

: **2003/12/25**

:

()

-

()

-

()

-

الإهداء

إلى أمي وأبي

إلى اخوتي

إلى زوجتي

إلى ابنتي

	:	
2		1:1
5		2:1
6		3:1
7		4:1
7		5:1
8		6:1
9		7:1
9		8:1

	:	
12		1:2
12		1:1:2
13		2:1:2
14		3:1:2
15		4:1:2
16		5:1:2
17		6:1:2
18		2:2

	:	
40		1:3
40		2:3
42		3:3
43		4:3
44		5:3
45		6:3
45		7:3
46		8:3
47		9:3

	:	
49		: 1:4
49		:1:1:4
50		:2:1:4
52	()	:3:1:4
53		:4:1:4
54		:5:1:4
55		:6:1:4
56		: 7:1:4
57		:2:4
64		: 3:4
69		: 4:4
77		:5:4

	:	
80		1:5
83		2:5

87		3:5
89		4:5
92		:5:5
94		6:5
94		7:5
95		
96		
100		
101		
b	(Abstract)	

40		1
41		2
42	/	3
45		4
50	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	5
51	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	6
52	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	7
54	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	8
55	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	9
56	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	10

57	(one – sample T-test) (%70)	11
58		12
61		13
61		14
62		15
65		16
68		17
69		18
70		19
72		20
73		21
74		22

102	.	1
110	.	2
118	.	3
102	.	4
103	.	5
104	.	
105	.	
106	.	
107	.	

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

.(% 70)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-4

(%10)

(600)

:

(One-sample T-test)

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

(%70)

()

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

$(\alpha = 0.05)$

-4

.

:

.

:

1:1

2:1

3:1

4:1

5:1

6:1

7:1

8:1

:

: **1:1**

: (31:1996)

(7:2000)

(1997)

(2001) (1989) .(1997)

(1997)

(Teacher's Evaluation)

(1994)

(1994) (Jenkins and Bausell,1974) (Shahly,1979)

(1994) (Kowalski,1987)

(2001) (1987)

(Geva-May, 1993) (Smith & Granton, 1992)

(Nevo , 1994)

(2001) (Chiero, 1996)

(Nevo, 1994)

.

: **2:1**

:(Teacher performance)

.(1994)

:

.(1994)

:

.(1996)

:

.(1996)

:%70

.(1994)

:

3:1

.(1992)

.(1994)

) :

.(

: **4:1**

:

-1

-2

-3

: **5:1**

:

-1

.(%70)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

($\alpha = 0.05$) -4

: **6:1**

:

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

.(%70)

($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

($\alpha = 0.05$) -4

: **7:1**

-:

-1

() -2

() -3

.(2001/2000) -4

: **8:1**

-:

-1

-2

-3

-4

1:2

1:1:2

2:1:2

3:1:2

4:1:2

5:1:2

6:1:2

2:2

(ERIC)

-:

: **1:2**

: **1:1:2**

(Philip Jackson)

: (Hillard) .

(Berliner) .

.(1996)

: **2:1:2**

) (1986)

.(2000) .

:

(2000) (1998) (1996

-

-

)

(Rutherford, 1971)

(1995

: **3:1:2**

.(1987)

: (1997)

: -1

:

: -2

.(1994) .

.(1992)

:

4:1:2

.(1996)

.(1999)

Geva – May,1993)) -

)

.(1994

:

5:1:2

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

.(1999)

-5

-6

-7

-8

-9

-10

(1997) .

-11

.(2001) (2000) (1997)

-12

.(Cobrun, 1984) .

:

6:1:2

.(1999) (

)

.(2001) (1997)

(Aleamoni, 1999)

(1998 – 1924)

: **2:2**

(1977)

:

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

($\alpha = 0.05$) -4

()

(650)

-:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-4

.

.(Reynolds, 1979)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

:

.

(18)

(48)

-

-

($\alpha = 0.05$)

.

(1994)

.(%70)

(94/93)

:

-1

. (%70)

-2

.

-3

.

-4

.

)

()

-5

(

(%32.87)

(918)

(2793)

(0.97)

()

(%70)

(3 X 2)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

)

()

(

231)

(%68.15

224.89)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(%70

($\alpha = 0.05$)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

()

(1994)

:

-1

-2

-3

)

(674)

(

(53) ()

(31)

SPSS

(0.79)

()

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

($\alpha = 0.05$)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

)

.(

(1996)

-:

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-1

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-2

(240)

)

(20)

.(

(0.64)

(0.69)

()

:

:

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-1

()

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-3

:

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-1

($\alpha = 0.01$)

-2

)

.(

(Fadda,1997)

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

.() .

