

\*

( - )  
(1400)

(310)

:

-

-

-

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

-

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

-

:

---

\*

. 2014/8/18 :

. 2014/1/23 :

**.2015**

©

...

---

**Authoritarian Practices of School Principals and Their Relation to  
Teachers' Motivation in Public Basic Schools of Amman Third  
Educational Directorate**

**Sameh Moh'd Mahafza**

**Amal Abdelrahman Abu Awad**

**Abstract**

This study aimed at investigating the authoritarian practices of school principals and their relation to the level of teachers' motivation for achievement as perceived by public basic school teachers at the 3<sup>rd</sup> educational directorate in Amman.

The population of the study consisted of (1400) teachers teaching at the basic stage (1<sup>st</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup> grades). The sample consisted of (310) male and female teachers.

Findings of the study revealed that:

- The authoritarian level of school principals practices toward teachers was medium.
- The level of teachers' motivation for achievement was medium.
- There were no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) at all dimensions of the authoritarian practices due to sex, qualifications, and experience.
- There were no significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) at all dimensions of motivation for achievement due to time and effort in favor of male teachers.
- There were significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between authoritarian practices of principals and their teachers' motivation for achievement.

**Keywords:** Authoritarian, motivation, achievement, basic school.

:

.(2010 ) .

.(D'Ambrosio,2002)

...



.(2009 )

.(2000 )

.(1990 )

.(2000 )



...

---

:

:

.1

.

.2

.

.3

.

.4

:

.

:

:

:

•

.(2000 P350 ) .

:

•

.(2009 P54-62 ) .

:

•

.

:

•

.(1979 P11 ) .

:

•

.(2006 P27 ) .

.2015

---

: •

: •

: •

:

:

.2013/2012

: .1

: .2

( - )

.

: :

: **.1**

.

...

---

)

.(2012

.(2000 ) .

.

.(2012 )

.

.(1998 ) .



.(2000 )

.(1989 ) :

- 
- 
- 
- 

: .2

...



:

.(1990 )

1880

" "

.(1997 )

:

" :

.(2008 P67 ) "

"

.(2012 P34 ) "

:

(Govern & Petri, P120-121, 2004) .

.(Zoo, 2003)

:

" :

.(2009 P16 ) "

...

---

:

:  
:  
(1989)

(42)

:

(1992)

(646) (57)

:  
.1  
.2  
.3

" : (2003)

"

(1141)

(10714)  
(76)

" : (2006)

(56)

(35)

(718)

(4114)

" : (2011)

"

(1620)

: (324)

...

---

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$  •

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$  •

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$  •

:

(Tanner & Tanner, 1987)

:

(320)

(Pennington,1997)

(200)

$(\alpha \leq 0.001)$  •

•

- 
- 

(Medina, 2000)

(18)

(132)

(Smith, 2000)

:

(1620)

(30)

:

(Lucks, 2002)

(1080)

...



(Sanchez, 2002)

(10)

(311)

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

:

(1989)

(2006)

(Tanner, 1987)

(Smith, 2000)

(Pennington, 1997)



(1992)

:

:

(1400)

(27)

(9)

(13)

(49)

(310)

.(2013

)

:

(2012)

...

---

	:		.(2009)	:
		(27)		:
(33)				:
			:	
(3)	(4)	(5)		
	(1)	(2)		
			:	
	(14)			
			%75	
60				
	(test-retest)			
		(35)		
.(Cronbach Alpha)				
%0.77		:		
%.0.80		%0.76		%0.83

%0.84

:

%0.80

%0.72

(0.78)

%.0.75

:

:

2.33 – 1.00

3.67 – 2.34

5.00 – 3.68

:

(MANOVA)

(ANOVA)

:

:

:

...

(1)

:

(1)

	1	0.91	2.97		1
	4	0.94	2.59		3
	3	1.07	2.63		4
	–	0.77	2.76		–

(1)

(0.91)

(2.97)

(2.59)

.(0.94)

(2.76)

.(0.77)

: .1

.. (2)

(2)

	1	1.09	3.22		8
	2	1.20	3.05		4
	2	1.20	3.05		7
	4	1.25	3.00		6
	5	1.29	2.97		3
	6	1.28	2.89		2
	7	1.27	2.83		5
	8	1.25	2.77		1
	-	0.91	2.97		-

...

---

(2)

.(2.97)

(2.77 - 3.22)

"

"

(1.09)

(3.22)

"

"

.(1.25)

(2.77)

:

**.2**

(3)

(3)

	1	1.17	3.52		6
	2	1.21	3.02		5
	3	1.26	3.00		3
	4	1.27	2.68		7
	4	1.17	2.68		1
	6	1.20	2.59		4
	7	1.12	2.58		2
		0.77	2.87		

...

---

.(2.87)

"

(2.58 - 3.52)

"

(1.17)

(3.52)

:

.

"

.(1.12)

(2.58)

"

:

.3

(4)



(4)

	1	1.39	3.11		5
	2	1.29	2.78		3
	3	1.24	2.58		1
	4	1.12	2.32		2
	5	1.02	2.16		4
	-	0.94	2.59		

...

---

(4)

.(2.59)

(2.16 - 3.11)

"

(3.11)

"

(1.39)

"

"

(1.02)

(2.16)

:

.4

(5)

(5)

	1	1.20	2.82		7
	2	1.18	2.70		4
	3	1.22	2.66		1
	4	1.21	2.59		2
	5	3.22	2.55		6
	6	1.12	2.54		5
	7	1.18	2.51		3
	-	1.07	2.63		

(5)

(2.51 - 2.82)

"

.(2.63)

(1.20)

(2.82)

"

...



