATION.
An independent t-test was used as shown in Table (12):

TABLE (12): RESULTS OF THE INDEPENDENT T-TEST FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT AND ITS DIMENSIONS AMONG GRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN AND ITS DIMENSIONS AMONG STUDENTS ACCORDING TO SPECIALIZATION

The dimension	Specialization	Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard Deviation	Freedom degree	T Value	Significance
educational courses	scientific	269	3.32	.81		-2.423	.016
	Humanitarian	409	3.46	.69			
University activities and programs	scientific	269	3.42	.73		-2.292	.022
	Humanitarian	409	3.55	.67			
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	scientific	269	3.34	.78		-.813	.417
	Humanitarian	409	3.38	.67	678		
Student	scientific	269	3.16	.69		-.354	.723
	Humanitarian	409	3.17	.65			
societal values	scientific	269	3.32	.85		-1.298	.195
	Humanitarian	409	3.41	.79			
Satisfaction with the faculty	scientific	269	3.29	.63		-1.602	.110
	Humanitarian	409	3.36	.56			
Total	scientific	269	3.30	.59		-1.793	.073
	Humanitarian	409	3.38	.50			

It is evident from Table (12) that the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the university environment among the students of the University of Jordan due to specialization, where the value of (T) = (-1.793) for the kidneys. For the dimensions (organizational climate (university facilities), student, societal values, satisfaction with faculty members) where the values

of (T) = (-0.813, -0.354, -1.298, -1.602), respectively, showing that there are differences in the two dimensions (-0.813, -0.354, -1.298, -1.602) Educational courses, university activities and programs) are attributed to the specialization, where the values   of (T) = (-2.423, -2.292) are in favor of those with humanitarian specializations. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the university environment and its exclusion (organizational climate (university facilities), student, societal values, satisfaction with faculty members) among graduate students at the University of Jordan due to specialization, and this may be attributed to the fact that students in colleges Scientific and humanitarian people live in similar university environmental conditions. The university directs its services and assistance regardless of specialization, and deals with the student regardless of his specialization. They also deal with faculty members from the same Jordanian environment, and provide them with the same services, and similar conditions are provided for both specializations.

As for the existence of differences in the two dimensions (educational courses, activities and university programs), and the differences may be attributed to the nature of the subjects being taught in terms of their difficulty. Students in scientific disciplines study courses different from those of students of humanities colleges, which require higher and greater capabilities. And it needs more effort, and it also requires the provision of scientific laboratories, which distinguishes these disciplines from humanity; The devices and equipment are modest, and most of them are old and unsophisticated; As a result of the financial conditions of Mutah University in particular and all Jordanian universities in general, and the programs and activities directed by the university differ between the two majors, the nature of the specialization requires specific activities and programs, and it is often difficult to provide this in practical majors as opposed to humanitarian majors.

THIRD: FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR

To answer the question of the study, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the students' responses were calculated on the scale of the university environment and its dimensions according to the academic year, and the table (13) shows that:

TABLE (13): ARITHMETIC MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENTS' RESPONSES ON THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND ITS DIMENSIONS ACCORDING TO THE ACADEMIC YEAR

Educational Level		educational courses	University activities and programs	University facilities	Student	societal values	Satisfaction with the faculty	Total
First	Arithmetic Average	3.24	3.47	3.24	3.05	3.31	3.28	3.26
	Number	183	183	183	183	183	183	183
	Standard Deviation	.74	.72	.78	.63	.83	.58	.55
Second	Arithmetic Average	3.45	3.46	3.29	3.20	3.33	3.36	3.34
	Number	206	206	206	206	206	206	206
	Standard Deviation	.75	.73	.70	.66	.74	.62	.55
Third	Arithmetic Average	3.46	3.49	3.43	3.18	3.40	3.31	3.36
	Number	184	184	184	184	184	184	184
	Standard Deviation	.76	.68	.67	.67	.82	.56	.52
Fourth	Arithmetic Average	3.53	3.64	3.60	3.29	3.53	3.42	3.49
	Number	105	105	105	105	105	105	105
	Standard Deviation	.65	.64	.66	.69	.90	.58	.50

For the dimensions (organizational climate (university facilities), student, social values, satisfaction with faculty members) where the values   of (T) = (-0.813, -0.354, -1.298, -1.602), respectively, showing that there are differences in the two dimensions (-0.813, -0.354, -1.298, -1.602) Educational courses, university activities and programs) are attributed to the specialization, where the values   of (T) = (-2.423, -2.292) are in favor of those with humanitarian specializations. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the university environment and its exclusion (organizational climate (university facilities), student, social values, satisfaction with faculty members) among graduate students at the University of Jordan due to specialization, and this may be attributed to the fact that students in colleges Scientific and humanitarian people live in similar university environmental conditions. The university directs its services and assistance regardless of specialization, and deals with the student regardless of his specialization. They also deal with faculty members from the same Jordanian environment, and provide them with the same services, and similar conditions are provided for both specializations.