($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

.()

($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

.()

(153)

)

(35)

.(

:

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

.() .

($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

(1997)

-

:

) ()

-1

(-

) ()

-2

(-

(200)

- (Nowicki and Strickland, 1973)

-

-1

(21)

(Cosgrove, 1959)

-2

)

.(

(Spielperger, 1978) -3

() (2 x2)

:

) () -1

(-

) () -2

(-

(1997)

:

-1

- -2

-

(210)

-1997)

:

.(1998

(60) : -1

)

.(

.

(0.61 0.84 0.64 0.81 0.76)

.

(1983)

-2

)

(

.

(60)

(0.77)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

:

(1997)

)

.(

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

.

(/ /)

(480)

.

(24)

(Menis, 1988)

(0.81)

:

(3X2X2)

-1

.

-2

(/ /)

-3

(1997)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

(605)

-:

() .()

:

-1

-2

-3

(2001) (1998)

:

($\alpha = 0.05$) -1

($\alpha = 0.05$) -2

($\alpha = 0.05$) -3

.()

) (66)

.(

.(0.92)

(234)

(620)

:

-1

:

-2

()

-3

()

(1999)

:

-1

-2

-3

(1119)

(23)

(0.86)

()

:

-1

-2

(2001)

:

-1

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

)

(

(1200)

:

-

:

.(2000)

(1999)

:

SPSS

(0.93)

()

:

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

$(\alpha = 0.05)$ -2

$(\alpha = 0.05)$ -3

(2001)

$(\alpha = 0.05)$ -1

$(\alpha = 0.05)$ -2

$(\alpha = 0.05)$ -3

(622)

:

-1

-2

)

(70)

(

(0.91)

-:

(0.86)

()

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-1

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-2

($\alpha = 0.05$)

-3

:

:

:

) (1996) (1994) (1994)

.(1998) (1997) (1997

(Reynolds, (1977)

) (1999) (1997) (Fadda, 1997) 1979)

.(2001) (2001

:

) (2001) (1997) (Fadda, 1997)

.(2001

(1999)

.

:

.(2001) (1998) (Fadda, 1997)

.(2001) .

.

1:3

2:3

3:3

4:3

5:3

6:3

7:3

8:3

9:3

: **1:3**

: **2:3**

(60)

:(1)

* (1)

12	15	27	
17	16	33	
29	31	60	

*

.(2001/2000)

(5916)

(2) (2001/2000)

:

*(2)

340	419	964	1050	
410	473	1041	1219	
750	892	2005	2269	

*

.(2001/2000)

(2)

(1219)

(1050)

(2269)

(964)

(2005)

(1041)

(419)

(473)

(892)

(410)

(340)

.(750)

: 3:3

(%10)

(600)

.()

(28)

(547)

(%9.24)

(25)

(3)

(3)

/ /

132	88	44		
121	88	33		
185	110	75		
109	80	29		
547	366	181		

(44)

(3)

(88)

(88)

(33)

(75)

(29)

(110)

(547)

(80)

()

.

.

: (56)

(9)

(10)

(8)

. (8)

(7)

(14)

(1)

(3)

) ()

) (7) (

.() (

(55)

(2)

) (8)

) (

) (5) (

) (

(51)

.(

(4) (5) :
() (2) (3)

: **5:3**

()

: (51)

(11) (5 - 1) (5)

(25 - 17) (9) () (16 - 6)

(46 - 40) (7) (39 - 26) (14)

.(51 - 47) (5)

(4) (3)

: **6:3**

(20)

(6)

(4)

0.82		1
0.84		2
0.76	()	3
0.87		4
0.76		5
0.68		6
0.94		

(0.87 - 0.68)

(6)

(0.94)

:

7:3

:

- 1

-2

-3

-4

(5)

()

-5

() (5)

-6

() (5) () (5)

-7

-8

(575)

(600)

(547)

(28)

(SPSS)

-9

: **8:3**

:

- : -

.() : -1

.() : -2

.() : -3

: -

: **9:3**

(SPSS)

:

-1

(ONE – WAY ANOVA)

