

\*

:

:

:

( )

(0.05= $\alpha$ )

:

.( )  
(104)

(38)

: (3 -Way Anova)

( )

-

( )

-

:

---

\*

.2014/4/17 :

.2012/7/16 :

.2015

©

---

...

---

## **The Level of Effective Teaching among Teachers of Shobak Directorate**

### **Abstract**

This study aims at investigating the reality of effective teaching at Shobak schools from the point of view of teachers, and it seeks to answer the following questions:

The first question – what is the point of view of teachers at Shobak directorate about the degree of fulfilling each paragraph of the effective teaching?

The second question – what is the point of view of teachers at Shobak directorate of the degree of each field of the four effective teaching fields (curriculum, methods of teaching, evaluation and class room management) and for the questionnaire as a whole?

The third question - Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $0.05 = \alpha$ ) in fulfilling effective teaching fields by teachers, (qualification, level, years of experience and interaction between them)

To answer the study questions, the researcher selected the study sample by stratified random method, that consists of (104) teacher from Shobak directorate. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher prepared a questionnaire that included in its final version of (38) paragraphs distributed at the four fields. The researcher adopted the descriptive statistics to answer the first two questions, and analyzing the triple contrast (3-Way Anova) to answer the third question.

The study concluded these results:

- Assessment of teachers was high for (class management and Methods of Teaching), average for (curriculum and evaluation) and for the questionnaire as a whole.
- There is an effect for the level of the phase, and there is no effect for experience, qualification, binary or triple interaction between variables as the appreciation of teachers for the questionnaire.

**Keywords:** A Level ,Affective Teaching

:

(988 ) .

(Ivin, 981)

(985)

:

(1994)

...



(987 )

:

...

(987 ) .

(Keller, 2004)

(1999 )

.(990 )

.(Twining, 991) .

(2002)

...

---

(2002)

.

.

(2000)

.

.

(Giza, 1998)

.

(1997)

.

(becman 1994)

:

.

(ocepeck 1994)

(1992)

(hudgins and con, 1992)

(1990)

...



.

.

:

/

:

:

)

(

(0.05= $\alpha$ )

:

)

.(



.1

.2

.3

: -1

(1997)

/ : -2

2012/2011

...



:

/

:

: -1

:

10 10 :

:

: -2

:

(520)

2012 /2011

:

(104)

(%20)

.(1)

(1)

67	26	7	22	12	
37	20	5	8	4	
104	46	12	30	16	

:

)

(

(2)

38

(1)

9-1	9	
19-10	10	
29-20	9	
38-30	10	

...

(5)

(1)

3

4

4

3

:

(38)

:

(20)

(cronbach- alpha)

(3)

(3)

0.82	
0.86	
0.81	
0.90	
0.82	

:

(104)

)

:

:

(4)

(4)

1	0.64	4.47		21
2	0.64	4.45		14
3	0.80	4.41		20
4	0.90	4.39		25
5	0.84	4.35		19
6	0.79	4.31		11
7	0.77	4.25		12
8	0.98	4.20		17
9	0.79	4.12		22
10	0.79	4.12		26
11	0.83	4.10		37

...

12	0.85	4.00		16
13	0.80	3.96		31
14	0.92	3.96		7
15	0.83	3.94		35
16	0.70	3.94		15
17	0.94	3.90		29
18	0.83	3.90		13
19	0.82	3.88		34
20	0.76	3.84		23
21	1.03	3.82		2
22	0.87	3.82		4
23	0.92	3.80		36
24	0.88	3.78		24
25	0.99	3.76		30
26	1.07	3.75		28
27	0.98	3.73		3
28	1.04	3.71		9
29	0.81	3.71		10
30	0.91	3.69		38
31	0.85	3.63		6

.2015

32	0.98	3.63		5
33	0.94	3.63		8
34	0.92	3.61		18
35	0.98	3.61		32
36	0.96	3.59		27
37	0.81	3.55		33
38	1.05	2.76		1

(12)  
) 21 (4.00-4.47)  
(16) (4.47) ( )  
(. )  
(.4.00)  
( 25 )  
) (31) (3.55-3.96)  
(3.96) (. )  
( ) (33)  
(.3.55)  
) (1)  
(.2.76) (

...

:

:

)

(5)

(

(5)

1	0.32	4.05	
2	0.25	4.02	
3	0.17	3.82	
4	0.34	3.63	
		3.88	

(5)

(4.05)

(3.82)

(4.02)

(3.63)

(3.88)

(0.05= $\alpha$ )

:

)

(



(6)

.08	3.18	616.79	1	616.79	V1
60.	.28	254.6	1	254.6	V2
1.0	89.8	81914.5	1	81914.5	V3
4.4	2.6	119.50	1	119.50	V1 * V2
4.17	21.9	371.68	1	371.68	V1 * V3
1.9	.01	12.6	1	12.6	V2 * V3
3.1	2.44	473.41	1	473.41	V1 * V2 * V3
		193.83	43	8334.88	
			51	11888.07	

(6)

.(p-value <0.005)

:

(12)

(4.00-4.47)

(21)

...



.

(25)

.

.

.

.

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

...



(3.88)

(.05=  $\alpha$ )

(6)

:

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.1575-1551 ( 4) 18

.(2002)

.(1990)

.(1994)

.(1988)

.(1987)

.(1992)

.(1997)

.(2000)

.187-237 (3)16

.(1999)

2 .

- 
- ...
- .(2002)
- .468-442 (2) 16
- .(1997)
- 13
- .196-171 ( 2)
- : 1 . .(1990)
- 1 . .(985)
- :
- 1 . .(987)
- :
- Becman, M.T. (1994) Personality characteristics of effective teacher (Doctoral Dissertation, India University of Pennsylvania, 1993) DAI, 45(11), 3933-A.
- Giza, J. (1998). Concordance between teachers and Principals on which Elements of Effective Teaching should be Evaluated. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Widner University. DAI, 59, 382-A.
- Hudings, J. and Cone, W. (1992). Principals should Stress Effective Elements in Classroom Instruction. Nassp Bulletin, 76(542), 13-18.
- Keller, J.M. & Suzuki, K. (2004). Learner motivation and E-learning design: a multinationally validated process. Journal of Educational Media, 29, 3, 229- 238
- Levin,t.&long.r. (1981).effective-instruction.
- Ocepeck, L. J. (1994). Selected Elements of Effective Teaching: Astudy of Perceptions of High School Teachers in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Akorn. DAI, 54, 3394-A.
- Twining, j. e.(1991) .strategies for active learning.