As for the existence of differences in the two dimensions (educational courses, activities and university programs), and the differences may be attributed to the nature of the subjects being taught in terms of their difficulty. Students in scientific disciplines study courses different from those of students of humanities colleges, which require higher and greater capabilities. And it needs more effort, and it also requires the provision of scientific laboratories, which distinguishes these disciplines from humanity; The devices and equipment are modest, and most of them are old and unsophisticated; As a result of the financial conditions of Mutah University in particular and all Jordanian universities in general, and the programs and activities directed by the university differ between the two majors, the nature of the specialization requires specific activities and programs, and it is often difficult to provide this in practical majors as opposed to humanitarian majors.

THIRD: FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR

To answer the question of the study, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the students' responses were calculated on the scale of the university environment and its dimensions according to the academic year, and the table (13) shows that:

TABLE (14): ARITHMETIC MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENTS' RESPONSES ON THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALE AND ITS DIMENSIONS ACCORDING TO THE ACADEMIC YEAR

The dimension	Contrast source	sum of squares	degree of freedom	mean squares	F value	Significance
educational courses	Between groups	7.224	3	2.408	4.407	.004
	The error	368.286	676	.546		
	Total	375.510	679			
University activities and programs	Between groups	2.650	3	.883	1.799	.146
	The error	331.044	676	.491		
	Total	333.694	679			
Organizational Climate (University Facilities)	Between groups	10.365	3	3.455	6.860	.000
	The error	339.439	676	.504		
	Total	349.804	679			
Student	Between groups	4.332	3	1.444	3.297	.020
	The error	295.207	676	.438		
	Total	299.539	679			
societal values	Between groups	3.759	3	1.253	1.888	.130
	The error	447.284	676	.664		
	Total	451.043	679			
Satisfaction with the faculty	Between groups	1.625	3	.542	1.558	.198
	The error	234.318	676	.348		
	Total	235.942	679			
total	Between groups	3.499	3	1.166	4.052	.007
	The error	193.989	676	.288		
	Total	197.488	679			

Table (14) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the arithmetic averages of the three dimensions of the university environment (university activities and programs, societal values, satisfaction with faculty members) among graduate students at the University of Jordan due to the academic year , where the values of (F) = (1.799, 1.888, 1.558), respectively, while it was found that there were differences in the total degree and the three dimensions (educational courses, university activities and programs, the student), where the value of (F) = (4.052), And for the dimensions (4.407, 6.860, 3.297), respectively, the Scheffe test was used for dimensional comparisons in order to find out in favor of which of the years these differences are due, and Table (15) shows the results of the Scheffe test.

TABLE (15): RESULTS OF A SATISFACTORY TEST FOR DIMENSIONAL COMPARISONS OF THE DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCES IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT AMONG GRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN ACCORDING TO THE ACADEMIC YEAR

The dimension	Year (a)	Year (b)	mean difference	Error	Level of Significance
educational courses	First	Second	-.20179	.07509	.066
		Third	-.21497	.07717	.052
		Fourth	-.28472*	.09050	.020
	Second	Third	-.01318	.07498	.999
		Fourth	-.08292	.08864	.831
	Third	Fourth	-.06974	.09041	.898
University activities and programs	First	Second	.01566	.07119	.997
		Third	-.01735	.07317	.997
		Fourth	-.16927	.08580	.274
	Second	Third	-.03301	.07109	.975
		Fourth	-.18493	.08404	.185
	Third	Fourth	-.15192	.08572	.371
Student	First	Second	-.15462	.06723	.153
		Third	-.12783	.06909	.332
		Fourth	-.23711*	.08102	.036
	Second	Third	.02678	.06713	.984
		Fourth	-.08250	.07936	.782
	Third	Fourth	-.10928	.08094	.610
Total	First	Second	-.07970	.05450	.544
		Third	-.10196	.05601	.346
		Fourth	-.22712*	.06568	.008
	Second	Third	-.02227	.05442	.983
		Fourth	-.14742	.06433	.155
	Third	Fourth	-.12516	.06562	.304

* Means a statistical function at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

It is clear from table (15) that the differences were statistically significant in the university environment and its three dimensions (educational courses, university activities and programs, students) between first-year students and fourth-year students, and in favor of fourth-year students.