-2

(Hotellings)

-3

(Multivariate K-Sample Test)

-4

:1:4

:2:4

:3:4

:4:4

:5:4

:

: **:1:4**

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

.(%70)

(one – sample T-test)

(9) (8) (7) (6) (5)

(11)

(10)

:

:1:1:4

(5)

(5)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	* *	()		*	
	0.0001	6.93	0.88	3.76	1
	0.0001	15.20	0.98	4.13	2
	0.0001	24.96	0.87	4.43	3
	0.0001	23.78	0.89	4.41	4
	0.02	2.34	1.34	3.36	× 5
	0.0001	19.34	0.63	4.02	

(5)

*

× ($\alpha = 0.05$)

**

()

(5)

- (%70)

(4 3 2 1)

(%70)

-

(5)

(3.36)

(4.02)

.($\alpha= 0.0001$)

(3.5)

: :2:1:4

(11)

(6)

(6)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	* *	()		*	
	0.037	2.08	1.07	3.59	6
	0.0001	21.64	0.87	4.31	7
	0.0001	9.51	1.06	3.93	8
	0.0001	17.50	1.32	2.50	×9
	0.0001	12.17	1.08	4.06	10
	0.014	2.46	1.23	3.63	11
	0.0001	28.54	0.83	4.51	12
	0.0001	4.95	1.24	3.23	×13
	0.0001	16.39	0.99	4.19	14
	0.0001	7.20	1.10	3.83	15
	0.0001	14.88	0.93	4.09	16
	0.0001	11.72	0.62	3.81	

(5)

*

× (α = 0.05)

**

() (6)

(%70)

(16 15 14 12 11 10 8 7 6)

(2.50) (9)

(13 9)

(3.23) (13)

(3.81)

.($\alpha = 0.0001$)

(3.5)

:()

:3:1:4

(9)

(7)

.()

(7)

(one – sample T-test)

.()

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	**	()		*	
	0.0001	13.90	1.28	2.73	×17
	0.0001	23.54	0.93	4.43	18
	0.0001	4.11	1.22	3.28	×19
	0.0001	11.77	1.38	2.80	×20
	0.0001	7.46	1.51	3.01	×21
	0.0001	7.24	1.15	3.85	22
	0.012	2.51	1.13	3.37	×23
	0.0001	4.74	1.33	3.77	24
	0.0001	9.56	1.45	2.90	×25
	0.0001	4.85	0.70	3.35	×

(5)

*

× ($\alpha = 0.05$)

**

() (7)

(%70) (24 22 18)

(3.28) (2.73)

(17,19,20,21,23,25)

(2.90) (3.37) (3.01) (2.80)

(3.35)

.($\alpha = 0.0001$)

(3.5)

: **:4:1:4**

(14)

(8)

() (8)

(39 38 37 36 35 34 33 31 30 29 28 27 26)

(%70)

(32)

(3.46)

(3.5)

(3.96)

.($\alpha = 0.0001$)

(8)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	* *	()		*	
	0.0001	13.90	0.96	4.07	26
	0.001	3.39	1.14	3.66	27
	0.58	0.54	1.21	3.52	28
	0.0001	32.72	0.72	4.51	29
	0.0001	44.69	0.63	4.71	30
	0.0001	21.22	0.89	4.31	31
	0.51	0.65	1.34	3.46	×32
	0.018	2.37	1.10	3.61	33
	0.0001	5.16	1.13	3.75	34
	0.0001	25.71	0.87	4.45	35
	0.37	0.89	1.12	3.54	36
	0.0001	6.65	1.19	3.84	37
	0.0001	5.47	1.10	3.75	38
	0.0001	17.72	0.96	4.23	39
	0.0001	16.88	0.64	3.96	

(5)

*

× (α = 0.05)

**

:

:5:1:4

(7)

(9)

(9)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	**	()		*	
	0.0001	45.67	0.94	1.66	×40
	0.0001	31.33	1.14	1.97	×41
	0.0001	36.77	1.09	1.77	×42
	0.0001	10.90	1.46	2.81	×43
	0.0001	17.33	1.39	2.46	×44
	0.0001	16.53	1.34	2.55	×45
	0.0001	35.61	1.09	1.83	×46
	0.0001	36.67	0.85	2.15	×

(5)

*

× (α = 0.05)

**

() (9)

(%70)