.

"

.

"

.(1.18)

(2.51)

.

:

:

(6)

(6)

	1	600.	703.		1
	2	630.	673.		2
	2	0.52	3.67		3
	4	610.	303.		4
		0.46	3.59		-

(6)

(0.61)

(3.30)

.(0.60)

(3.70)

:

.1

(7)

...

(7)

	1	1.03	3.75		4
	2	1.01	3.69		3
	3	1.13	3.43		1
	4	1.27	3.20		7
	5	1.28	3.19		6
	6	1.25	3.10		2
	7	1.37	3.03		8
	8	1.09	3.00		5
	-	0.61	3.30		-

(7)

.(3.30)

(3.00 - 3.75)

"

"

(1.03)

(3.75)

"

.

.2015

---

(3.00)

"  
(1.09)

:

.2

(8)

(8)

	1	0.93	4.11		4
	2	0.98	3.92		3
	3	1.01	3.91		2
	4	0.92	3.90		6
	6	1.37	3.35		5
	7	1.22	2.96		7
	-	0.60	3.70		

...

---

		(8)	
	.(3.70)	(2.96 - 4.11)	
	"	"	
	(0.93)	(4.11)	
	"	"	
	(2.96)		.(1.22)
(1992)		(2003)	
	(Medina,2000)		
			.3
		:	
	(9)		



(9)

	1	0.82	4.25		5
	2	0.81	4.21		4
	3	0.86	4.16		1
	4	0.91	4.09		3
	5	0.94	3.80		2
	6	1.15	3.51		6
	7	1.22	2.86		8
	8	1.18	2.48		7
	-	0.52	3.67		

(9)

.(3.67)

(2.48 - 4.25)

"

"

(0.82)

(4.25)

...

---

" " .  
(1.18) (2.48)

: .4

(10)

(10)

	1	0.76	4.22		3
	2	0.93	3.98		10
	3	2.11	3.94		2
	4	0.97	3.87		4
	5	0.89	3.79		1

.2015

	5	1.10	3.79		5
	7	1.07	3.56		7
	8	1.21	3.30		8
	9	1.21	3.26		6
	10	1.30	3.00		9
	-	0.63	3.67		

(10)

(4.22 - 3.00)

"

.(3.67)

(4.22)

"

(0.76)

"

(3.00)

"

.(1.30)

...

---

" : :

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

"

:

**(MANOVA)**

**(11)**

		Wiliks Lamda	
.248	1.359	.982	
.320	1.145	.955	
.303	1.167	.955	

(11)

(Pennington, 1997)

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

(MANOVA)

(12)

		Wiliks Lamda	
0.034	2.63	0.034	
0.117	1.50	0.59	
0.054	1.73	0.068	

(12)

...

(2011)

(1992)

:

(13)

				-	
3.7620	3.7636	3.7795	3.4851		(92= )
.54265	.46122	.56567	.59411		
3.6267	3.6325	3.6748	3.2208		(218= )
.63569	.53442	.61099	.60176		
3.6670	3.6715	3.7059	3.2992		
.61174	.51648	.59891	.61064		

(14)

	( )				
0.002 *	10.045	3.509	1	3.509	
0.211	1.57	0.556	1	0.556	
0.066	3.314	0.897	1	0.897	
0.137	2.219	0.809	1	0.809	

(14)

(10.045)

.(14)

.( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

(Smith,2000)

" :

:

"

: (15)

...

---

(15)

* -.147	-.102	-.039	-.047	
-.055	-.019	.050	.073	
*-.135	* -.112	-.047	.010	
-.046	-.017	.013	.018	

( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

•



:

:

(1

(2

(3

(4

(5

(6

(7

...



(2009)

.1 4 15

( 2012)

-

(1979)

-

(1990)

-

3

(2009)

.(1) 24

"

" (1997)

1950

(1990)

( 2009)

(4 -1 )

.3 5

(2011)

-

(2009)

(2006)

-

(2006)

(1989)

(2008)

(2003)

-

(1992)

-

(1989)

(2000)

-

(2013)

(2012)

D'Ambrosio, Melody (2002), Leadership in today's world,

<http://www.stanswartz.com/DAMBROSIO>htm>.

Govern, J; Petri, H. (2004), Motivation: Theory Research and Applications. Thomson – Wadsworth, Australia.

Lucks,H.J. Transformational leadership and teacher motivation across New York public schools, Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI), 63 (06) A, AA, 3058275 P. 3642.

Medina, Phyllis L. (2000), Leader Social Power and Subordinate Creativity, Dissertation Abstract International (DAI), B61/ P1682.

Pennington, Philip Wayne (1997), Principal leadership and Teacher Motivation in Secondary Schools, EtD Collection for Tennessee State University. Paper AA/9806348.

Sanchez-Perkins, Raquene (2002), Relationship Between Teachers Perceptions of Principals leadership Behavior and level of Work Motivation.Dissertation Abstract International (DAI) – A63/ 62. P455.

Smith, Tyronne Martin (2000), A study of the Relationship between the Principals leadership Style and Teacher Motivation, The Teacher Perspective Dissertation Abstract International (DAI). A6/08. P2808.

Tanner, D. And Tanner L., (1987), Supervision in Education: problems and practices, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, PP. 301-302.

Zoo, C. (2003) Creativity at Work: The Monitor on psychology, The American Psychological Association, (23) 61607