

*

(81)

(20) (53)

. (%73.2)
. (%72.04)

Abstract

The reality of practices of mathematics supervisors for their expected rules in the knowledge society, and its relationship with teachers attitudes toward the educational supervision

The study aimed to recognize the reality of practices of mathematics supervisors for their expected rules in the knowledge society, and its relationship with teachers attitudes toward the educational supervision. The sample of study included (81)teachers from secondary and high primary schools. They were chosen in stratified manner due to gender and level, and with simple random way for all levels.

The researcher used the supervisory practices questionnaire which contains(53) items, and the attitudes measurement which contains(20) items,

2015

the researcher prepared both of them, the researcher used the descriptive approach, the research achieved the following results:

- The supervisory practices area had a total proportional weight (73.2%). The teachers attitudes towards their supervisors was(72.04%).
- There is relationship between the supervisory practices and the teachers attitudes towards supervision.
- There is no statistically Significant differences in the supervisory practices which related to the teachers' gender.
- There is no statistically significant differences in supervisory practices which related to education stage.

⋮

.(5 :2000)

(Sullivan&Glanz,2009)

⋮

....

.(GLickman 1985)

)

.(130-97 :1989

.(3 :2002)

.(91 :2006)

(2006)

2015

(2009)

(2006)

(1993)

.1

.2

.3

.4

....

:

.1

.2

.(-)

.3

.(-)

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

:

2015

2014/2013

....

:

:

.(264 :2007)

:

" :

.(2004:114)"

"

)

.(130 :1992

"

.(15 :1998)"

2015

: (129 :2000)

.1

.2

.3

.4

(Katz)

: (60 :2006)

: .1

.2

.3

:

-113 2001)

: (117

193

....

: () .1

: .2

: .3

(Sergiovann & Starratt)

.1

.2

.3

.4

(30-14 :2002)

: .1

: .2

2015

: .3

:

: .4

: (315 :2009) .1

: .2

: .3

:(... -) .4

:

....
.(2004)

Bizhan Naseh

:(Naseh,2000)

.1
.2
.3
.4
.5
.6

)

:(2007:89

.1
.2
.3
.4
.5
.6

2015

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.(1994:171)

.(1995:279)"

(55-53 :1983)

(2009)

(68)

(%60)

(2006)

(2005)

2015

(2002)

(2007)

(226)

(2007)

(64)

(2007)

(168)

(2006)

(36)

....

(%55) (275)

(1991)

5

(Delormel 1985)

(100)

(2014)

(140)

40

(2013)

(441)

(%54.9)

200

2015

(2014)

(145)

(%52.67)

(%55.91)

(%47.05)

(2012)

(2007)

(2007)

(2009)

(2005)

(1991)

(2012)

(150)

(1)

41	43	
32	34	
73	77	

%60

(81)

2015

(5)
(13)

(53)

(21)

:(2)

0.83	
0.85	
0.79	
0.81	
0.87	

'(2) (3) (4) (5))
[5 1] ((1)
67 -52 51 - 36 35 - 20 (%100 %20)
100 - 84 83 - 68

20
"()

(100) (20)

(21)
(0.84)

[5 -1]

2015

(3)

(%60)

90

204-2013

81

205

....

(3)

2	%72.31	0.88	3.6	
4	%70.89	0.87	3.54	
3	%71.13	0.88	3.55	
1	%78.97	0.91	3.94	
	%73.20		3.66	

(%78.97)

(%72.31)

(%70.89)

(%71.13)

(2006)

(2007)

:

2015

(4)

1	80.49	0.67	4.02		1
9	72.10	0.89	3.60		2
2	77.78	0.92	3.89		3
14	67.16	0.88	3.36		4
6	74.07	0.83	3.70		5
3	76.05	0.81	3.80		6
8	73.58	0.89	3.68		7
13	68.15	1.06	3.41		8
16	65.19	0.91	3.26		9
5	74.57	0.95	3.73		10
6	74.07	0.93	3.70		11
10	71.85	0.83	3.59		12
11	70.62	0.87	3.53		13
4	74.81	0.79	3.74		14
15	66.67	0.99	3.33		15
12	69.88	0.95	3.49	()	16
	72.31	0.88	3.61		

(1)

(3) (%80.49)

" (%77.78)

" (9)

(%65.19)

(5)

	%				
7	69.88	1.07	3.49		1
1	79.26	0.77	3.96		2
2	77.28	0.89	3.86		3
8	69.14	0.92	3.46		4
9	68.15	0.89	3.41		5
4	76.54	0.80	3.83		6
3	77.04	0.67	3.85		7
9	68.15	0.65	3.41		8
6	70.37	0.78	3.52		9
14	63.70	0.82	3.19		10
5	71.85	0.77	3.59		11
11	67.90	1.03	3.40		12
13	65.68	0.98	3.28		13
12	67.65	1.09	3.38		14
	70.89	0.87	3.54		

" (2)

(%79.26)

"(3)

2015

(%77.28)

"(10)

(%63.7)

(6)