(46 45 44 43 42 41 40)

(2.81) (1.77) (1.97) (1.66)

(1.83) (2.55) (2.46)

(2.15)

.(α = 0.0001)

(3.5)

:

:6:1:4

(5)

(9)

(10)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70					
	**	()		*	
	0.11	1.60	1.21	3.58	47
	0.001	3.26	1.14	3.66	48
	0.0001	15.95	0.99	4.17	49
	0.0001	15.80	1.01	4.18	50
	0.0001	8.79	1.06	3.89	51
	0.0001	12.27	0.76	3.90	

(5)

*

× (α = 0.05)

**

()

(10)

(%70)

(51 50 49 48 47)

(3.90)

.(α=0.0001)

(3.5)

:

:7:1:4

()

(11)

(11)

(one – sample T-test)

(%70)

3.5 = %70						
	**	()		*		
	0.0001	19.34	0.63	4.02		1
	0.0001	16.88	0.64	3.96		2
	0.0001	12.27	0.76	3.90		3
	0.0001	11.72	0.62	3.81		4
	0.0001	4.85	0.70	3.35	()	×5
	0.0001	36.67	0.85	2.15		×6
	0.14	1.47	0.54	3.53		

(5)

*

× (α = 0.05)

**

(11)

()

(3.53)

(α = 0.14)

:

:2:4

:

(α = 0.05)

()

(12)

: (12)

-1

(0.72)

(3.87)

(0.50)

(4.15)

(0.28)

(12)

(294 =)		(253 =)		
	*		*	
0.50	4.15	0.72	3.87	
0.58	3.90	0.64	3.70	
0.62	3.52	0.72	3.15	()
0.55	4.12	0.68	3.77	
0.80	2.25	0.90	2.03	
0.74	3.98	0.76	3.80	
0.46	3.65	0.59	3.39	

(5)

*

-2

(0.64)

(3.70)

.(0.58)

(3.90)

(0.20)

-3

(0.72)

(3.15)

()

.(0.62)

(3.52)

(0.37)

(3.77)

-4

(0.68)

.(0.55)

(4.12)

(0.35)

-5

(0.90)

(2.03)

.(0.80)

(2.25)

. (0.22)

-6

(0.76)

(3.80)

.(0.74)

(3.98)

. (0.18)

(12)

-7

(0.59)

(3.39)

.(0.46)

(3.65)

(0.26)

F = 34.401, P =) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(0.001

(3.65)

(3.39)

(13)

(13)

*	F				
*0.001	34.401	9.626	1	9.626	
		0.280	545	152.502	
			546	162.129	

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(14)

(14)

*			F	F
*0.001	540	6	10.61	0.118

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(14)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(15)

(15)

*	F					
*0.001	27.908	0.381	10.635	207.675	10.635	
*0.001	13.458	0.377	5.077	205.616	5.077	
*0.001	41.666	0.456	19.008	248.632	19.008	()
*0.001	43.612	0.380	16.586	207.262	16.586	
*0.002	9.553	0.725	6.930	395.389	6.930	
*0.007	7.209	0.575	4.147	313.483	4.147	

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

:

-1

(F = 27.908, P = 0.001) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(4.15)

.(12)

(3.87)

-2

(F = 13.458, P = 0.001) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.70)

(3.90)

.(12)

-3

(F = 41.666, P = 0.001) F

()

(15) (α = 0.05)

()

()

()

(3.52)

.(12)

(3.15)

-4

(F = 43.612, P = 0.001) F

(15)

(α = 0.05)

(4.12)

.(12)

(3.77)

-5

(F = 9.553, P = 0.002) F

(15) ($\alpha = 0.05$)

(2.25)

.(12)

(2.03)

-6

(F = 7.209, P = 0.007) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.80)

(3.98)

.(12)

:

:3:4

0.05)

:

($\alpha =$

()

(16)

(16)

(230 =)		(317 =)		
	*		*	
0.64	4.04	0.62	4.01	
0.64	3.83	0.60	3.79	
0.69	3.42	0.70	3.30	()
0.63	3.99	0.64	3.94	
0.84	2.19	0.86	2.12	
0.73	3.92	0.78	3.88	
0.54	3.56	0.54	3.50	

(5)

*

: (16)

-1

(0.62)

(4.01)

.(0.64)

(4.04)

(0.03)

-2

(0.60)

(3.79)