This may be due to the presence of shortcomings in the university's activities offered to first-year students, as new students face the problems of moving from secondary school life to a new life, and from a narrow school environment to a more spacious university environment, which creates difficulties and problems in adaptation, and these students did not They get used to university courses and teaching methods in them. At school, you want to have a textbook with information and it is the reference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BASED ON THE FINDINGS, THE FOLLOWING CAN BE RECOMMENDED:

1. Deepening the understanding of the faculty and administrative staff of the content of the university's vision and mission, and linking the activities, programs, curricula and all elements of the university environment to this vision and mission.
2. Those responsible for the university's policy should pay attention to developing appropriate programmes, activities and solutions to alleviate the suffering of students, especially first-year graduate students.
3. Conducting studies dealing with the relationship between the university environment and other psychological and cognitive variables.

REFERENCES:

Black, Fayez Ali. (2019). The role of the university in developing the academic ambition of its students towards excellence. *Journal of Al-Azhar University in Gaza*, Human Sciences Series, Vol. 11, p.

Afneesh, Ahmad and Faluqi, Muhammad and Al-Shaibani, Omar and Shaqaliyah, Al-Aman and Bahamy, Al-Sagheer and Abu Said, Fawzi (2002). Higher education in Libya, Libya, Tripoli, **the national environment for scientific research.**

Al-Badarin, Ghaleb and Ghaith, Souad (2013). Parenting styles, identity styles, and academic adaptation as predictors of academic self-efficacy among Hashemite University students, **Jordan Journal of Educational Sciences**, Vol. 9, p. 1, p. 65-87.

Brigitte, Akram and Al-Hukiri, Abdel-Qader and Al-Hazmi, Muhammad (2009). **Elements of an attractive**

university environment. Taibah University, Saudi Arabia.

Ben Touati, Khaira (2014). The relationship between emotional balance and the level of ambition of the university student at the University of KasdiMerbah in Bouargla. **A magister message that is not published**. KasdiMerbah University, Ouargla, Algeria.

Hariri, Rafida (2010). **Leadership Quality Management in Higher Education**. Jordan, Amman: House of Culture for Publishing and Distribution.

Al-Kharsha, Dalal (2012). The degree of availability of the elements of a typical university environment at Mutah University from the viewpoint of the faculty members. **Unpublished Master's Thesis,**Mutah University, Karak, Jordan.

Al-Zeyoudi, Majid (2007). Perceptions of university youth in Jordan to the degree to which the university environment contributes to shaping their attitudes and values   in light of globalization and information. **Journal of the Association of Arab Universities for Education and Psychology,** 5(1), 81-144.

Shabeer, Tawfiq (2005). The level of ambition and its relationship to some variables in light of the prevailing culture among students of the Islamic University of Gaza. **Unpublished Master's Thesis**, The Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine.

Al-Shadouh, Walid (2012). The degree of satisfaction of Jerash University students with the university environment. **Journal of the Association of Arab Universities,** No. 61, 281-303.

Al-Salih, Musleh (2004). **Academic achievement factors at university levels**. Jordan, Amman: Al-Warraq Establishment for Publishing and Distribution.

Al-Taie, Youssef and Hajim, Al-Abadi and Muhammad, Fawzi and Al-Abadi, Hashem (2008). **Total Quality Management in University Education**. Jordan, Amman: Al-Warraq Establishment for Publishing and Distribution.

Abdel Fattah, Camelia (2007). **Level of ambition and personality.** Riyadh, Dar Al-Zahra.

Kamal, Marwan (2009). University education in Jordan: basic features. **Journal of Scientific Research**, Higher Education Profile in Jordan, 1(3), 22-35.

Al-Maraziq, Imad (2010). The level of ambition, self-efficacy and emotional intelligence as predictors of social adjustment among students of Jerash Private University. **Unpublished master's thesis**, Yarmouk University. Irbid, Jordan.

Muftah, Ali (2003). **The level and quality of ambition among some groups of Egyptian society** (a comparative correlative study). Annals of the Etiquette of Ain Shams. (31), (105-155).

Miqdad, Muhammad and Sarhan, Sayel and Ersheeda's brother, Hani (2020). The impact of the university environment on the civil culture of students: Al al-Bayt University and the University of Jordan. **Journal of the University of Jordan for Humanities and Social Sciences**, Vol. 40, Vol. 1, pp. 82-105.

Jacob, Nafez (2010). Perceived self-efficacy and its relationship to achievement motivation and academic achievement among students of faculties of King Khalid University in Bisha (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**). Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences**, 13(3): 72-89.

Al-Maaytah, Khalil. (2000). **Social Psychology**, Amman: Dar Al-Fikr.

Salem, Rebekah Khalaf. (2008). The relationship of self-efficacy and the academic stream to the motive of academic achievement among the female students of Ajloun University College. **Research published in the Journal of Educational and Psychological Research**, No. 23.

Bandura, A. (1977). **Self – efficacy toward a unifying theory of behavioral change**. Psychological Review. 84. 191. 215.

Bandura, A.(1997). Self-Efficacy, **The exercise of Control**. Stanford University. New York, W.H.Freeman and company