	%					
4	72.59	0.75	3.63			1
9	65.68	0.88	3.28			2
2	75.80	0.75	3.79			3
6	71.11	0.79	3.56	(l.c.d -)		4
4	71.85	0.93	3.59			5
8	65.93	1.01	3.30			6
3	72.84	0.78	3.64			7
4	71.85	0.82	3.59			8
1	78.27	0.87	3.91			9
7	68.64	1.09	3.43			10
10	67.90	1.11	3.40			11
	71.13	0.88	3.56			

....
 "(9)
 "(3) (%78.27)
 "(%75.80)

" (11)
 "(%67.90)

(7)

	%				
8	77.53	0.90	3.88		1
3	81.73	0.85	4.09		2
11	74.81	1.05	3.74		3
6	80.74	0.93	4.04		4
5	81.23	0.94	4.06		5
7	78.02	1.01	3.90		6
9	77.28	0.93	3.86		7
4	80.49	0.88	4.02		8
12	74.07	0.89	3.70		9
1	83.70	0.91	4.19		10
2	81.98	0.89	4.10		11
10	76.05	0.84	3.80		12
	%78.97	0.91	3.94		

2015

"(10)
" (11) (%83.70)

"(12)

(8)

	%				
12	75.56	0.59	3.78		1
2	80.99	0.72	4.05		2
4	79.01	1.07	3.95		3
3	79.75	0.58	3.99		4
1	81.23	0.73	4.06		5
16	66.67	1.14	3.33		6
6	77.53	0.93	3.88		7

....

8	76.54	0.95	3.83		8
9	76.30	0.88	3.81		9
5	77.78	1.01	3.89		10
17	64.69	1.19	3.23		11
20	46.91	0.75	3.40		12
13	69.14	1.14	3.46		13
15	67.9	1.05	2.35		14
7	77.28	1.22	2.99		15
9	76.30	0.92	3.81		16
19	59.75	0.70	3.86		17
9	76.30	1.17	3.81		18
18	62.96	1.49	3.15		19
14	68.15	0.89	3.41		20
	72.04	0.96	3.60		

"

"(5)

(%81.23)

(2)

"

(%80.99)

"

"(12)

(%46.91)

(1985)

2015

.(0.05 $\geq \alpha$) 0.288

.(-)

() : (9)

	()					
0.05	2.21	7.91	55.93	36		
		9.66	60.25	45		
	0.11	4.93	49.55	36		
		8.36	49.72	45		
	0.02	5.65	39.13	36		
		5.62	39.11	45		

....

	1.59	8.48	48.71	36		
		8.32	45.72	45		
	0.28	20.26	193.33	36		
		27.68	194.80	45		

(0.05 $\geq \alpha$)

(2014)

(2007)

(2013)

:

.(-)

()

:(10)

	()					
	0.15	10.96	58	42		
		6.21	57.69	39		
	0.79	7.22	50.19	42		
		5.96	49.02	39		
	0.02	6.11	39.73	42		
		4.99	38.46	39		
	0.81	8.89	48.11	42		
		8.08	46.58	39		
	0.81	28.19	196.04	42		
		17.73	191.76	39		

2015

(0.05 $\geq a$)

(2006)

(1

(2

(3

(4

(5

(6

.1

.2

.3

.4

	
	.(2013)	.1
-		
	.280-241 2 15	
	.(2007)	.2
"		
	31-30"	
	.(2006)	.3
"		
	.(52)	
	".(1993)	.4
	.(6)	"
	" .(2005)	.5
"		
-		
	(2000)	.6
	"	3
	".(1995)	.7
"		
	".(1989)	.8
.(5) (2)		
"	".(2000)	.9
http://moudir.com/vb/archive/index.php3t.443.htm		
:		
	.(1998)	.10
:		
	.(1992)	.11
.		

2015

			(2004)	.12
	24-23 "	"		
		(1994)		.13
	-	(1995)		.14
		(2012)		.15
.274 - 237 2	20			
		(2006)		.16
		(116)		
	-	".(2007)		.17
		"		
.2007	31-30			
		" .(2007)		.18
		"		
		(2009)		.19
	(4)	(33)		
	"	" .(2002)		.20
		"		
		(2007)		.21

-
- . (2014) .22
- .364 – 327 .6 2
.(2014) .23
- .268 – 247 .5 2
" .(2002) .24
- "
.(2001) .25
- :
.(1983) .26
27. Delorme T.6 (1985).An Assessment of the attitude and perceptions of selected elementary school teachers who serve native American children toward instructional supervision and evaluation. (Ed. D. Dissertation. The university of North Dakota. Dissertation Abstracts International. Us (8). P2324.
28. Glickman, G,(1985).Development as the aim of instructional supervision .ERIC.Ed .(263655).
29. Sergiovanni, T.J and Starratt, R.J.(1988). Supervision :Human Prespectives. New York : Mc Graw – Hill com .
30. Sullivan,S.& Glanz, J(2009). Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
31. smith, J(1991)"Teachers attitudes towards classroom observation a means of their evaluations "university of Georgia , Dissertation Abstracts International :
- .(2004)
- <http://doc.abhatoo.net.ma/MG/doc/chap3.26ab.doc>
- Naseh, Bizhan(2000),knowledge society and higher educational institutions, Roles and Responsibilities.
www.Ask.com