.(0.64)

(3.83)

(0.04)

-3

(0.70)

(3.30)

()

.(0.69)

(3.42)

(0.12)

-4

(0.64)

(3.94)

.(0.63)

(3.99)

(0.05)

-5

(0.86)

(2.12)

.(0.84)

(2.19)

(0.07)

-6

(0.78)

(3.88)

.(0.73)

(3.92)

(0.04)

-7

(0.54)

(3.50)

.(0.54)

(3.56)

(0.06)

(F = 1.655, P = 0.199) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.50)

(17)

(3.56)

(17)

*	F				
0.199	1.655	0.491	1	0.491	
		0.297	545	161.129	
			546	162.129	

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(18)

(18)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(18)

*			F	F
0.558	540	6	0.816	0.009

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

: **:4:4**

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

()

(19)

: (19)

-1

(0.61)

(4.01)

.(0.64)

(4.02)

(0.01)

(19)

(366 =)		(181 =)		
	*		*	
0.64	4.02	0.61	4.01	
0.59	3.81	0.66	3.79	
0.71	3.35	0.68	3.34	()
0.63	4.00	0.64	3.88	
0.89	2.23	0.74	1.99	
0.75	3.90	0.78	3.89	
0.54	3.55	0.54	3.48	

(5)

*

-2

(0.66)

(3.79)

.(0.59)

(3.81)

(0.02)

-3

(0.68)

(3.34)

()

.(0.71)

(3.35)

(0.01)

-4

(0.64)

(3.88)

.(0.63)

(4.00)

(0.12)

-5

(0.74)

(1.99)

.(0.89)

(2.23)

(0.24)

-6

(0.74) (3.89)

.(3.90) (2.23)

(0.01)

-7

(0.54) (3.48)

.(0.54) (3.55)

(0.07)

(20)

*	F				
0.165	1.937	0.574	1	0.574	
		0.296	545	161.555	
			546	162.129	

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(F = 1.937, P = 0.165) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(4.01)

(4.02)

(20)

(21)

(21)

*			F	F
*0.003	540	6	3.402	0.038

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(21)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(22)

(22)

*	F					
0.84	0.039	0.401	0.015	218.294	0.015	
0.716	0.133	0.386	0.051	210.642	0.051	
0.900	0.016	0.491	0.007	267.632	0.007	()
*0.045	4.053	0.408	1.652	222.196	1.652	
*0.002	9.787	0.725	7.098	395.221	7.098	
0.837	0.043	0.583	0.024	317.605	0.024	

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

:

-1

(F = 0.039, P = 0.84) F

(22)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(4.01)

.(19)

(4.02)

$$(F = 0.133, P = 0.716) F$$

$$(22) \quad (\alpha = 0.05)$$

$$(3.79)$$

$$.(19) \quad (3.81)$$

$$(\quad)$$

$$(F = 0.016, P = 0.900) F$$

$$(22) \quad (\alpha = 0.05)$$

$$(\quad)$$

$$(\quad)$$

$$(3.34)$$

$$.(19) \quad (3.35)$$

$$(F = 4.053, P = 0.045) F$$

$$(22) \quad (\alpha = 0.05)$$

(3.88)

.(19)

(4.00)

-5

(F = 9.787, P = 0.002) F

(22)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(1.99)

.(19)

(2.23)

-6

(F = 0.43, P = 0.837) F

(22)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.89)

.(19)

(3.90)

: :5:4

:

(%70) ($\alpha = 0.05$) *

(%70) ($\alpha = 0.05$) *

($\alpha = 0.05$) *

($\alpha = 0.05$) *

($\alpha = 0.05$) *

:

()

.

($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

.

1:5

2:5

3:5

4:5

5:5

6:5

7:5

:

:

1:5

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

.(%70)

(11)

(2001)

(2001)

(2001)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

(2001)

(11)

()

(1996)

(2001)

(1997)

(1997)

:

()

-1

()

(2001)

-2

(26)

(15:2000)

-3

(11)

(2001)

(2001)

.(1994)

2:5

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

F = 34.401, P =) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(0.001

(3.65)

(3.39)

(13)

:

-1

(F = 27.908, P = 0.001) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(4.15)

.(12)

(3.87)

-2

(F = 13.458, P = 0.001) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.70)

(3.90)

.(12)

-3

(F = 41.666, P = 0.001) F

()

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

()

()

()

(3.52)

.(12)

(3.15)

-4

(F = 43.612, P = 0.001) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(4.12)

.(12)

(3.77)

-5

(F = 9.553, P = 0.002) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(2.25)

.(12)

(2.03)

-6

(F = 7.209, P = 0.007) F

(15)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.98)

.(12)

(3.80)

) (1994)
 (1997) (1997) (1996) (1994)
 (1977) .(1998)
 (1999) (1997) (Fadda, 1997) (Reynolds,1979)
 .(2001) (2001)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

(1994)

(1997)

:

3:5

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(F=1.655, P=0.199) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.50)

(17) (3.56)

(18)

($\alpha = 0.05$)

) (Fadda,1997)

(1999)

.(2001) (2001) (1997

:

-1

(1997)

-2

:

4:5

:

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(F=1.937, P=0.165)F

($\alpha=0.05$)

(4.01)

(4.02)

(20)

:

-1

F = 0.039,) F

($\alpha = 0.05$)

(P = 0.84

(22)

(4.01)

.(19)

(4.02)

-2

(F = 0.133, P = 0.716) F

(22) (α = 0.05)

(3.81)

(3.79)

.(19)

-3

F =) F ()

(α = 0.05) (0.016, P = 0.900

() (22)

()

()

(3.34)

.(19)

(3.35)

(F = 4.053, P = 0.045) F

(22) ($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.88)

.(19) (4.00)

F = 9.787, P =) F

(0.002

(22) ($\alpha = 0.05$)

(1.99)

.(19) (2.23)

(F = 0.43, P = 0.837) F

(22) ($\alpha = 0.05$)

(3.89)

.(19)

(3.90)

(2001)

.(2001) (1998) (Fadda, 1997)

:

.1

.2

:

:5:5

()

()

: :6:5

:

:

:

:

:

: :7:5

:

:

-

-

		:	
		.(1996)	-
.	(5)10		
		.(1997)	-
		.	
		.(1999)	-
472	.(2) 26		
		.482	
		.(1994)	-
		.	
		.(1996)	-
.(1)		(8)	
		.179 115	
		.(1997)	-

143 (34)

.189

.(1995) -

.(2001) -

.(1996) -

.(1994) -

.(1992) -

7

88 69 .(3)

.(1992) -

298 279 .(7) 43

		.(1997)	-
.			
.	:	.(2000)	-
		.(1997)	-
.187	171 .(6)12		
		.(1997)	-
		.92 63 (34)	
:		.(1996)	-
		.	
		.(1994)	-
138 - 97 (49)			
:		.(1987)	-
		.	
		.(2001)	-
.			
:	.	.(1998)	-

.(1986) -

. : .
.(1997) -

-

. 32

:

- Aleamoni, L. M.(1999). “Student **Rating Myths versus Research Facts from 1924 to 1998**”. Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, 13 (2).153-166.
- Fadda, A. N.(1997). “Student’s **Perceptions of the Ideal Professor**”. Unpublished M.ED Thesis, an Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
- Geva, May, I. (1993). " **Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behavior study in instruction evaluation**". Studies in Educational Evaluation, 19.383-396.
- Hamond, D.L (1986). “Aproposal for evaluating in the teaching **profession**”.The Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 531-551.
- Louisa,C.(1984). “Student **Evaluation of Teacher Performance**” (Eric Document Reproduction No.ED289887).
- Nevo,D.(1994). “How **teachers benefit from teacher evaluation**”. Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, 8 (2), 109-149.
- Reynolds,W.M.(1997). “**Relationship of Affective Characteristics of Student to their Evaluations of Instructors**”. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 39 (4), 965-970.

(1)

.

/

)

(

.

:

/

:			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
			5
			6
			7
			8

:

:			
	(10)		
		.	1
		.	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6
		.	7
		.	8
		.	9
		.	10

:

:			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
			5
			6
			7
			8
			9

:

:			
	(10)		
		.	1
		.	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6
		.	7
		.	8
		.	9
		.	10
		.	11
		.	12
		.	13
		.	14

:

:			
	(10)		
		.	1
		.()	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6
		.	7

:

:			
	(10)		
)	1
		.(....	
		.	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6
		.	7
		.	8

:

(2)

. -:

"

"

(10)

.

-: ()

				:	

-:

/

:			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
			5
			6
			7
			8

:			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
	(10)		
			5
			6
			7
			8
			9
			10

() :			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
			5
			6
			7
			8
			9

:			
	(10)		
			1
			2
			3
			4
			5
			6
			7
		()	
			8
			9
			10
			11
			12
			13
			14

:			
	(10)		
		.	1
			2
		.()	
)	3
		.(
		.	4
			5
		.	6
		.	7

:			
	(10)		
		.(....)	1
		.	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6

(3)

/

)

(

(x)

.

:

/

:

(x)

:

: -1

: -2

: -3

:

				X		

					:	
						1
						2
						3
						4
						5

					:	
						6
						7
						8
						9

						10
						11
						12
						13
						14
						15
						16

					() :	
						17
						18
						19
						20
						21

						22
						23
						24
					() :	25

					:	
						26
						27
						28
						29
						30
						31
						32

) :	
					.(33
					.	34
					.	35
					.	36
					.	37
					.	38
					.	39

					:	
						40
) :	
					.(
) :	41
					.(

						42
						43
						44
						45
						46

					:	
						47
					.(....):	
						48
						49
						50
						51

(4)

	·	1
	·	2
	·	3
	·	4
	·	5
	·	6
/	·	7
/	·	8
/		9

(5)

An-Najah National University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

*Evaluation of performance of Mathematics Teacher's from
The point of View of Their Students in Jenin District*

By

Samir Wajeih Mohammed Hamed

Supervisor

Dr. Salah Edeen Yassin

*Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Educational Sciences in Methods of Teaching Mathematics,
Faculty of Graduate Studies, at An-Najah National University, Nablus,
Palestine.*

2003

*Evaluation of performance of Mathematics Teacher's from The point of View
of Their Students in Jenin District*

Prepared by

Samir Wajeih Mohammed Hamed

Supervised by

Dr. Salah Al deen Yassin.

Abstract

The present study aimed at knowing the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers from the point of view of their students in Jenin district. The problem of the study is limited to the following hypothesis.

- There is no statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the main of performance of the mathmatics teachers at the secondary level in government schools of Jenin district from the point of view of their students and the acceptable performance standard educationally and sociologically(70%)

- There is no statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the main of evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teacher at the secondary level at the government schools in Jenin district from the point of view of their students due to their gender.

- There is no statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the main of evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teacher at the secondary level at the government schools in Jenin district from the point of view of their students due to their stream (scientific , literary)
- There is no statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the main of evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teacher at the secondary level at the government schools in Jenin district from the point of view of their students due to their level of study.

To examine the previous hypothesis, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the sample of the study which was (600) students male and female. They present 10% of the original community of the study in the government school in Jenin district. The questionnaire was distributed after being shown to a group of specialized jury of experts and the reliability of the questionnaire was calculated.

The researcher used the following statistical methods to analyze the data:

- Averages and standard deviation for the answers of the members of the sample of the study for the questionnaire as a whole and for every item of it.
- One - sample T- test to examine the first hypothesis

- One- Way Anova analysis and Hotellings test and Multivariate K-Sample test to examine 2nd, 3rd, 4th, hypothesis.

After the implementation of the study the results of the study show the following :

- There was a statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the mean of the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers at the secondary level in the government school of Jenin district from the point of view of their students and acceptable performance standard educationally and sociologically (70%) in favor of acceptable standard on fields of evaluated procedures (examination) and the activities inside the school.

But there was no difference between them on the other fields and the whole degree.

- There was statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the mean of the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers at the secondary level in the government school of Jenin district from the point of view of their students between males and females and it was in favor of females at the all fields and the whole degree.

There was no statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the mean of the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers at the secondary level in the government school of Jenin district from the point of view of their students between the eleventh and twelfth grade

- There was statistical difference at ($\alpha = 0,05$) in the mean of the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers at the secondary level in the government school of Jenin district from the point of view of their students between scientific stream and literary stream in favor of literary stream on the fields of teaching and the activities inside school, But there was no difference between them on the other fields and the whole degree.

The researcher provided, upon these results, some recommendations such as:

The Directorates of Education have approved this study in the mean of the evaluation of the performance of the mathematics teachers from the view of their students. Thus, distribution the results of this study to Mathematics teachers to improve their performances and held courses for them to develop their abilities of school activities, and also courses on evaluation and measurements concentrated on the fields of good level of study (good test).